



PLANNING & ZONING

AGENDAS & MINUTES

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 23, 2010

The regular meeting of the Sussex County Planning and Zoning Commission was held Thursday evening, September 23, 2010, in the County Council Chambers, County Administrative Office Building, in Georgetown, Delaware.

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. with Chairman Wheatley presiding. The following members of the Commission were present: Mr. Robert Wheatley, Mr. Rodney Smith, Mr. I. G. Burton, and Mr. Michael Johnson, with Mr. Vincent Robertson – Assistant County Attorney, Mr. Lawrence Lank – Director, and Mr. Shane Abbott – Assistant Director.

Motion by Mr. Smith, seconded by Mr. Johnson, and carried unanimously to approve the Agenda as amended by deleting Item 4 under Other Business and to move the Other Business items for consideration prior to the Public Hearings. Motion carried 4 - 0.

Motion by Mr. Smith, seconded by Mr. Johnson, and carried with three votes to approve the Minutes of September 9, 2010 as amended. Motion carried 3 – 0 – 1, with Mr. Wheatley abstaining since he was not present during the public hearings.

OLD BUSINESS

C/U #1855 – application of **DOUBLE R HOLDINGS, LLC** to consider the Conditional Use of land in an AR-1 Agricultural Residential District for general offices and medical/professional offices to be located on a certain parcel of land lying and being in Lewes and Rehoboth Hundred, Sussex County, containing 3.40 acres, more or less, lying southwest of Plantation Road (Road 275) 2,100 feet northwest of Route 24.

The Commission discussed this application, which has been deferred since September 9, 2010.

Motion by Mr. Johnson, seconded by Mr. Burton, and carried unanimously to defer action for further consideration. Motion carried 4 – 0.

C/U #1858 – application of **OMAR ROAD, LLC** to consider the Conditional Use of land in an AR-1 Agricultural Residential District for a helicopter landing site (private) to be located on a certain parcel of land lying and being in Dagsboro Hundred, Sussex County, containing 8.45

acres, more or less, lying north of Omar Road (Route 54) 1,800 feet east of Road 354 (Dukes Road) and 0.5 mile west of Road 382 (Armory Road).

The Commission discussed this application, which has been deferred since September 9, 2010.

Mr. Johnson stated that he would move that the Commission recommend approval of C/U #1858 for Omar Road, LLC for a private helicopter landing site based upon the record made at the public hearing and for the following reasons:

- 1) This Conditional Use is being requested as part of the operations permitted by C/U #1679, which provides maintenance for chain store facilities. The Applicant is requesting a helipad so that he can use his personal helicopter to oversee his business, which has sites like this in several states.
- 2) The helipad will be limited to just the owners' use, and will not be open to general aviation or the public.
- 3) The use will not lead to any increase in traffic.
- 4) The Applicant provided expert testimony that the helicopter landing and takeoffs will not generate excessive noise or adversely affect the neighboring properties or community.
- 5) No parties appeared in opposition to this application.
- 6) This recommendation is subject to the following conditions:
 1. The use shall be for the private personal use of the business occupying the adjacent office/warehouse and shall not be open for general aviation purposes.
 2. The use of the helicopter landing pad shall be subject to the applicable requirements of the F.A.A., and any other governmental agency having jurisdiction over its use.
 3. No fuel storage or repair facilities for the helicopter shall exist on the site.
 4. As stated by the Applicant, any helicopters using this site shall have a capacity of 4 seats or less.
 5. As stated by the Applicant, the landing site shall not be lighted.
 6. The Final Site Plan shall be subject to the review and approval of the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Motion by Mr. Johnson, seconded by Mr. Burton, and carried unanimously to forward this application to the Sussex County Council with the recommendation that the application be approved for the reasons and with the conditions stated. Motion carried 3 – 0 – 1 with Mr. Wheatley abstaining since he was not present during the public hearing.

Subdivision #2009-11 – application of **BRANCH WOODS, L.L.C.** to consider the Subdivision of land in an AR-1 Agricultural Residential District in Broadkill Hundred, Sussex County, by dividing 30.99 acres into 46 lots, (Cluster Development), located at the southeast corner of the intersection of Route 5 (Union Street) and Road 234B (Draper Road).

The Commission discussed this application, which has been deferred since September 9, 2010.

