

# **City of Cottage Grove Planning Commission August 27, 2007**

Pursuant to due call and notice thereof, a regular meeting of the Planning Commission was duly held at City Hall, 7516 – 80th Street South, Cottage Grove, Minnesota on the 27th day of August 2007, in the Council Chambers and telecast on local Government Cable Channel 16.

## **Call to Order**

Chairperson Thiede called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

## **Roll Call**

Members Present: Ken Brittain, Tina Folch-Freiermuth, Obid Hofland, Steve Messick, Tracy Poncin, Chris Reese, David Thiede, Chris Willhite

Members Absent: Shane Bauer

Staff Present: Howard Blin, Community Development Director  
John McCool, Senior Planner  
Mark Grossklaus, City Council

## **Approval of Agenda**

*A motion was made and seconded to approve the agenda. Motion approved unanimously (8-0 vote).*

## **Open Forum**

Chairperson Thiede asked if anyone wished to address the Planning Commission on any non-agenda item. No one addressed the Commission.

## **Chair's Explanation of the Public Hearing Process**

Chairperson Thiede explained the purpose of the Planning Commission, which serves in an advisory capacity to the City Council, and that the City Council makes all final decisions. In addition, he explained the process of conducting a public hearing and requested that any person wishing to speak should come to the microphone and state their full name and address for the public record.

## **Public Hearings and Application Reviews**

### **6.1 Werner Electric Site Plan Review – Case SP07-041**

**Werner Electric has applied for a zoning amendment to rezone approximately 6.7 acres of land from R-5, Medium Density Residential, to I-2, General Industrial; and a site plan review to allow the construction of a 158,000 square foot office and distribution facility on**

**property located north of 95th Street and approximately 570 feet west of Hemingway Avenue.**

McCool summarized the planning staff report and recommended approval subject to the conditions listed in the staff report.

Reese asked for clarification on the how much land should be rezoned and if it should be only 3.3 acres and not 6.7 acres. McCool responded yes.

Hofland asked if there would be further landscaping on the 100-foot buffer. McCool responded yes and that the city wants a trail between the Werner site and the residential area with additional plantings within that area.

Thiede asked why the number of acres that will be rezoned was changed from 6.7 to 3.3. McCool when the city advertised the public hearing on the proposal, there had not yet been discussions about which part of the property needed to be rezoned. During staff's review, it made more sense to use the westerly property line of the Werner site for the boundary between the R-5 and the I-2 zoning.

Brittain asked if staff is still recommending that the drive aisle be moved to the east. McCool stated that staff is still discussing that with the applicant, noting that there are issues with grade elevations and the amount of fill material required to bring up the elevation up for the driveway. Brittain then asked if the parking lot lights would shine into the residential properties due to the grade difference. McCool responded that the residential area is about 20 to 25 feet higher than the parking area.

Thiede asked about the operations at Werner Electric. Craig Amundson, Vice President of Operations with Werner Electric, 1800 Elm Street, Minneapolis, explained that they are a wholesale electrical distributor with seven branches. Thiede asked if this is an expansion or are they moving out of the Minneapolis building. Amundson stated that the Minneapolis facility is currently leased and they want to own their building and it is also an expansion as they have outgrown their current facility. Thiede asked how many employees they will have. Amundson replied that they currently have about 100 employees in their Minneapolis branch. They also do training for their customers at their facility.

Willhite asked about their traffic patterns. Amundson responded that they have two shifts; the first shift runs from 7:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. but their primary shift is the second shift, which runs from about 11:00 a.m. to 8:00 to 8:30 p.m. Their receiving doors are open from 7:00 to 12:30. Their transfer trucks start leaving around 2:00 a.m. and their city trucks around 5:00 a.m. Their training sessions with customers typically run from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.

Thiede asked why they positioned their office area to the north as 95th Street seems to be the front. Amundson responded that they would prefer to have the offices overlooking the park and ponding area as opposed to looking out over the street. In addition, this design works better to shift the receiving doors on the side of the building away from the residential area.

Brittain asked if it was feasible to shift the drive access further east away from the residential area. Jack Gratkin, R.J. Ryan Construction, stated that they would be doing some berming and landscaping by the drive. He stated that they may shift further down but they are still working

with staff. Brittain stated that he is concerned about braking noise in the middle of the night because there are two stop points, one as you come out from the loading dock to the main drive and then at the road. Gratkin responded that originally they wanted it farther to the west but they moved so it is 200 feet away from the residential area at the nearest point.

