

Greater Wilshire Neighborhood Council



Greater Wilshire Neighborhood Council Land Use Committee Meeting

April 6, 2010

Approved by
the Committee
05/04/10

MINUTES

Call to Order

A duly noticed meeting of the Land Use Committee of the Greater Wilshire Neighborhood Council (“GWNC”) was held on Tuesday, April 6, 2010, at the Wilshire United Methodist Church, 4350 Wilshire Blvd., GWNC President Charlie Dougherty called the meeting to order at 7:25 p.m.

Roll Call & Approval of Minutes

Committee member Elizabeth Fuller called the roll. Committee members in attendance at the roll call were: Karen Gilman, Rudy Gintel, John Gresham, Elizabeth Fuller and Charlie Dougherty. Committee members Yigal Arens, Patti Carroll, and Patty Lombard joined the meeting later. Committee members James Wolf, Cindy Chvatal, Mike Genewick and Bryan Christie were absent.

Ms. Fuller stated that a quorum was not present at roll call. The meeting proceeded with non-vote items only.

Approval of the minutes was tabled until later in the meeting.

Community Concerns

Stakeholder Suzanne Chase asked why the unpermitted synagogue at 303 S. Highland was not on our agenda, and why the GWNC isn’t actively protesting its presence. Committee Rudy Gintel said the GWNC and the Land Use Committee have weighed in on the issue each time there was an opportunity to do so through an open public comment period. He said we have always opposed the use, and also view it as illegal. But, he said, the Neighborhood Council has no way to enforce its wishes, and the City has refused to enforce the rulings while the federal appeal case is still open.

Committee member John Gresham noted that we do have a new City Attorney

now, who might be more willing to take on the enforcement issue. Committee Member Karen Gilman said the pending federal court case may also create issues with enforcement jurisdiction. Ms. Fuller agreed, noting that the NC has no role in the current court case, which will be settled by lawyers, judges and the court process. GWNC President Charlie Dougherty said the GWNC has voted on the issue at least a couple of times, condemning the improper land usage (which is the only issue we are concerned with). He said we get frustrated, too, with the lack of enforcement.

[Committee member Patti Carroll joined the meeting at 7:45 p.m.]

New Business

CVS at 3rd & La Brea – Architect Keith Coffman presented plans for the new building, which measures 10,000 square feet, with 13 parking spaces at grade and 31 more on the roof, with an elevator to the roof level. There will be a pedestrian entrance on La Brea.

Committee member Rudy Gintel asked if there will be covered parking on the roof, and Mr. Coffman said there will be some. Cars will enter the parking areas from either La Brea or the alley.

Mr. Coffman also said the Mid-City West Community Council (whose district actually contains the property) is very concerned about the design elements, and ensuring they fit in with the character of the neighborhood, and the design does draw from the art deco character of the neighborhood.

President Dougherty said he senses what the architects are going for, but would like to hear a description of what influences the building is reflecting, and Mr. Coffman showed some examples of nearby Art Deco buildings on La Brea and Wilshire.

Stakeholder Lucille Saunders asked if Mr. Coffman could show some earlier renderings that the MCWCC liked better. Contractor Ira Handelman said the current version is the one MCWCC liked. MCWCC board member Keith Nakata said that group has heard three presentations from the developers, each showcasing slightly different designs. The first was “very generic,” the second has some new design elements and then the third appeared to be a “watered down” version of the second.

Committee member Rudy Gintel asked what permissions CVS is seeking from the City. Mr. Handelman said they are seeking a liquor license and permission to operate 24 hours a day. Mr. Nakata said they are also asking for permission to have less than the required 50% glazing on the façade (mostly on 3rd St.). Mr. Dougherty asked if that was to accommodate ramps up to the parking area, but Mr. Handelman said many drug stores have such issues, because they must locate things like stockrooms and the pharmacy in certain areas dictated by the site plan.

Mr. Dougherty asked if the developers have contacted people who live nearby or work in a nearby office building. Mr. Handelman said they have contacted the apartment residents, but haven't yet located the owner of the office building.

Committee member Elizabeth Fuller said that as a resident of a nearby neighborhood, she's concerned about allowing the sale of alcohol on three of the four corners of the La Brea/3rd intersection, and wonders if alcohol sales is really necessary for CVS's business. Mr. Handelman said it's a convenience for the customers, and part of the normal drug store product line...though it only amounts to 10-15% of total sales.

