

**FINAL MINUTES — NOVEMBER 19, 2019
CITY OF INDIAN ROCKS BEACH
BOARD OF ADJUSTMENTS AND APPEALS**

The Regular Meeting of the Indian Rocks Beach Board of Adjustments and Appeals was held on **TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 2019**, at 7:30 p.m., in the City Commission Chambers, 1507 Bay Palm Boulevard, Indian Rocks Beach, Florida.

1. **CALL TO ORDER.** Chair Alvarez called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

2. **ROLL CALL:**

PRESENT: Chair Rick Alvarez, Vice Chair Stewart DeVore, Board Member Jim Labadie, and Board Member David Watt.

ABSENT: Board Member Waldemar H. Clark, Jr.

OTHERS PRESENT: Planning Consultant Hetty C. Harmon, AICP, City Attorney Randy Mora, and City Clerk Deanne B. O'Reilly, MMC.

VACANT POSITIONS: 1st Alternate Board Member and 2nd Alternate Board Member.

(To provide continuity for research, items are listed in agenda order although not necessarily discussed in that order.)

3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES. October 15, 2019 Minutes.**

MOTION MADE BY VICE CHAIR DEVORE, SECONDED BY MEMBER LABADIE, TO APPROVE THE OCTOBER 15, 2019 BOARD OF ADJUSTMENTS AND APPEALS MINUTES AS SUBMITTED. UNANIMOUS APPROVAL BY ACCLAMATION.

4. **BOA CASE NO. 2019-08 — 349 12th AVENUE**

Owner/Applicant: Jeff Schaefer

Representative: Enterprise Marine

Subject Location: 349 12th Avenue

Legal Description: Indian Beach Re-Revised 2nd Addition, Block 89, Lot 12

Parcel #: 06-30-15-42066-089-0120

Variance Request: Variance request from Code Section 94-86(a)(1) to allow for a dock facility to exceed the 50-foot length from the seawall by 6 feet.

SUBJECT: BOA CASE NO. 2019-08 is a variance request from Sec. 94-86(a)(1) to allow for a dock facility to exceed the 50-foot length from the seawall by 6 feet for property.

OWNER: Jeff Schaefer
PROPERTY LOCATION: 349 12th Avenue
ZONING: Single Family Residential

Direction	Existing Use	Zoning Category
North	Residential	S
East	Residential	S
South	Intracoastal	N/A
West	Residential	S

BACKGROUND:

Mr. Schaefer is requesting a variance to be able to install a dock and boat lift that exceeds the maximum length allowed by 6 feet. Sec. 94-86 (a)(1) allows for a dock length not to exceed 50 feet from the seawall. Mr. Schaefer is proposing a dock and boat lift to be 56 feet in length to avoid the mangroves in front of the seawall.

Sec. 2-152. Variances.

(a) *Generally; criteria for granting variances from the terms of subpart B.*

(1) The Board of Adjustments and Appeals shall make recommendations on and the City Commission shall decide variance applications will not be contrary to the public interest, where, owing to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the provisions of subpart B will result in unnecessary and undue hardship. In order to recommend or decide any variance from the terms of subpart B, the Board or the City Commission shall consider each of the following.

- a. Special conditions and circumstances exist which are peculiar to the land, structure or building involved and which are not applicable to other lands, structures or buildings in the same zoning district.

The existing mangroves in front of the seawall are peculiar to this property and are not typical of other properties in the area.

- b. The special conditions and circumstances do not result from the actions of the applicant.

The mangroves are a natural condition of nature and did not result in actions of the applicant.

- c. Granting the variance will not confer on the applicant any special privilege that is denied by subpart B to other lands, structures or buildings in the same zoning district.

Granting the variance would not confer special privileges to the applicant, it would allow for access to a dock and a boat lift similar to others in the area.

- d. Literal interpretation of the provisions of subpart B would deprive other properties in the same zoning district under the terms of subpart B and would work unnecessary and undue hardship upon the applicant.

The approval of this variance request would not deprive other owners of use and enjoyment of their properties.

- e. The variance granted is the minimum variance that will make possible the reasonable use of the land, structure or building; and

Granting of this variance would allow a dock and boat lift to installed.