***Thiede opened the public hearing.***

Mike Hines, 9209 Harkness Avenue South, expressed concern about the parking area facing the residential area noting that the residential area is about 25 feet higher in elevation than the proposed project. He asked how tall the parking lot lights would be. McCool answered 20 to 24 feet tall. Hines also is concerned about traffic noise from the access drive that is 200 feet from the houses. He stated that the residents in the area knew that there would be development on that site, but he feels the site plan could be designed so that the impact to the residential area is minimized. He asked if the stormwater ponding in the area was sufficient and about landscaping on the 100-foot buffer. He also wondered why this site was chosen over other undeveloped land in the industrial park that is further away from the residential area. He stated that General Industrial zoning this close to a neighborhood does not make sense to him. Thiede asked Hines what he would see as a better neighbor for that location. Hines responded a smaller company that does not have truck traffic at night.

Mike Aune, 7990 – 96th Street South, explained that his back yard overlooks the Werner Electric site. He read from a letter he distributed to the Commission that expressed his concerns about the proposal, specifically traffic, the location of the access to the site, and buffering. He stated that the homes on 96th Street that back onto 95th Street are elevated above the site. Traffic coming up to the site on 95th Street is in clear view. Moving the access further east would be less disruptive to the residents in the area. He stated that he believed the area proposed for rezoning from R-5 to I-2 was to be the buffer between the residential and industrial properties. He suggested that the access to the Werner Electric site should be on the newly created road to the east. Willhite asked if the road he was referring to was Hemingway Avenue. McCool showed a map of the area pointing out the location of Hemingway Avenue and a stormwater pond. Willhite asked if Hemingway goes all the way through. McCool stated that Hemingway ends in a cul-de-sac to the north and 91st Street goes west into a parking area for the expanded Hamlet Park. He explained that access to the Werner site from Hemingway Avenue would require purchasing privately owned property for a road. McCool explained that the property being rezoned would only be used for part of the parking lot so they could still use it without the rezoning.

Reese asked where the drive is located. McCool displayed the aerial photo for the area showing where the road would be located.

Brittain asked where the stormwater ponding for this site would be located. McCool explained how the stormwater drainage system works for that area. Folch asked if the original zoning was done to prevent access from 95th Street to that property as a buffer from the residential area. McCool explained that when the zoning took place in the late 1970s or early 1980s, they probably did not look at individual access for parcels in the industrial park. It was understood that this remnant parcel of industrially zoned property would have access off 95th Street; it is just a matter of where the access would be located. Folch asked if the property needs to be rezoned to allow driveway access. McCool responded that driveways would be allowed in both the R-5 and the I-2 zoning districts.

***No one else spoke. Thiede closed the public hearing.***

Thiede asked what the implications would be of moving the driveway over. Gratkin stated that more people work in the office than in the warehouse, noting that there are approximately five semi-trucks that come to the site. He stated that there is a little flexibility on where they move the access but they don't want to take it all the way down to the pump house. He then stated that if the access came from the CP site, they would need to flip the building so the loading docks would face the residential area, which no one wants.

Brittain suggested moving the access further to the east. Gratkin stated that the further east it is moved, the more likely that headlights would shine into the residential area. Brittain stated that with a 25-foot grade the lights should not hit the houses. He stated that they would continue to work with staff on this issue. Blin asked if there is room to landscape on the south side of 95th Street between the back of the curb and the fence line of the houses. McCool responded that there is a trail on that side and he does not know how much spacing there is between the trail and the property lines. Aune stated that from the fence line to the road there is a trail as well as a trail on the other side of the street. He requested that the access drive be moved further to the east to help prevent lights from shining into the homes south of 95th Street.

Reese asked if there are any plans for future expansion or another building on the proposed Lot 2 along 95th Street. Gratkin responded that there are currently no plans, but with only being allowed one access off 95th Street, they want to maintain their options for the balance of the property.