Mr. Coffman said alcohol would take up less than 5% of the sales floor, but every little piece of the store's sales is important. Mr. Dougherty asked what the MCWCC position on the alcohol permit was, and Mr. Nakata said they were told it would be 15% of the total sales...which is also what 7-11 sells. He said that group hasn't voted on the project yet, because they haven't yet seen the final design plans. He noted, however, that alcohol seems to be less of an issue to their council than to ours.

Committee member John Gresham asked about landscaping, and Mr. Coffman said there will be some landscaping, but they don't have a lot of control over the street trees and will follow the City's directions there. Mr. Gresham said they do have some control, if they follow certain spacing guidelines. He said he would like to see them actively pursue additional trees for that stretch of street. Mr. Handelman said they may also consider placing vines on the non-glazed walls, because they're a good protector against graffiti.

[Committee member Patty Lombard joined the meeting at 8:05 p.m.]

Mr. Gresham asked what elements MCWCC found objectionable, and Mr. Nakata said it was primarily design. Mr. Handelman said he went back to CVS after the first presentation and told them what MCWCC wanted in the design before they would support the project.

Mr. Gresham asked about the nearest 24-hour CVS, and most people seemed to think it's at 3rd and Fairfax. Mr. Gresham said it would break up the building's façade a bit better to have more light-catching elements than just flat walls. Mr. Nakata said many members of the MCWCC were also very interested in a corner entrance, which they felt would create more walking energy on the corner. He said glazing was also a big issue, and that people would like to be able to see into the store...but CVS had problems with that as well.

Mr. Nakata also said CVS's claims that it has a specific corporate look for its stores can't be an absolute standard, since they are moving into an old theater space in another part of town, which looks nothing like a drug store. He said CVS is inconsistent with its claims of design uniformity – the East LA location had to match its community before it could be approved. He said most MCWCC Land Use Committee members would like a door on La Brea, but a door on the corner doesn't work as well with the proposed pharmacy design for the building's interior.

Mr. Dougherty asked which version of the plans we are looking at tonight, but after some discussion among the various speakers, Mr. Nakata said it doesn't really

matter because the MCWCC will vote on whatever is presented to them as the “final” design.

Ms. Saunders said that in addition to the number of alcohol licenses at the intersection, there was discussion at the MCWCC that the other stores there (e.g. Trader Joe’s and Ralphs’) are blind to the street...so they wanted to see more articulation in the CVS plans.

Mr. Nakata said they would discuss the issue again at the next MCWCC meeting at the end of the month. Committee Member Rudy Gintel asked if they would take a vote on supporting the project at that point, but Mr. Nakata said he wasn’t sure because people are still discussing the corner entrance issue. Mr. Gresham asked if they would like the GWNC to weigh in on the issue, and Mr. Nakata said yes.

Committee member John Gresham asked if there will be alley access to the facility and Mr. Handelman said there would be. Committee Member Patty Lombard asked if it’s the same width as the Trader Joe’s alley, and Mr. Gresham said it is, and that it’s very narrow. Mr. Dougherty asked Mr. Nakata if MCWCC is happy with the parking plans, and Mr. Coffman said there’s usually only one large truck a week making deliveries to CVS stores.

Ms. Lombard said she agrees with the MCWCC members about the corner doors, and that she’s disappointed in Trader Joe’s for not using it’s corner. She said we need to do more to create a sense of neighborhood walkability in Los Angeles, and this is an opportunity to do something nice with the corner and the street. Mr. Gresham said most doors like to have their doors contained within a single plane for security reasons. Mr. Handelman said MCWCC has asked for more art deco elements in the non-glazed portions of the wall, which would add to the appearance. Ms. Lombard said though, that studies show people respond to architecture, that they’re tired of cookie cutter designs and that it would be nice to set higher standards for new buildings and hope that people will meet them

Mr. Handelman reiterated that the current design was done in response to MCWCC design requests, and Mr. Coffman said that when they started the design they knew a pedestrian entrance would be important, but there are reasons it didn’t end up on the corner. For example, city codes say there must be an entrance adjacent to parking (and as close as possible to handicapped parking spaces). He also said that as a developer for CVS, he sees a lot of stores with two entrances...and the street entrances are usually locked because managers feel they can’t control them. So they tried to come up with a compromise in this design, with a street entrance away from the corner, which isn’t as bad as Trader Joe’s – there is still a pedestrian entrance on La Brea. Mr. Gresham advised Mr. Nakata to push CVS to pay as much attention as possible to the exterior design, because the interior design will be “cookie cutter.”