- f. The granting of the variance will be in harmony with the general intent and purpose of subpart B, and such variance will not be injurious to the area involved or be otherwise detrimental to the public welfare.

Granting the variance will be in harmony with general intent and purpose of subpart B.

PUBLIC NOTIFICATION: A public meeting notice was mailed by First Class Mail to the property owners within 150 feet in any direction of the subject property and posted on the property on November 4, 2019 per Code Section 2-149.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Based on the variance review criteria of Section 2-152, staff recommends approval of the request.

City Attorney Mora stated this is a quasi-judicial proceeding.

City Attorney Mora inquired of the Members if any of them had any ex-parte communications with the applicant, with all Members responding in the negative.

City Attorney Mora inquired of the Board Members if any of them had done a site visit for the limited purpose of evaluating this case, with Chair Alvarez, Vice Chair DeVore, and Member Watt responding in the negative, and with Member Labadie responding in the affirmative.

City Attorney Mora inquired if Member Labadie felt that his visit in any way impaired his ability to impartially adjudicate this matter, with Member Labadie responding in the negative.

All persons planning to give testimony during the quasi-judicial proceeding were duly sworn in by the City Attorney.

Planning Consultant Harmon read the Agenda Item by title only.

Planning Consultant Harmon stated BOA Case No. 2019-08 is a variance request from Section 94-86(a)(1) of the Code of Ordinances to allow for a dock facility to exceed the 50-foot length from the seawall by 6 feet to avoid the existing mangrove line.

Planning Consultant Harmon presented a PowerPoint Presentation depicting the following slides aerial views of the property, an aerial map, a photograph looking south, the mangroves, and the proposed dock.

Member Labadie stated he thought the City Code for maximum dock lengths was 35 feet.

Planning Consultant Harmon stated Code Section 94-87, Length, reads as follows: *“The length of the proposed dock shall not extend more than 35 feet from the property line or seawall, whichever is nearer to the water. If the property does not have a seawall, the length of the proposed dock shall not extend more than 35 feet from the mean high-water mark. A dock may extend beyond 35 feet only if necessary to reach 36 inches of water depth at a mean low water mark, but in no case shall the length exceed 50 feet beyond the property line, seawall or mean high water mark, whichever is applicable. A sealed affidavit attesting to the water depth at mean low water mark shall be submitted at the time of permit application.”*

Member Labadie inquired what is the water depth, with Planning Consultant Harmon replying that she does not know what the water depth is.

Member Watt stated this being used for a different reason, like mangroves, and would the City Code allow for such a thing because it is not related to water depth, but rather a mangrove line.

Planning Consultant Harmon stated the City has dealt with this before because as the Members know, mangroves cannot be removed, cut down, or trimmed without Pinellas County approval.

Planning Consultant Harmon stated in order for the applicant to have a dock, the dock would have to be located beyond the mangroves.

City Attorney Mora stated the length of docks are ordinarily 35 feet. The way the City Code is written in Section 94-87, a dock may go beyond 35 feet only if necessary to reach 3 feet or 36 inches of water depth at a mean low water mark, but under no circumstances would it ever more than 50-feet under the City Code, absent a variance.

City Attorney Mora stated the applicant is seeking to go beyond the 35 feet based on some other impediment other than the 36 inches of water depth. At the end of the day, this is a variance board, so even if the City Code restricts it, this Board is empowered to make a recommendation that the City Code in this particular instance should not apply based on a claimed hardship, and so even if the City Code reads that way that is the ordinary permissions. However, they are saying the ordinary permissions and the ordinary City Code should not apply to them.

Member Watt clarified the dock application will require Pinellas County approval after City approval, and then the City issues a permit.

Member Labadie stated the City is assuming that at 35 feet, the depth of the water is not 3 feet, and the applicant is having to go out 56 feet to reach the appropriate depth of water.

City Attorney Mora stated at present staff has not presented any evidence concerning the depth of the water.

Vice Chair DeVore stated it also appears that the boat lift is going to be erected on the south side of the dock, and his thought is that if the lift was to go on the west side of the dock there would that still be the 36 inches of mean low tide. He does not know if that lift can be resituated to the west side versus the south side. He stated by resituating it, it would eliminate the need for the extra 6 feet.

Member Watt inquired if there were any objections from the neighbors, with Planning Consultant Harmon responding in the negative.