Thiede asked if the restriction to one access to 95th Street is the city's restriction. Gratkin responded yes. Thiede asked if there could be a truck entrance by the pump house and the automotive entrance where they have it planned. Gratkin responded that it would be very expensive to construct two full driveways. Amundson explained that they have only about four trucks leaving the facility before 6:00 a.m. and no trucks arriving at the facility before 7:00 a.m., which is when they open their receiving doors. He stated that they will be posting the drive for five to ten miles an hour, which should help mitigate the concerns about braking noise.

Willhite asked about the size of the trucks. Amundson responded that they are measure from 20 to 28 feet and they also are leasing one semi-truck. That truck leaves at about 11:00 p.m. Willhite asked for further information on their trucking schedule. Amundson explained that deliveries of product are made to their receiving area from 7:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. Their four transfer trucks are loaded with product for delivery to their branch locations and leave around 2:00 a.m. They also have three city route trucks that don't leave their facility until 6:00 a.m.

Reese asked if the applicant has any concerns with the change to the number of acres being rezoned. Amundson responded no.

Aune again asked that the access drive be located by the pump house so it would be away from the residential properties.

Messick stated that he has no problems with the propose site plan. He believes that it is one of the goals of the City to fill these parcels respectfully and smartly. He noted that there is a

lengthy list of conditions that will satisfy the aesthetics of the property and will enhance the use of the site.

Reese asked how far down that drive would be moved. McCool responded it would be moved eastward 150 to 200 feet. Reese noted that would not make any difference from a noise standpoint, and that the drive would go down approximately 20 to 25 feet to where the parking area was. McCool displayed the grading plan and explained that they would fill in material to provide for a gradient slope down to that area, noting that from 95th Street there is probably about a 15-foot difference in grade. Reese stated that that the grade would provide a noise buffer. Aune stated that the grade from the pump house is level and the natural hill would be the buffer for the noise. Reese asked if the new landscape plan would have additional plantings such as black spruce trees to work as a buffer along 95th Street. McCool stated that staff is recommending a mix of deciduous trees, conifers, and additional plantings, but again the site does drop down so any plantings on that slope would be below the trail elevation.

Willhite asked how far back the pump house is from the road. McCool responded about 30 feet.

Brittain commented that architecture of the building meets the city's standards. He also appreciates the additional detail added to the 95th Street side of the building so it isn't just a barren wall. He hopes that staff can work with the applicant on the road alignment that would work with the grading, site lines, and noise. Overall the design is well thought out and will add significant value to the industrial park.

Thiede reiterated Brittain's comments, stating that this is a relatively low impact use compared to what could go in there.

***Reese made a motion to recommend approval of rezoning 3.3 acres of land from R-5 to I-2, instead of the 6.7 acres proposed in the staff report. Brittain seconded. Motion passed unanimously.***

***Willhite made a motion to recommend approval of the site plan review subject to the conditions listed below and that staff continue to work with the applicant on the road alignment. Hofland seconded the motion.***

- 1. All building and site development must conform to the plans dated August 21, 2007.***
- 2. All applicable permits (i.e., building, electrical, grading, and mechanical) and a commercial plan review packet must be completed, submitted, and approved by the City prior to the commencement of any construction activities. Detailed construction plans must be reviewed and approved by the Building Official and Fire Marshal.***
- 3. All outdoor lighting must be directed downward with cut-off fixtures. Reflected glare of spill light must not exceed five-tenths (0.5) foot-candle as measured on the property line. An outdoor lighting plan must be submitted to the Planning Division before a building permit is issued.***
- 4. The grading and erosion control plan for the site must comply with NPDES II Permit requirements. Erosion control devices must be installed prior to commencement of***

**any grading activity. Erosion control must be performed in accordance with the recommended practices of the "Minnesota Construction Site Erosion and Sediment Control Planning Handbook" and the conditions stipulated in Title 10-5-8, Erosion Control During Construction of the City's Subdivision Ordinance.**