Mr. Burton stated that he would move that the Commission grant preliminary approval for Subdivision #2009 – 11 for Branch Woods, LLC, based upon the record and for the following reasons:

1. This property was previously approved as a standard subdivision with less open space and tree preservation. The Applicant has created a plan that is superior to the old one and is now seeking approval of a clustered subdivision. The Applicant is seeking clustered lots with a minimum area of 7,500 square feet.
2. The clustered subdivision on this site will not have an adverse impact on the neighboring properties or community.
3. The subdivision will not adversely impact schools, public buildings, area roadways or public transportation.
4. The proposed subdivision meets the purpose and standards of the Subdivision Ordinance.
5. The Commission is satisfied that this project is a superior design under the subdivision ordinance, because it preserves open space, with 18.42 acres of open space compared with only 6.79 acres of open space under the standard subdivision plan. Within this open space there will be extensive tree preservation.
6. The design addresses the requirements of Section 99-9C of the Code.
7. The subdivision will have no more than 46 lots on 30.99 acres, which complies with the density permitted for this site.
8. The subdivision will be served by central water and sewer.
9. This preliminary approval is subject to the following:
 - A. There shall be no more than 46 lots within the subdivision.
 - B. The Applicant shall form a homeowners' association responsible for the perpetual maintenance of streets, roads, any buffers, storm water management facilities, erosion and sedimentation control facilities and other common areas.
 - C. The storm water management system shall meet or exceed the requirements of the State and County. It shall be constructed and maintained using Best Management Practices.
 - D. All entrances shall comply with all of DelDOT's requirements, and an area for a school bus stop shall be established. The location of the school bus stop shall be coordinated with the local school district.
 - E. Road naming and addressing shall be subject to the review and approval of the Sussex County Mapping and Addressing Department.
 - F. The Final Site Plan shall contain the approval of the Sussex Conservation District for the design and location of all storm water management areas and erosion and sedimentation control facilities.
 - G. A 20-foot forested Buffer shall be shown along boundaries of the subdivision. The buffer areas that are currently forested shall remain undisturbed. The Final Site Plan shall also contain a landscape plan for all of the buffer areas, showing all of the existing forest and new landscaping and vegetation included in the buffer areas.

- H. The developer shall maintain as many existing trees as possible. All of the undisturbed forested areas shall be shown on the Final Site Plan.
- I. No wetlands shall be included within any lots. As stated by the Applicant, there shall be a buffer of at least 50-feet from the wetlands.
- J. Sidewalks shall be located on both sides of all streets in the subdivision.
- K. As stated by the Applicant, all homes within the project shall be stick-built. No mobile homes shall be permitted.
- L. The subdivision shall be served by a central sewer system as defined by Sussex County Ordinance, designed in accordance with Sussex County Engineering Department and DNREC specifications.
- M. A hunting notice similar to the Agricultural Use Protection Notice shall be included on the Final Site Plan and within the Restrictive Covenants stating that hunting activities may occur on nearby properties.
- N. This Preliminary Approval is contingent upon the applicant submitting a revised Preliminary Site Plan either depicting or noting the conditions of this approval on it. Staff shall approve the revised site Plan upon confirmation that the conditions of approval have been depicted or noted on it.
- O. The Final Site Plan shall be subject to the review and approval of the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Motion by Mr. Burton, seconded by Mr. Johnson, and carried 3 votes to none, with Mr. Wheatley not participating, to approve this application as a preliminary, for the reasons, and with the conditions stated. Motion carried 3 – 0 – 1.

OTHER BUSINESS

Bethany Bay AR-1/RPC
Revised Master Plan – Road 350

Mr. Abbott advised the Commission that this is a revised master plan for the remaining 21 units located in the Bethany Bay residential planned community; that three single-family dwellings have been returned to Section 1.5, which is located on the southerly side of Pinehurst Court; that 18 multi-family dwelling units have been relocated to Section 1.3, which is known as The View; that instead of 12 unit buildings in this section, there will be 18 unit buildings; that a third floor has been added to the multi-family section; that the revised plan is very similar to the previous approved master plan that was approved by the Commission on September 17, 2008; that the Heron Run Condo Association, The Pointe at Bethany Bay Homeowners' Association and the Bethany Bay Homeowners' Transition Board have all reviewed the revised plan and have sent letters in support of the revisions.