Joe Place, Enterprise Marine, 8165-46th Avenue North, St. Petersburg, provided the following answers to the Board's questions:

- Water is unreachable 30 feet from the seawall because of the mangroves.
- If the boat lift is moved to the right, the applicant could park the boat there, but would drive the boat into the mangroves.
- The mangroves are the big issue here.

Mr. Place stated the biggest issue is the mangroves not so much the water depth. They need to get past the mangroves, and are trying to have the least impact on the environment as possible. He explained that is why the boat is out beyond the end of the dock to get into the deeper water and to avoid the interference with the mangroves.

Mr. Place stated they have started over with the process about six months when they drew up the plans for a 50-foot length dock, and realized the mangroves were a little more than expected, so they decided to ask for a variance of 6 feet in length to clear the mangroves.

Mr. Place stated they are trying to cause little environmental impact as they can.

Mr. Place clarified that both Pinellas County and the City have approved a 50-foot length dock, and presented the approved Pinellas County permit dated April 22, 2019, but have not applied for a City permit for the 50-foot dock.

Mr. Place explained the process for the issuance of dock permits by the City and Pinellas County.

In response to Member Watt's question, Mr. Place stated the size of the head of the dock was increased from 4 feet to 10 feet from the original submittal. The increase was to make the dock more functional.

Vice Chair DeVore inquired if the Army Corps of Engineering has dredged around the existing docks to allow for additional drafts for boating going in and out.

Vice Chair DeVore stated his concern is for the applicant's boat protruding to much into the channel and affecting the egress and ingress of the other boats to their docks.

Member Labadie inquired what size boat does the applicant have.

Jeff Schaefer, 361 La Hacienda Drive, the applicant, responded he owns a 31-foot boat.

Mr. Place stated that it is not so much about the water depth, there is no water depth in the beginning because of the mangroves.

Planning Consultant Harmon inquired if the boat lift could be smaller than 15 feet, with Mr. Watt stating it depends on the beam of the boat.

Mr. Place stated that is the standard for that lift.

Mr. Place inquired of the applicant if he could live with a less wide boat lift, with Mr. Schaefer responding in the affirmative.

City Attorney Mora opened the public hearing. Seeing and/or hearing no one wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed.

Planning Consultant Harmon confirmed that the City and Pinellas County had previously approved a 50-foot length dock for this property pending the construction plans of the house.

Member Labadie inquired about the seawall work and inquired how far out are the mangroves.

Mr. Place stated there was a previous seawall there, and they are just capping an old seawall. The mangroves are at least 30 feet out.

Mr. Place stated with the 4-foot wide dock head, the mangroves will be right up against the dock head, and that is why he is recommending the 10-foot wide dock head in order to get access to the boat. The applicant will be restricted to a narrow walkway because of the mangroves.

Mr. Alvarez stated the sketch shows a 30-foot mangrove line, so there is a hardship by having to start at that point for his deck. A 4-foot deck is not functional, it is not operational.

Vice Chair DeVore inquired if the Board were to recommend that the new rendering be only 12-foot for the lift, would that be something that the applicant would then have to come in and reapply for a new permit.

City Attorney Mora stated the Board can make recommendations as the Board wishes. This is an advisory board. The Board can make an approval recommendation subject to this limitation, however, the applicant's application is for a specific number and unless they consent to a slight modification in that regard, they would proceed on an application as framed and that might be part of the discussion before the Board based on the Board's recommendations to the City Commission and how that proceeding goes.

Mr. Place spoke on and clarified why he would not recommend reducing the size of the beam.

Member Watt stated there is clearly a hardship because of the mangrove line. He stated it can be done without the 6-foot variance, but the dock platform would have to be reduced from 10 feet to 4 feet. He stated the dock platform would have much of an impact on others.

Chair Alvarez stated the hardship is the mangrove line and having to start dock head at 30 feet. He stated this is an usual piece of property and probably is the only one on that finger that has any mangroves.

Vice Chair DeVore stated this could have been done without a variance, so it is difficult for him to understand granting the variance in this particular case. He does see that the proposed dock would protrude quite a bit further than the surrounding docks.

Vice Chair DeVore stated he thinks some verison of a recommendation of a slightly reduced platform and maybe a foot in from the lift, he could see granting a variance for.