- 5. A final grading plan and stormwater calculations must be submitted to the City Engineer for review and approval before a building permit will be issued.**
- 6. Final exterior construction materials and colors must be reviewed and approved by the Planning Division prior to the issuance of a building permit.**
- 7. All curbing for the project must be B612 concrete design and the concrete drive aprons compliant with city standards.**
- 8. The applicant must provide the City with an "as-built" survey of all private utilities.**
- 9. The developer is responsible for the cost of installing a "STOP" sign at the exit lane. The "STOP" sign must be ten feet from the roadway edge and two feet from the driveway edge. The bottom of the sign must be six feet from the ground. The "STOP" sign must be a 30-inch sized sign having a high intensity reflective face. Said sign should be mounted on a six-foot No. 3 and eight-foot No. 2 steel post. The applicant may request the City's Public Works Department to install this sign, but must pay the City for actual costs incurred by the City.**
- 10. All signs must comply with the provisions of the sign ordinance and the comprehensive sign package submitted by the applicant. A building permit must be obtained prior to the installation of any new signs.**
- 11. A landscaping plan must be revised to include additional trees, shrubs, grasses, and/or perennials. The revised landscape plan must be submitted to the Planning Division City Council takes final action on the applications.**
- 12. A plan showing the underground irrigation system must be submitted to the City. Once the irrigation system is installed, the landowner is required to maintain and operate the irrigation system so that all yards and landscaped areas continue to thrive.**
- 13. A bona fide cost estimate of the landscaping improvements must be submitted in conjunction with a letter of credit approved by the City in the amount of 150 percent of such estimate. Upon completion of the landscaping requirements, the applicant must submit to the city in writing City that said improvements were completed. The City will retain the financial guarantee for a period of one year from the date of notice to insure the survival of the plantings. A building permit will not be issued until the required letter of credit has been received and accepted by the City.**
- 14. Rooftop mechanical equipment and final exterior screening materials and colors must be reviewed and approved by the Planning Division prior to the issuance of a building permit.**

- 15. A radio-read water meter(s) must be installed.**
- 16. All ground-mounted mechanical equipment accessory to the principal structure over 30 inches or greater than 12 cubic feet must be screened from public views with landscaping, berming, or a screen wall/fence. Screening materials must be similar to or compatible in design and color with those used on the principal structure. Screening materials may include property maintained wood, vinyl, or metal screens or fencing as required in City Code Title 11-6-4(3).**
- 17. The property owner must agree to allow city personnel to enter upon the property to maintain, repair, and inspect all public utility systems that exist on the property. Flushing the fire hydrant internal to the property is the city's responsibility.**
- 18. Outdoor storage is prohibited.**
- 19. When the property is re-platted in the future, all property owners must sign the plat so that it can be recorded at Washington County Recorder's Office.**
- 20. The developer must comply with all City ordinances and policies.**
- 21. A stormwater system improving stormwater quality before leaving the site must be provided on-site.**
- 22. Only one access drive connecting to 95th Street is permitted for this property.**
- 23. The south 40 feet from the south line of the Northeast Quarter of Section 20 will be required to be dedicated as public right-of-way.**
- 24. A 25-foot wide drainage and utility easement is required to be centered on the existing trunk sanitary sewer at the time the property is platted.**
- 25. The curb radius for the access drive connecting to 95th Street is required to be a minimum of a 30-foot radius.**

**Motion passed unanimously (8-to-0 vote).**

## **6.2 Holt Rezoning – Case ZA07-046**

**Jason Holt has applied for a zoning amendment to change the zoning of approximately 9.55 acres of land from AG-1, Agricultural Preservation, to R-1, Rural Residential. The property is located approximately one-quarter mile west of Manning Avenue (State Highway 95) and north of 114th Street South.**

Blin summarized the planning staff report and recommended approval subject to the conditions stipulated in the staff report.

Brittain asked with respect to the changes being investigated to the comprehensive plan, where would commercial entities be located in that area of the community. Blin pointed out on the area on the map that is currently zoned B-2, which is west of Manning Avenue and north of

Highway 61. Brittain asked about the road, 114th Street, along the south side of the church. Blin explained that when this parcel was subdivided, a 60-foot local street right-of-way was dedicated, but was not improved beyond the westerly boundary of the Latter Day Saints parcel. This street effectively provides access to that area. Brittain asked if the B-2 area is large enough to support development in that area. Blin responded that at this point there is sufficient commercially zoned property when combined with the commercial area on the south side of Highway 61. Brittain asked if reconfiguration of the intersection of Manning Avenue and Highway 61 could cause an issue with this parcel. Blin responded that it is far away enough that it should not be an issue. Brittain asked what the minimum lot size is for the R-1 zoning district. Blin responded that R-1 requires a minimum of three acres, but it is possible to go less with cluster developments.