[Committee member Yigal Arens joined the meeting at 8:25 p.m., bringing the meeting to a quorum.]

Mr. Dougherty said he likes the current design, even though he knows it's cost-driven and suspects that if there were more money available, it could be better. He asked if the exterior columns near the glazing triangular, and Mr. Coffman said they are. Mr. Dougherty said the effect would be more powerful if the articulation were even bolder...but he knows MCWCC will vet the design, and he's not inclined to invade their turf on that issue.

Mr. Dougherty asked how left turns from northbound La Brea will be handled, and Mr. Handelman said people can turn left on 3rd St., and then take another left into the alley. Mr. Coffman said they have done a traffic study, which has been reviewed and approved by the DOT, and it does allow turns from northbound La Brea directly into the parking lot. The street will be re-stripped with a left turn lane there.

Mr. Dougherty asked if the street will stay the same width, and Mr. Coffman said they don't expect to widen it. Mr. Dougherty asked if the La Brea pedestrian entrance will be important enough that it won't be blocked off after a few thefts, but Mr. Coffman said there will be no reason to lock that door, because it's adjacent to the parking lot entrance.

Mr. Gintel said he will defer to the MCWCC, but he likes the design and thinks good landscaping would add a lot. He said liquor sales feels like more of a convenience than anything and he has no objections or fears that will become a liquor store. He said, however, that if MCWCC votes against the liquor sales, he will support them.

Committee member Karen Gilman said she echoes everyone else's concerns: more articulation would be better, more landscaping would be better, and that she's not enchanted with the alcohol sales or 24-hour operation, but will support MCWCC if they can come to an agreement.

Committee Member Patti Carroll said she has nothing to add, does not object to the design, and is happy that there are some windows.

Mr. Dougherty said the best way for us to help would probably be to write a letter that reflects the pros and cons discussed here, and expresses our support of the MCWCC coming to a productive agreement on these issues with the developer. Mr. Gresham moved that we ask the GWNC Board to write a letter reflecting our general discussion and supporting MCWCC's ultimate decision after their next discussion with the architects and CVS. Ms. Carroll seconded the motion.

Mr. Gintel said that, in principle, he wants to support the MCWCC, but he would like to see the final design before he votes to support it. Mr. Nakata said he's taking the developer's work that they will present the plan shown tonight to the MCWCC. Mr. Gresham said he is, too, but he has seen architects who present one thing at a meeting, and then another for signatures later. Mr. Handelman said he stands by his commitment that what he has promised will be done. Mr. Nakata said we're welcome to send a representative to the MCWCC meeting, to see how it turns out. Mr. Gresham said he'd like to add a recommendation that we send a representative to the MCWCC meeting.

The vote was 6-1 (Lombard) in favor of the motion. Ms. Fuller asked for a volunteer to attend the MCWCC meeting, and Mr. Gintel said he would go.

Cell Phone Monopole at 1st & Wilton – Committee Member Patti Carroll said that although we've been fighting a number of cell phone antenna installations on buildings in our area, this is the first monopole that's come up (though other neighborhoods, such as Pacific Palisades have been dealing with them for a while). The proposed T-Mobile pole would be 45 feet tall and located on 1st St., just off Wilton.

Kathleen Mulligan, from the Ridgewood-Wilton neighborhood, presented a map of the area, showing four homes that will be directly affected, one with a child's bedroom only 11 feet from the pole. She said this location is on the edge of the Wilton Historic District, but the existing Above-Ground Facility (AGF) ordinance regulated cabinets only; not poles. And the cabinet that pairs with this pole would lie just slightly outside the historic district. Still, she said, the new four-story pole would be a glaring intrusion and a complete distortion of the historic nature of the historic district. It would be located in the middle of a parkway area.

Ms. Mulligan said Synergy, the company representing T-Mobile, has not discussed the installation with the neighborhood association, though one resident - Brian Terr - has discussed it with them.