Member Watt stated in the aerial view, there is a dark line where boats run, which is a pretty big radius. The mangrove line is unusual and it is important to keep the mangroves, and not mess with them much.

Vice Chair DeVore agreed the mangroves are important and they should be preserved.

Vice Mayor DeVore stated that the applicant definitely has a hardship with the mangrove line in light of that, he is willing to recommend approval with the recommendation of a 1-foot decrease in the size of the lift and 2-foot decrease in the size of the platform for a total of 3-foot.

City Attorney Mora stated Vice Chair DeVore is moving to approve the application, if it looks different. He would recommend the Board make a motion to either recommend approval or denial with comments.

MOTION MADE BY MEMBER WATT, SECONDED BY MEMBER LABADIE, TO RECOMMEND TO THE CITY COMMISSION APPROVAL OF BOA CASE NO. 2019-08, A VARIANCE REQUEST FROM CODE SECTION 94-86(A)(1) TO ALLOW FOR A DOCK FACILITY TO EXCEED THE 50-FOOT LENGTH FROM THE SEAWALL BY 6 FEET, FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 349-12TH AVENUE, INDIAN ROCKS BEACH, FLORIDA, AND LEGALLY DESCRIBED AS INDIAN BEACH REVISED 2ND ADDITION, BLOCK 89, LOT 12. PARCEL #06-30-15-42066-089-0120.

Member Watt stated the mangrove line is the hardship and the mangroves need to be preserved.

Member Labadie stated he feels a little uncomfortable, and he does not want this case to be set as a precedent.

City Attorney Mora stated every variance is considered on and stands on its own as to each property. Variances are specific to real property. Variances are exceptions to the rules, so exceptions do not become the rules, just because they are granted. An exception does not set precedent.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

***AYES: LABADIE, WATT, ALVAREZ
NAYES: DEVORE.
ABSENT: CLARK***

MOTION CARRIED BY A VOTE OF 3 TO 1.

City Attorney Mora stated this case will proceed to the Indian Rocks Beach City Commission on December 10, 2019.

5. BOA CASE NO. 2019-09 — 329 LA HACIENDA DRIVE

Owner/Applicant: Kort Dantuma

Subject Location: 329 La Hacienda Drive

Legal Description: La Hacienda Replat, Lot 35 and W 5 ft of Lot 36

Parcel #: 12-30-14-47412-000-0350

Variance Request: Variance request from Code Section 110-131(1)(f.)(1) of 4.25 feet into the required 25-foot front yard setback, resulting in a total front yard setback of 20.75 feet, to allow for a carport addition on the front of the house.

SUBJECT: BOA CASE NO. 2019-09, a variance request from Sec. 110-131(1)(f.)(1) of 4.25 feet into the required 25-foot front yard setback, resulting in a total front yard setback of 20.75 feet, to allow for a carport addition on the front of the house.

OWNER: Kort Dantuma
PROPERTY LOCATION: 329 La Hacienda Drive
ZONING: S- Single Family

Direction	Existing Use	Zoning Category
North	Residential	S
East	Residential	S
South	Intracoastal	N/A
West	Residential	S

BACKGROUND:

Kort Dantuma is requesting to install a carport to the front of the house. The existing residence was built in 1956 and has a front yard setback of 40.75 feet. The required front yard setback in the single-family residential zoning district is 25 feet. The house presently has a small one car garage, and they would like to add a carport in front of the one car garage for their vehicles. The carport would extend 20 feet from the house and project in to the front yard setback by 4.25 feet.

Sec. 2-152. Variances.

(a) *Generally; criteria for granting variances from the terms of subpart B.*

(1) The Board of Adjustments and Appeals shall make recommendations on and the City Commission shall decide variance applications will not be contrary to the public interest, where, owing to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the provisions of subpart B will result in unnecessary and undue hardship. In order to recommend or decide

any variance from the terms of subpart B, the Board or the City Commission shall consider each of the following.

- a. Special conditions and circumstances exist which are peculiar to the land, structure or building involved and which are not applicable to other lands, structures or buildings in the same zoning district.

The existing structure was built in 1956 prior to the current zoning regulations.

- b. The special conditions and circumstances do not result from the actions of the applicant.