Thiede asked where the house would be located. Blin explained that if the rezoning is approved, they would acquire the parcel west of the church and staff would encourage them to develop it in a way that the house is not in the middle, so there are future subdivision possibilities. Thiede asked about the other properties in the area. Blin stated that they are zoned agricultural.

Willhite asked where the properties that were rezoned are located. Blin responded at Lehigh Avenue. He reiterated that all these properties are guided for rural residential and the proposed rezoning would make the property conform to the underlying land use.

Brittain stated typically there is higher density closer to major thoroughfares and he expressed concern about having large lot development across the street from commercially zoned property. Thiede stated that three houses could be built on the property's nine acres with the R-1 zoning, which could be relatively easy to remove if there are future redevelopment plans for this area. Blin stated that the questions include whether there is sufficient commercial zoned property for future development and if rural residential property should surround the commercial property. If it is determined by this group that R-1 is not the appropriate zoning for this property, then the Commission should go back consider a commercial land use there.

Willhite stated that the reason that property was not originally rezoned was that the Commission at that time did not want a piecemeal rezoning. The intent always was to have this area zoned rural residential.

Reese stated that most of the businesses that would locate out there probably be similar to what is currently there, not strip malls or drug stores. He believes it would almost be a mirror to what is across Highway 61.

Hofland stated that rezoning this parcel would make sense in regard to what else is taking place out there, which is larger residential lots.

Folch believes that the city does not have a real vision for how that area should be developed, and that vision should be determined before decisions are made on rezoning.

Poncin agreed with Folch, noting there could be issues if larger scale commercial development occurs next to a rural residential area.

Reese asked if Denmark Township has any plans for their side of Manning Avenue, which he assumes will be rural residential. Blin responded that except for little nodes of commercial areas along Highway 61, all of Denmark Township is rural residential.

Willhite stated that due to traffic concerns, she does not believe higher density housing should be built in that area, and it makes more sense to continue the rural residential zoning.

Brittain asked when utilities would be extended to this area. Blin responded that was not likely within the next 25 years. Brittain then asked what the long-term plans are for the road width on Manning Avenue. Blin stated that the right-of-way would likely be in excess of 150 feet. In the next 10 years or so, there will be some improvements to the two-lane section, such as adding left-turn lanes, and 20 to 30 years out, the state is looking at four lanes. The plan is that Manning Avenue will become a connector between I-94 on the north and Highway 61 on the south. As this whole area starts to develop, there will be more traffic demand along that highway.

Folch asked if only one house has been proposed. Blin responded yes. He noted that it would be possible to come in and subdivide it further.

***Thiede opened the public hearing. No one spoke. Thiede closed the public hearing.***

***Reese made a motion to recommend approval based on the findings of fact and subject to the conditions listed below. Willhite seconded.***

**Findings of Approval**

- A. The property and surrounding areas continue to be guided for the Rural Residential land use.***
- B. In accordance with State Statutes, the designated land use and zoning will eventually have to be synchronized by the City.***
- C. One hundred twenty three (123) acres of property within the same land use district, transition zone, and general location was rezoned from AG-1, Agricultural Preservation, to R-1, Rural Residential, in 2005 as a part of the Biscoe Grove subdivision.***
- D. The rezoning of the property would only create the potential of 10 additional trips per day on to the adjacent Manning Avenue, and 30 trips per day if two additional lots were ever approved through a subdivision process.***

**Conditions of Approval**

- 1. The property must be approved by Washington County as being capable of supporting a residential private septic system, as evidenced by a standard percolation test and drain field location design.***
- 2. All applicable permits (i.e., building, electrical, grading, mechanical) must be completed, submitted, and approved by the City prior to the commencement of any construction activities on the property. Detailed construction plans must be reviewed and approved by the Building Official and Fire Marshal.***

- 3. The installation of the future roadway within the 114th Street public right-of-way will be required when Lot 2 Block 1 is subdivided further, or the adjacent property to the south develops. This roadway will be constructed to city standards as a public improvement project, and will be assessed against all benefiting properties. Until the roadway is constructed to city standards, the City will not be responsible for repair or maintenance within the public right-of-way.**
- 4. The applicant must enter into an agreement with the city for the use of a private drive within the public right-of-way prior to issuance of a building permit.**
- 5. A park dedication fee shall be paid at the time of a building permit on the property, and at the rate applicable at the time of the building permit application.**

***Motion passed on a 7-to-1 vote (Folch).***

Folch explained that in the future if the interchange between Manning Avenue and Highway 61 is developed and frontage roads go in, that corner becomes more suitable for commercial development. She believes it is premature to put houses there. That corner area has a lot of potential for commercial development in the future and this rezoning would limit future development possibilities.