Motion by Mr. Smith, seconded by Mr. Johnson and carried unanimously to approve the revised master plan as submitted. Motion carried 4 – 0.

Ocean Park
Amended Condition – Road 275

Mr. Abbott advised the Commission that this is a request to amend a condition of approval; that this application was approved and one of the conditions of approval stated that “The site plan shall be redesigned so that there is no parking within the front or side yard setbacks”; that the applicant’s engineers are requesting that the applicant be permitted to allow parking 15 feet from the site property line along Cedar Grove Road; that DelDOT is in the process of designing a realignment of Cedar Grove Road; that the realignment will take place in 2014 according to an e-mail from DelDOT voicing no objections to the request; and that since the condition originated at the Commission level, the Commission has the authority to amend the condition.

Mr. Burton stated that this is a completely different plan than what was submitted during the public hearing; that DelDOT does not have the money for the realignment of Cedar Grove Road and that no one is sure when the realignment will take place; Mr. Smith stated that the plan is different than the previous submitted plan and that it appears that the redesigned plan addresses the conditions of approval; and Mr. Johnson stated that the area is primarily agricultural and residential; that it appears that there are at least 40 more parking spaces and questioned where the underground parking has been relocated to.

Dennis Schrader, Esquire, and Garth Jones, P.E., were present on behalf of this request and advised the Commission that parking is still proposed under the units; that the storm water management areas will be located between the existing Cedar Grove Road right of way and the realigned Cedar Grove Road right of way; and that the parking along Cedar Grove Road will be 15 feet from the right of way line.

Mr. Abbott questioned if the site would be considered a corner lot and that if the lot is a corner lot, the side yard setback on a corner lot is 15 feet.

Mr. Schrader advised the Commission that the parking is set back 15 feet from the existing right of way of Cedar Grove Road.

Motion by Mr. Burton, seconded by Mr. Smith and carried unanimously to defer action. Motion carried 4 – 0.

Bay Forest Club MR/RPC
Phase 2 Subphase 2.1 – Final Site Plan – Roads 347 and 349

Mr. Abbott advised the Commission that this is the final record plan for Phase 2 Subphase 2.1 of the Bay Forest Club residential planned community; that this phase contains 37 townhouse lots; that the final site plan is the same as the revised preliminary plan that was approved by the Commission on March 17, 2010; and that all agency approvals have been received.

Motion by Mr. Smith, seconded by Mr. Johnson and carried unanimously to approve the site plan as a final. Motion carried 4 – 0.

Angola Estates GR/RPC
Lot 63 Revised Buildable Area – Talbot Drive

This item was removed from the Agenda on September 20, 2010.

Nancy H. and Christina Russell
Lot and 50' Right of Way – Road 451 (Arvey Road)

Mr. Abbott advised the Commission that this is a request to create a lot with access from a 50-foot right of way; that the proposed lot would be a minimum of 0.75-acre and would be subdivided out of a 68.12-acre parcel; that the 68.12-acre parcel is currently access by a 28-foot recorded easement across Glatfelter Pulpwood Company lands; that the proposed lot would be for the applicant's son; that the existing 28-foot easement across her property would be widened to 50 feet; that the request could be approved as submitted, or an application for a major subdivision can be required; and that if the request is approved as submitted; this would make two lots having access from the easement/right of way.

Motion by Mr. Smith, seconded by Mr. Johnson and carried unanimously to approve the request as submitted as a concept. Motion carried 4 – 0.

Norman C. Jackson, III
2 Lots and 50' Easement – Road 88 (Cave Neck Road)

Mr. Abbott advised the Commission that this is a request to create a .50-acre lot with access from a 50-foot easement; that the owner is proposing to create the 50-foot easement over an existing driveway to serve as access to the lot; that DNREC has issued a letter stating that they have no objections to the proposed lot size since their regulations permit 0.50-acre lots for on-site septic systems; that the request can be approved as submitted as a concept or an application for a major subdivision can be required; and that if the request is approved as submitted, it should be as a concept only since a variance from the minimum lot size requirement will be required from the Board of Adjustment.