The applicant did not create any special conditions or circumstances.

- c. Granting the variance will not confer on the applicant any special privilege that is denied by subpart B to other lands, structures or buildings in the same zoning district.

Granting the variance would not confer special privileges to the applicant, it would allow for a carport similar to others in the area.

- d. Literal interpretation of the provisions of subpart B would deprive other properties in the same zoning district under the terms of subpart B and would work unnecessary and undue hardship upon the applicant.

The approval of this variance request would not deprive other owners of use and enjoyment of their properties.

- e. The variance granted is the minimum variance that will make possible the reasonable use of the land, structure or building; and

This is the minimum variance to allow the owner to construct the carport as desired.

- f. The granting of the variance will be in harmony with the general intent and purpose of subpart B, and such variance will not be injurious to the area involved or be otherwise detrimental to the public welfare.

Granting the variance will be in harmony with the general intent and purpose of subpart B.

PUBLIC NOTIFICATION: A public meeting notice was mailed by First Class Mail to the property owners within 150 feet in any direction of the subject property and posted on the property on November 4, 2019 per Code Section 2-149.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Based on the variance review criteria of Section 2-152, staff recommends approval of the request.

City Attorney Mora stated this is a quasi-judicial proceeding.

City Attorney Mora inquired of the Members if any of them had any ex-parte communications with the applicant, with all Members responding in the negative.

City Attorney Mora inquired of the Board Members if any of them had done a site visit for the limited purpose of evaluating this case, with all Members responding in the negative.

All persons planning to give testimony during the quasi-judicial proceeding were duly sworn in by the City Attorney.

Planning Consultant Harmon read the Agenda Item by title only.

Planning Consultant Harmon stated BOA Case No. 2019-09 is a variance request from Section 110-131(1)(f.)(1) of the Code of Ordinances of 4.25 feet into the required 25-foot front yard setback to allow for a carport addition on the front of the house on the property located at 329 La Hacienda Drive.

Planning Consultant Harmon presented a PowerPoint Presentation depicting the following slides: an aerial view, a survey, the front of the house, looking east, looking west, proposed carport location, and front elevation.

Member Watt inquired why Planning Consultant Harmon mentioned the current setback for this home is 40.75 feet when most of the homes on that street are set back that far, and just wanted to make sure he was not missing any relevant information.

Planning Consultant Harmon stated most of the homes in this area were built in the 1950's with large front setbacks.

Member Labadie stated this is the only location on that street that will have a carport, stating that all the other homes have garages. He is assuming there is no City ordinance controlling that issue and that carports were acceptable.

Planning Consultant Harmon stated these homes were built prior to the adoption of the Land Development Code.

City Attorney Mora stated the City does not know the motives historically, and of course, as it relates to private property, every private property owner does what they wish and the preference commonly in Florida being garage. At present, he is not aware of any City Code provision mandating a garage over a carport or the inverse.

Planning Consultant Harmon stated there was a single garage originally built with the house.

Kort Dantuma, 329 LaHacienda Drive, the applicant, stated there are a couple of other carports on his street. He stated his main reason for building a carport is to get his cars off the street. It will have a mid-century look and it will match the existing roof line of his house, and it will be tied into his house and will have trusses also. It will not be an aluminum-type flat roof. Once completed, it will be professionally landscaped.

Chair Alvarez asked if the sides will be open or closed, with Mr. Dantuma responding the sides will be open and further explained the construction of the carport posts, which will be black and stuccoed.

Member DeVore inquired if Mr. Dantuma considered installing a supplement paved carport area in front of the home that would allow him to stay within the setback, but would allow for additional parking.

Mr. Dantuma stated he likes concrete, and he just did not want to go the paver route because it would take his wife six months before she decides on it.

Member Watt clarified the applicant could build 16 feet without asking for a variance. He also stated the carport will be wider as well.

Mr. Dantuma stated the carport needs to be wider because of the window closest to the garage because he has to tie the beams in and then he has to fill in the existing block with concrete.

Mr. Dantuma stated he has four cars, and he will probably park them two stacked, so he thinks 20 feet will give him enough room where he can park four cars. He also has a truck that is pretty big.

Member Watt stated 16 feet actually would be a fairly legitimate one car depth carport, and the applicant would not have to apply for a variance.