Mr. Terr distributed copies of the plans for the pole. He said the FCC licenses antennas, so this is a federal action. He also said that a 2007 Dept. of Interior report said cell towers in historic areas is a big issue and is regulated by the Federal Government. However, the City of Los Angeles only considers local historic designations as part of its mandate. Mr. Terr said City Council District 4 deputy Doug Mensman says the City can't consider federal historic districts in its decisions. (And his neighborhood is not a locally designated HPOZ, but is a federally designated historic district).

Mr. Gintel asked if the company is erecting a new pole in place of an old one and claiming it's their right to do so. Everyone present agreed that is the situation. Mr. Dougherty asked who owns the pole. Ms. Fuller explained that cell companies are allowed to locate their equipment on public utility poles, but the old poles aren't large enough, so the cell companies are replacing them with larger metal poles, which they claim to be able to do in the public right of way, with little review or regulation.

Mr. Gresham said this may be an example of "push-back" we're seeing from opposing other applications to put cell antennas on buildings. Ms. Mulligan agreed, and also noted that this particular pole is part of an effort to increase cell coverage in Hancock Park, but the companies haven't been able to find locations there, so they're putting up antennas in surrounding areas.

She said she has been in contact with a federal preservation officer at the FCC, who said the project does have to go through a review process. But when she asked what the status of that process is, the FCC said that as of today, they have no information about this tower. The representative said he will check to see if the state knows anything, but

so far they don't. Apparently, T-Mobile is deflecting the federal historical discussion until after the city OKs the installation, so they can say the City approved it.

Mr. Terr said the City has approved it, but he filed an appeal today at the Bureau of Engineering.

Mr. Gintel asked who said they can't build in that location, and Ms. Mulligan said the only people eligible to file an appeal are the owners of the four homes most directly affected. She said she will speak with at least one more of the, to see if they will support the appeal. Then the appeal will trigger a hearing at the Board of Public Works.

Ms. Mulligan said her association supports the issue of moving the pole to a more appropriate location – but they also don't want to shove it off on any other neighbors or neighboring associations. She said they'd rather address it through the public process, which there will be with an appeal. She said there's also an opportunity for T-Mobile to negotiate privately with the people filing the appeal, but then someone else will have to go through this whole process if the location is moved.

Mr. Gintel asked whose burden is it to show there is or isn't a viable alternative location. Mr. Terr said T-Mobile asked him if he knows of other locations, and when he asked them where else they could put a pole, they didn't have a response.

Ms. Mulligan said it's not fair to make the neighbors find another location, because they'd just be bidding against themselves, and no one wants to move it onto their neighbors.

Committee Member Patty Lombard said our committee members are trying to understand the process, and trying to figure out what approach it's reasonable to take to T-Mobile, both this time and in future situations. She asked if this neighborhood's situation is unique because of its Federal historic designation, or whether this case could serve as an action template for other pole location fights.

Ms. Mulligan said they would like the GWNC to write to the Bureau of Engineering opposing the installation based on inappropriate location, size, opposition of the community...and T-Mobile's ignorance of the area's historical designation.

Ms. Lombard asked if this means they're challenging the company's "by right" claims. Mr. Gintel said that by right they can locate equipment on the old 25' utility poles...but 25' and 45' poles are not the same thing. Committee member Yigal Arens said there are two issues at play here: first, no one has looked yet at the new phenomenon of replacing old poles with qualitatively different ones...and, second, if the City allows such replacements to happen, whether this is an appropriate place for it.

Mr. Gresham said there might also be a legal question. The current poles belong to public utilities, but now they're allowing a private company to put up a replacement pole that the private company owns, in exchange for public use of the pole. And this makes a big difference because there are no height restrictions. Ms. Mulligan said it's

called the right of co-location. The City seems to think it doesn't require any bigger showing because there's no qualitative difference in the poles. Ms. Lombard said if that's the case, then the neighbors' best argument is to insist that any replacement poles be identical to the originals.

Ms. Mulligan said they will have more polished arguments ready next week, in time for the GWNC board meeting, but wants to make sure this is done in a public, transparent manner. She would like the GWNC to send a letter to the Bureau of Engineering, asking them to stop the application process until there has been an examination of compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106...and approval of the state historical preservation office. She said she doesn't understand how T-Mobile can replace a 20-foot wood pole with a 45-foot metal pole with antennas.