Motion by Mr. Burton, seconded by Mr. Smith and carried 3 votes to 1 with Mr. Johnson opposed, to approve the request as a concept subject to the Board of Adjustment granting a variance from the minimum lot size requirement. Motion carried 3 – 1.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

ORDINANCE AMENDMENT – AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 115 OF THE CODE OF SUSSEX COUNTY BY AMENDING ARTICLE I RELATING TO DEFINITIONS REGARDING MANUFACTURED HOMES.

Mr. Lank provided the Commission with a copy of the Minutes of the Manufactured Housing Committee meetings of February 4, 2010, March 4, 2010 and April 8, 2010.

Mr. Lank summarized this Ordinance Amendment which addresses the fact that there are three similar, but different definitions of manufactured home in the current Code and stated that the new definition of a manufactured home will allow the Code to be consistent throughout; that the new definition of an accessory building clarifies language as to exactly what is considered an accessory building and to specify that an accessory building is a detached structure; that the new title and revised definition of a manufactured home park was done for consistency purposes in the Code; and that all of the definitions contained in this Ordinance Amendment are approved recommendations from the Manufactured Housing Committee.

Mr. Robertson advised the Commission that Section 1 of this Ordinance Amendment should reference Subsection 115-4 B and C, not just B, and that each of the different terms referenced in Section 2 and Section 3 should be quoted individually and not as quoted list as written currently.

The Commission found that Elaine Campbell of Bay City Manufactured Home Park, Roberta Hemmerick of McNichols Place Manufactured Home Park, and Susan Laushey of Silver View Farms Manufactured Home Park spoke in reference to this Ordinance Amendment and questioned the difference between a typical manufactured home and an authorized manufactured home, i.e. units placed in the Baywoods Community; that the Attorney General has made a recent decision regarding manufactured homes in New Castle County or Kent County; that Kent County and New Castle County view sheds differently from Sussex County; and that Ms. Laushey does not believe that a shed should be considered an accessory building since other jurisdictions do not consider it to be one.

Mr. Robertson advised the Commission that Sussex County and the majority of the Towns and Cities in Sussex County define sheds as accessory buildings.

The Commission found that there were no parties present in opposition to the Ordinance Amendment.

Mr. Robertson advised those parties present that the Planning and Zoning Commission considers and makes recommendations on Ordinance Amendments and that the Sussex County Council makes the final decision on whether to adopt an Ordinance Amendment.

At the conclusion of the public hearings, the Commission discussed this Ordinance Amendment.

Mr. Johnson stated that he would move that the Commission recommend approval of this Ordinance Amendment to Chapter 115 – Definitions Manufactured Homes based upon the record made at the public hearing and for the following reasons:

- 1) This amendment is the result of meetings and recommendations from a Manufactured Housing Committee that included representatives from the County, park owners, and home owners.
- 2) This amendment makes needed clarifications to the Code to address various different definitions of “manufactured home” in the Code. It also brings terms such as “house trailer”, “single-wide”, “double-wide”, “mobile home” and “trailer” used throughout the Code under the consistent term of “manufactured home”.

- 3) As currently written, the Code uses the various terms “trailer park”, “trailer court”, “mobile home park” and “mobile home community”. This amendment will bring all of those terms under the name “manufactured home park”.
- 4) This recommendation is subject to the following suggested revisions to the proposed Ordinance:
 1. The Definition of “Manufactured Home” that is being deleted in Section 1 is part of Section 115-4 C of the Code, not 115-4 B as the proposed Ordinance currently reads. It should be revised so that the first line of Section 1 states: “Amend Sussex County Code, Chapter 115, Article I, Section 115, Subsection 115-4B and C...”.
 2. Put each of the deleted terms set forth in Section 2 within individual quotation marks, rather than the entire phrase within quotation marks, since each of the individual terms, and not the entire phrase, appear throughout the Code and need to be replaced by the term “Manufactured Home”.
 3. Put each of the deleted terms set forth in Section 3 within individual quotation marks, rather than the entire phrase within quotation marks, since each of the individual terms, and not the entire phrase, appear throughout the Code and need to be replaced by the term “Manufactured Home Park”.

Motion by Mr. Johnson, seconded by Mr. Smith, and carried unanimously to forward this Ordinance Amendment to the Sussex County Council with the recommendation that the Ordinance Amendment be approved for the reasons and with the corrections stated. Motion carried 4 – 0.