Mr. Dantuma stated there is a walkway next to the front door that goes past the garage door that leads to the backyard. He stated this is the only access to the backyard, so if the cars are parked too far forward, there would be an access problem to the backyard and also the lawn service would have a problem with their big lawn mowers.

Mr. Dantuma stated all the existing concrete will be torn up and replaced.

City Attorney Mora opened the public hearing. Seeing and/or hearing no one wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed.

Member Watt stated he appreciates Mr. Dantuma doing the more custom carport. He has no problem with a 16-foot or a shorter version of it and/or creating some other additional space in front the residence there. That way Mr. Dantuma could accommodate another vehicle. Four vehicles are four vehicles, and he does not see that as being a reason to go inside of a setback going toward LaHacienda Drive, which is already a small street to begin with.

MOTION MADE BY VICE CHAIR DEVORE, SECONDED BY MEMBER WATT, TO RECOMMEND TO THE CITY COMMISSION DENIAL OF BOA CASE NO. 2019-09, A VARIANCE REQUEST FROM SEC. 110-131(1)(F.)(1) OF 4.25 FEET INTO THE REQUIRED 25 FOOT FRONT YARD SETBACK, RESULTING IN A TOTAL FRONT YARD SETBACK OF 20.75 FEET, TO ALLOW FOR A CARPORT ADDITION ON THE FRONT OF THE HOUSE FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT 329 LA HACIENDA DRIVE, INDIAN ROCKS BEACH, FLORIDA, AND LEGALLY DESCRIBED AS LOT 35 AND THE WEST 5 FT OF LOT 36 OF LA HACIENDA REPLAT. PARCEL NO. 12-30-14-47412-000-0350.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

**AYES: WATT, DEVORE.
NAYES: LABADIE, ALVAREZ.
ABSENT: CLARK.**

MOTION TO DENY FAILED BY A VOTE OF 2 TO 2.

City Attorney Mora stated the motion has failed for a lack of a majority vote.

MOTION MADE BY MEMBER LABADIE, SECONDED BY CHAIR ALVAREZ, TO RECOMMEND TO THE CITY COMMISSION APPROVAL OF BOA CASE NO. 2019-09, A VARIANCE REQUEST FROM SEC. 110-131(1)(F.)(1) OF 4.25 FEET INTO THE REQUIRED 25 FOOT FRONT YARD SETBACK, RESULTING IN A TOTAL FRONT YARD SETBACK OF 20.75 FEET, TO ALLOW FOR A CARPORT ADDITION ON THE FRONT OF THE HOUSE FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT 329 LA HACIENDA DRIVE, INDIAN ROCKS BEACH, FLORIDA, AND LEGALLY DESCRIBED AS LOT 35 AND THE WEST 5 FT OF LOT 36 OF LA HACIENDA REPLAT. PARCEL NO. 12-30-14-47412-000-0350.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: LABADIE, ALVAREZ.
NAYES: WATT, DEVORE.
ABSENT: CLARK.

MOTION TO APPROVE FAILED BY A VOTE OF 2 TO 2.

City Attorney Mora stated with the Board having had a vote to approve and a vote to deny both failing to receive a majority vote. The gridlock functionally amounts to a failure for the application to pass.

City Attorney Mora stated the City Commission will be advised that the Board was unable to achieve a majority vote in favor of approval and it also did not formally deny it, only passively by virtue of the absent of the majority.

City Attorney Mora advised the applicant that this Board is an advisory board, and its recommendation will be made to the City Commission who will hear and make a ruling at their December 10, 2010 meeting.

Member Labadie stated it will be mentioned to the City Commission that only four members of the Board were present.

Mr. Dantuma stated there are other homes that went through this process and were granted a variance further than his request. He was a little surprised that the Board did not recommend his variance request to the City Commission.

6. OTHER BUSINESS.

City Clerk O'Reilly stated there will be a December 17, 2019 Board of Adjustments and Appeals Meeting beginning at 7:00 p.m.

7. ADJOURNMENT.

MOTION MADE BY VICE CHAIR DEVORE, SECONDED BY MEMBER LABADIE, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:25 P.M. UNANIMOUS APPROVAL.

December 17, 2019
Date Approved

/dor