Mr. Terr said the challenge he faces is that the city is just going to move ahead, and he's the one who will have the expense of hiring an attorney and figuring out an alternative location. Right now, the Mayor's office says the installation will happen and they've never lost such a case. Ms. Lombard said it's not clear that it will happen, but Mr. Terr asked who will pay for a lawyer to fight it. Ms. Lombard said we could do some research on attorneys with expertise in this area, and perhaps could suggest some contacts...which might save him some money and keep the pole off his property. Mr. Terr asked whose property it would go on, then...but Ms. Lombard said we need a global solution to this issue – people need to send data and we need cell phone poles. But this issue is different: first we need to get it away from Mr. Terr's house, and then we'll work with you and others on the bigger solution. Others agreed, saying it's not Mr. Terr's responsibility to find another location. Mr. Terr said it would probably just end up on his property anyway, but Ms. Lombard said that's not necessarily true, since they often look for the path of least resistance. She also suggested that someone contacted the representative from T-Mobile who attended our last GWNC meeting and said she'd be willing to discuss cell phone coverage issues.

Mr. Arens said the problem is like a balloon, when you press in on one side, it pops out on another. People do want extra bandwidth for their phones...but we have to balance that desire with the presence of antennas. We can make them look nicer, but we can't get away from them...and people will always want to put them "elsewhere."

Ms. Carroll said that at the hearing on the 535 S. Gramercy cell antenna installation, the commissioners did put pressure on T-Mobile to come up with more efficient equipment so they could locate in commercial and not residential areas. Ms. Mulligan agreed, saying it's a personal matter, but we need a policy to deal with it. Ms. Lombard said we have to keep in mind what we can do here: stop one pole and buy time for a larger solution. We need to be able to say definitively that they can do smaller installations, so we can pressure them to do that. She moved that we recommend the GWNC write a letter supporting the neighbors' opposition to this pole, based on its violation of the federal historic district designation and its proximity to a landmarked home (Mr. Terr's house), and a statement that we would oppose any such installation in historic areas.

Ms. Mulligan said they'd also like us to address the current lack of any requirement that the cell phone companies talk to the neighborhood associations in areas where such installations are planned. Ms. Lombard said we can't demand that Synergy talk to them, though we agree with the neighbors and oppose this particular pole.

Mr. Gresham said he would like to see the City Attorney's report on this issue, but Ms. Lombard said it's not done yet. Mr. Dougherty said our letter should go to the Bureau of Engineering, with copies to the City Attorney and City Council Member Tom La Bonge's office. He agreed that there's a larger policy issue to deal with here, but only after we deal with this particular pole in this particular location.

Ms. Fuller proposed that we recommend that Ms. Mulligan draft a more specific motion for the GWNC board, which can be presented at next week's meeting and reworked, as needed, before a vote is taken. There was general agreement on this plan of action. Ms. Lombard said we may also be able to come up with some legal referrals for Mr. Terr by then. Ms. Carroll said it's interesting that all the applications coming up lately are for T-Mobile...because all their location contracts came up for renewal at the same time and they were kicked out of many of their old locations.

Approval of the Minutes

Committee member Elizabeth Fuller presented the minutes of the last meeting. Committee member Rudy Gintel asked that he be added to the list of members in attendance at the beginning of the meeting. Committee Member Patty Lombard moved that the minutes be approved as amended. Committee member John Gresham seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

Old Business

Cell Phone Tower at 535 S. Gramercy – Committee Member Patti Carroll reported that T-Mobile's appeal was denied by the City Planning Commission on basis of its assault on residential neighborhoods, and T-Mobile was urged by the CPC to improve its technical equipment. I

Bricks & Scones CUP – 403 N. Larchmont -- Committee Member Elizabeth Fuller reported that the applicant, Jinah Kim, is still waiting for a hearing date to be set, and will return to the GWNC at that time to report on her efforts to gain neighborhood support.

Larchmont Bungalow – 107 N. Larchmont – Committee Member Patty Lombard reported that the City Attorney has filed a lawsuit against the Bungalow owners, based on three criminal charges. A court date has been set on April 15 to enter a plea before the judge. The City Attorney will ask that the business be shut down and thinks they have a good case. Ms. Lombard said she thinks they'll win...but it may not result in a big change in that particular space. The fine for violations, though, is \$1,000 a day since the non-compliance began in October. Finally, Ms. Lombard says she has also heard that the

Bungalow is offering corkage for alcohol (a big violation)...and the next step in Larchmont zoning issues will be to work toward a limitation on takeouts.