ORDINANCE AMENDMENT – AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 115 OF THE CODE OF SUSSEX COUNTY BY AMENDING ARTICLE XXV, 115-187 C RELATING TO GROSS FLOOR AREA OF MANUFACTURED HOMES.

Mr. Lank summarized this Ordinance Amendment which makes this subsection of the Code consistent with other portions of the Code which reference 450-square feet and that this Ordinance Amendment was based on an approved recommendation from the Manufactured Housing Committee. The current Code references a minimum gross area of a mobile home as being 400 square feet within a mobile home park.

The Commission found that there were no parties present in support of or in opposition to this Ordinance Amendment.

At the conclusion of the public hearings, the Commission discussed this Ordinance Amendment.

Mr. Smith stated that he would move that the Commission recommend approval of Ordinance Amendment for Chapter 115 – Gross Floor Area Manufactured Homes based upon the record made at the public hearing and for the following reasons:

- 1) This Amendment is the result of meetings and recommendations from a Manufactured Housing Committee that included representatives from Sussex County, park owners and home owners.
- 2) The Amendment makes Section 187C of the Code that reference 450 square feet as the minimum size for a manufactured home.

Motion by Mr. Smith, seconded by Mr. Johnson, and carried unanimously to forward this Ordinance Amendment to the Sussex County Council with the recommendation that this Ordinance Amendment be approved for the reasons stated. Motion carried 4 – 0.

ORDINANCE AMENDMENT – AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 115 OF THE CODE OF SUSSEX COUNTY BY AMENDING ARTICLE XXIV 115-172 G RELATING TO CONDITIONAL USES REGARDING MANUFACTURED HOMES.

Mr. Lank summarized this Ordinance Amendment which is intended to clarify regulations regarding accessory buildings in manufactured home parks. The Ordinance Amendment also adds to the Code regulations regarding handicap ramps. The sentence in Subsection 115-172 G. (7) was deleted as it is covered in the proposed new Subsection (14). This Ordinance Amendment was based on an approved recommendation from the Manufactured Housing Committee.

Mr. Robertson stated that if the Ordinance Amendment is recommended for approval, Subsection (13) should be amended to clarify that the reference to accessory buildings being previously permitted references “by Sussex County”, and that Subsection (14) should be amended to clarify in the first line that the handicap ramps are “for emergency purposes”, and that permanent ramps be required to comply with setbacks.

The Commission found that Mark Mesiner of West Bay Park Manufactured Home Park, Patty Weyl of Bay City Manufactured Home Park, Susan Laushey of Silver View Farms Manufactured Home Park, John Morris of Camelot Manufactured Home Park, Jeanne Sisk of Sea Air Village Manufactured Home Park, and Roberta Hemmerick of McNichols Place Manufactured Home Park spoke in reference to this Ordinance Amendment.

Mr. Mesiner supported the reference to 5-foot setbacks from property lines for accessory buildings and the proposed 10-foot spacing between accessory buildings, and that steps and landings in Flood Zone areas cannot comply with the current Code since the landings have to be elevated to the floor level and it takes more steps to get down to grade since the homes are elevated based on the Flood Zone requirements.

Mrs. Weyl questioned the setbacks.

Mrs. Laushey stated that other Counties do not apply setbacks to sheds under a maximum square footage, one example being 600 square feet; and that she questions the difference between a non-conforming lot and a non-conforming improvement.

Mr. Morris referenced that there are several handicap ramps in Camelot Manufactured Home Park.

Ms. Sisk referenced that she does not have a problem with the existing Code; that there are some difficulties with sheds; that the proposed Ordinance Amendments are written for 5,000 square

foot lot, not non-conforming lots; that there should not be a need for variances for sheds; that this Ordinance Amendment should be readdressed; that a shed should be identified by a building permit only; that improvements should be required to comply with a 10-foot front yard setback; that the landowner/park-owner should identify the lot boundaries and approve the location of the shed, and then the tenant should be allowed to get a permit.

Ms. Hemmerick stated that County employees need a refresher course on what permits are required since several people have stated that they have been told by County employees that permits are not needed for sheds, and some other improvements.

At the conclusion of the public hearings, the Commission discussed this Ordinance Amendment.