## **Discussion Items**

### **7.1 Sign Ordinance Amendments**

Blin updated the Commission on the city's moratorium on dynamic signs, which was put in place in January to allow time for a study on those signs. He stated that the League of Minnesota Cities has finished the study, and believes the report gives the city enough support to prohibit these signs. Next month staff will propose an ordinance amendment prohibiting these types of signs. He then stated that staff is also recommending that the Planning Commission look into an entire rewrite of the city's sign ordinance. He explained that parts of the ordinance are antiquated and probably less than totally defensible from a legal standpoint. After discussions with the city attorney, it was recommended that the city should update the ordinance. The key issue will be content neutral signs. The basic premise is that cities can regulate such issues as size or whether signs are electronic, but from a first amendment standpoint cannot regulate the content of signs or who they are relating to. In other words, the city cannot make an exception for a non-profit group if signs for for-profit commercial enterprises are prohibited. He asked if the Commission was interested in pursuing this. Willhite asked if the Commission would get a copy of the League study. Blin responded yes. Reese requested a copy of the current sign ordinance. Thiede asked how long ago the sign ordinance was overhauled. Blin responded that it has probably been about 20 years since any major changes were made to the ordinance. It was the consensus of the Commission to review and rewrite the entire sign ordinance.

### **7.2 Lot Sizes**

Blin gave background information on why lot size requirements differed between the proposed Walden Woods development, which was denied in part due to lots less than 85 feet wide and the proposed McHattie Farms development which has some lots that are 76 feet wide. The basic

reason for the difference is that in the West Draw, which was where Walden Woods would have been located, the standard, from the West Draw Task Force Report, requires that lots widths are a minimum of 85 feet. In the East Ravine Master Plan, there are provisions for no more than 10 percent of the lots to be less than 85 feet wide. The discussion centered on how lot widths were determined for the East Ravine. It was the consensus of the Commission that in the East Ravine, the average lot width for a development should be 85 feet, but that no more than 10 percent of the lots can be less than 85 feet wide but not less than 75 feet wide and must be scattered throughout the development.

## **Approval of Planning Commission Minutes of June 25, 2007**

***Being that there were no corrections to the June 25, 2007, minutes, they were accepted as distributed.***

## **Reports**

### **9.1 Recap of July and August City Council Meetings**

Blin reviewed the items discussed by the City Council at their July 28 and August 18, 2007, meetings.

### **9.2 Response to Planning Commission Inquiries**

None.

### **9.3 Planning Commission Requests**

Reese noted that one of the houses being built by Pulte Homes, which is next door to the model, in the Timber Ridge Estates is mostly garage along the front. Blin stated that staff would look at that.

Hofland asked about the status of the McHattie Farms development. Blin responded that the developers reported to staff due to the housing market slowdown and the recent credit crunch, they are holding off on that development for now, but they have not backed out of it yet.

Reese asked if Military Road would reopen. Blin responded that the initial plans were to re-open the road, but that is currently being re-evaluated. If it weren't re-opened, it would still have to provide access for several houses located on the road, so there could be a cul-de-sac on each end.

Folch asked if there were any plans to upgrade the 80th Street bridge over Highway 61. Blin responded that a range of options have been looked at, including a new bridge which could cost \$9 to \$10 million. However, the bridge is in good condition and won't be replaced any time soon. There was also a suggestion to build a new deck or widen the deck so there could be sidewalks on both sides, which would cost about a million dollars. Mn/DOT will not pay for either of those. Another proposal looked at would add decorative rails and lights, which would be in the range of \$200,000 to \$300,000. The city submitted a bonding request to the state to

enhance the whole Gateway area, and if successful, some of those funds may be used to upgrade the bridge.

## **Adjournment**

***Willhite made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Folch seconded. Motion passed unanimously and the meeting adjourned at 9:03 p.m.***