Yeshivath Torath Emeth Academy – 7002 W. Clinton -- Ms. Fuller said the City Planning Commission approved the CUP for the school's new preschool building, but the neighbors may file an appeal. She asked if people think it would still be worth it to have the GWNC board vote on the issue next week (a vote wasn't possible at last month's meeting because we lacked a quorum), and everyone agreed it would still be good to weigh in on the issue.

See's Candies – Committee Member Patti Carroll said renovation work is proceeding on the recently landmarked building, and the developers are working hard to be good neighbors. See's itself turned down the idea of returning a store to that location, but there may still be an opportunity for a franchise or re-addressing the issue in some other way, so they still need neighborhood support. Ms. Lombard suggested that they try to interest the Larchmont Chronicle in doing a story on the re-development and what a good job the developers are doing.

Review of Recent Early Planning Notifications

Committee members reviewed a summary of recent early planning notifications in the GWNC area, and flagged 4001 W. 6th St. and the new asphalt on Muirfield for brief investigation (such as drive-by visits).

Committee Member Comments & Reports

Cell Phone Tower Subcommittee – Committee Member Patti Carroll said the committee still needs to meet, although many of the larger concerns were discussed in earlier agenda items this evening. She said she would love to have Committee Member Karen Gilman join the subcommittee and Ms. Gilman agreed to do so. Ms. Lombard said the three committee members could schedule a conference call to begin their discussions.

City Planning Department Audit Review Committee – Ms. Carroll said her mother has been in the hospital, so she hasn't been able to do anything on this issue. Ms. Lombard said they would try to meet before next week's board meeting.

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

Board Member Comments

Committee Member Patty Lombard suggested that, as a way of moving our board meeting agendas along faster, we present the Land Use Committee recommendations as a package for a single vote at the board meeting. This would keep us from completely repeating the discussions that have already taken place at the committee level. She said some people might not be comfortable with this because they wouldn't get to discuss

things fully at the Board meetings, but it doesn't make sense to do things twice. She said the Board could ask questions of LUC members, and stakeholders could also be allowed to speak, but only if they have new information to add to the discussion. (And we can make exceptions – such as we did for people who came to speak on the Yeshiva issue who couldn't attend the LUC meeting).

Mr. Arens asked how the Board could vote on things they haven't discussed fully...but said one alternative might be for letters to come directly from the Land Use Committee instead of the Board. Ms. Gilman pointed out, however, that when the Planning Commission takes comments, they have to come from the board as a whole. Ms. Fuller agreed, saying Community Impact Statements, which go into City Council Files, also have to be from the NC as a whole, and have to have Board minutes attached.

Ms. Lombard said we should make it clear to the board, however, that this committee has spent many hours discussing the issues we're bringing to them, and that we'd like to expedite the recommendation process. Mr. Gintel said he doesn't object, as long as the LUC recommendations are unanimous; if there is a split decision, the Board has a right to know about the minority opinions. Ms. Fuller agreed, but said we should make it very clear that the public hearings on Land Use issues will take place at the Committee level, not the Board meetings, unless there are extenuating circumstances.

Mr. Dougherty said he agrees, with one caveat: that some issues are particularly politically charged, and we do have a mandate to provide grass roots representation. Mr. Arens said the problem is that the Board has to be at the Committee meetings if they want to know what's going on. We could ask if the Board members object to such a change, and if they do, we could discuss it further. Ms. Lombard said we could also note what the points of dissention in committee votes were, if any...and Ms. Fuller promised to include them in the committee summaries that are provided to the board from now on.

Ms. Lombard said we could also consider asking people to submit things in writing before a presentation. Everyone agreed that we need some kind of structure, and that we should find out more about how other NCs handle this problem. Ms. Carroll suggested that Chris Spitz, from the Pacific Palisades NC, would be a good source of information. Mr. Dougherty said we could agendize a discussion of this idea at the next Board meeting. Mr. Gresham suggested we could present the LUC recommendations as a group, for a single vote, at the beginning of the Land Use segment of the Board meeting, and if anything seems to need further discussion at that point, we could provide it. Mr. Gintel said the summary should appear in the Board agenda, and if we can cut out even half of the discussions, we'd come out ahead.

Announcements & Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Fuller
Committee Member