Mr. Robertson stated that this Ordinance Amendment has received a lot of discussion and that clarity may be necessary on some of the issues; that we may need to address the difference between permanent and temporary handicap ramps.

Motion by Mr. Smith, seconded by Mr. Burton, and carried unanimously to defer action for further consideration and to allow the Commission time to review the testimony and the Minutes of the Manufacturing Housing Committee. Motion carried 4 – 0.

ORDINANCE AMENDMENT – AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 115 OF THE CODE OF SUSSEX COUNTY BY AMENDING ARTICLE XXVII 115-211 RELATING TO VARIANCES.

Mr. Lank summarized this Ordinance Amendment which is intended to clarify that an adjoining property to a property that has received an approved variance in a Manufactured Home Park shall not have to apply for a variance if the adjoining property replaces an accessory building or improvement with one of the same size, as long as setback requirements are met, and that this Ordinance Amendment was based on an approved recommendation from the Manufactured Housing Committee.

Mr. Robertson stated that Section 1 of the proposed Ordinance Amendment should reference Subsection 115-211, not 115-121: that on the second line of Subsection 211 H. it should be noted that the reference to an accessory building should also reference one that was previously permitted by Sussex County; and that there may be some need for clarification on this Ordinance Amendment with the County Attorney that prepared the document. For example, as currently written, it seems to address the need for building separation, since compliance with setbacks will still be required; if that is the intent, it should be more clearly stated.

The Commission found that Patty Weyl of Bay City Manufactured Home Park, Ron Motti of Bay City Manufactured Home Park, Neil Dickerson of Pot Nets Creekside Manufactured Home Park, Susan Laushey of Silver View Farms Manufactured Home Park, John Morris of Camelot Manufactured Home Park, Annette Peary of Pot Nets Lakeside, Roberta Hemmerick of McNichols Place Manufactured Home Park, Mark Mesiner of West Bay Park Manufactured Home Park, Elaine Campbell of Bay City Manufactured Home Park, Eleanor Ell of Camelot Manufactured Home Park spoke in reference to this Ordinance Amendment.

Mrs. Weyl stated that they purchased their lot with the shed as it is placed and that when she replaces the shed it will conform to the regulations; that her neighbor has a permitted shed on his lot, but the shed was placed in error and does not conform to regulations and that the improvements on that lot are considered non-conforming; and that all sheds should be considered important and should be required to conform to setback requirements.

Mr. Motti questioned the difference between setbacks and separation between improvements.

Ms. Laushey questioned why so many variances are being granted and why the tenants should be required to apply for variances and the need for registered surveys with applications.

Mr. Morris made reference to inspections, variances, park owner/management responsibilities and questioned the placement of buildings, not permitted, without the need for variances.

Ms. Perry stated that when she acquired her lot the marketing agent showed her where her lot lines were by marking a spot with her foot and striding off the dimensions, and that when the lot was finally monumented her lot is actually larger.

Ms. Hemmerick stated that one of the purposes of the Manufactured Housing Committee was to establish clear text in the Code; questioned the difference between conforming and non-conforming manufactured home parks; and stated that Sea Air Village Manufactured Home Park was originally intended for single wide units and that some of units had small porches and decks; and that the original intent of the Park was not for double-wide manufactured home parks.

Ms. Campbell questioned what the landowner or park owner is required to do, and why all of the County regulations appear to be directed at the lot tenants.

Mr. Lank responded that the landowner/park-owner are required to follow the same regulations, plus additional ones affecting the park.

Ms. Ell suggested that the County should provide a brochure referencing the regulations and require the park management to maintain the brochures for distribution to the tenants when building and placement permits are being requested.

At the conclusion of the public hearings the Commission discussed this Ordinance Amendment.

Mr. Robertson requested time to review this Ordinance Amendment and to discuss the Ordinance Amendment with the County Attorney that drafted the document.

Motion by Mr. Smith, seconded by Mr. Johnson, and carried unanimously to defer action for further consideration by the Commission and for Mr. Robertson to research the drafting of this Ordinance Amendment. Motion carried 4 – 0.

Additional Business

The Commission discussed their November 10, 2010 meeting time.

Motion by Mr. Johnson, seconded by Mr. Burton and carried unanimously to hold the November 10, 2010 at 3:00 p.m., instead of 6:00 p.m. Motion carried 4 – 0.

Meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.