MINUTES OF THE JUNE 7, 2011 REGULAR MEETING OF THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS OF THE VILLAGE OF OAK BROOK APPROVED AS WRITTEN ON JUNE 27, 2011

1. CALL TO ORDER: CALL TO ORDER

The Meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals was called to order by Chairman Champ Davis in the Samuel E. Dean Board Room of the Butler Government Center at 7:02 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL: ROLL CALL

Gail Polanek called the roll with the following persons
PRESENT: Chairman Champ Davis, Members Jeffrey Bulin, Natalie Cappetta, Baker Nimry, Steven Young and Wayne Ziemer. Joseph Rush arrived at 7:06 p.m.
IN ATTENDANCE: Mark Moy, Trustee, and Robert Kallien, Jr., Director of Community Development

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: MINUTES

There were no minutes to be approved.

Chairman Davis announced that New Business and Other Business would be heard prior to Unfinished Business

4. UNFINISHED BUSINESS UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. GROTTO OAK BROOK – 3011 BUTTERFIELD ROAD – SPECIAL USE – AMEND CONDITIONS CONTAINED IN ORDINANCE S-1117 GROTTO – 3011 BUTTERFIELD RD – SPECIAL USE – AMEND ORD S-1117

Chairman Davis swore in those that testified at this hearing.

Don Lullo, General Manager of the Grotto Italian Steakhouse restaurant provided a recap of the request to amend the special use. Granting approval of the special use would allow them to bring more guests into the Oak Brook area and would increase the tax revenue as well. Many restaurants in the DuPage area are now providing live entertainment and speaker music entertainment on their outdoor patios such as in Lombard and Oakbrook Terrace. These restaurants are located right across the street in another community and takes away sales and tax revenue from Oak Brook, which also creates a disadvantage

and hardship on their facility.

As a restaurateur, they respect the neighbors and surrounding communities in making sure that the village ordinances are adhered to. It is their understanding that the more recently approved outdoor dining special uses no longer are restricted by dates to utilize the outdoor dining area, and they have requested that relief as well.

Chairman Davis clarified that the special use applies to the Grotto, Kona Grill and McCormick and Schmick, all of which are seeking the elimination of the date restrictions, but that the live music is only being sought by the Grotto. .He noted that extensive testimony had been heard at the last meeting by all interested parties.

Mr. Lullo said that a decibel meter was purchased. A normal conversation between 2 people registers 65-70 on the meter. They do not have any guidelines as to where to take the readings. They are trying to understand decibels and have taken readings from Meyers Road and it was very difficult to get a good reading. The meter was recording decibels almost to 200 just because of the traffic. It was very difficult to isolate the music from that location. They also took readings from the patio edge on the north side and it was measuring between 85-90 decibels, which was right at the entertainment area. Simple conversation registered in violation of the noise ordinance. They need a determination as to where the decibel readings are to be taken in order to determine compliance. They hired Shiner and Associates, Acoustical Engineering, who has put together a proposal to evaluate several locations, including the condo towers, in order to put together a thorough report. In addition, they will be providing sound reduction recommendations.

Several weeks ago he attended the Condo Tower Association meeting and he further assured them that the Grotto cares and to call him if there are any problems. On Saturday, Robert Mesch called and they immediately took action and that is where it ended. One other evening an Oak Brook Police Officer was writing a ticket on Meyers Road directly across from the restaurant and afterwards came to the restaurant because he felt the music was too loud. They lowered the music to where the officer believed it was acceptable and he left. No other calls were received from the residents. They have taken a lot of measures to ensure the music is at an acceptable level all night. There were no further incidents or complaints since the log book has been started.

Chairman Davis questioned that the residents of the towers knew how to get in touch with Mr. Lullo at the Grotto.

Mr. Lullo responded that they did.

Chairman Davis questioned that a copy of the completed Shiner and Associates report should be given to the homeowners association.

Mr. Lullo agreed.

Director of Community Development Kallien said that measurements would need to be taken during the music event in order to have a valid report to address the issues.

Member Young suggested that the average level of the sounds should be determined at each point, at the patio, across the street, and the towers. He questioned whether the decimeter had been certified as a lab tested calibrated device. Without the device being calibrated the readings may not have been accurate.

Mr. Lullo responded that it came with some paperwork, but he was not aware that he had to have that information. If the device does not meet those standards, they could purchase a lab-quality tested device.

Chairman Davis noted that in the Shiner proposal they were requesting approximately $10,000 in upfront fees from the applicant.

Member Lullo said that they had discussed a per hour fee with the firm.

Member Rush questioned the maximum decibels stated in the Village Code. He noted that with all the traffic in that area it would be difficult to get a measurement within the code allowance

Director of Community Development Kallien responded that from a residential property line between 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. it is 65 decibels and between 7 p.m. to 7 a.m. it is 55 decibels. At a commercial property line it is 70 and 60 respectively. They measured at the east property line in front of the lake edge at Meyers Road and it measured 60 decibels at 9:00 while music was playing. Another reading was taken at the Oak Brook Promenade sign at Butterfield and Meyers Road. At that location the meter jumped between 60 and over 70, which was influenced significantly by vehicles as they passed.

Member Young noted that overall reading assumptions can be made based upon averages, by taking several readings over the course of the day.

Member Nimry said that the only real concern is what the sound reading is while the music is being played.

Director of Community Development Kallien agreed. He added that the proposal states that sound readings would be taken from various locations and depending upon the numbers, they would offer technical suggestions for operational changes to be made or physical improvements to the space. The sound code, exempts sound from motor vehicle.

Member Ziemer noted that the Grotto is unsure as to where to take the measurements from the patio or the property line.

Director of Community Development Kallien responded that the Code requires the reading to be taken 25 feet from the sound source and that measurement is in the lake. Arrangements could be made with the owner to do that. Readings could also be taken from other locations in order to create a base line.

Member Ziemer added that because it is such a noisy intersection the measurement should be taken at night, such as at 10:00 p.m. and at midnight and also taken on evenings when the music is not playing so that the ambient level can be determined.

Chairman Davis questioned that the report would be ready for the next hearing.

Mr. Lullo agreed.

Dominic Ruggerio, 3 North Tower Road, President of the Oak Brook Towers townhome and homeowner associations, said that Mr. Lullo recently appeared at the associations meeting. He requested the report be sent to the association.

Robert Mesch, 20 North Tower Road, 3rd floor, had copies of noise ordinances that he had obtained from the internet for different cities, such as Boston, Chicago, Dallas, LosAngeles, New York and Phoenix. There were common phrases used in the noise ordinances. They set locations ranging from 50, 100, 200 and 600 feet. The other issue was the timeframe. If electronic equipment ceases to be allowed after 11:00 p.m., the decibel readings would not be necessary. This was the main issue from these ordinances.

Member Young said that during the noise ordinance hearings, the Village reviewed at least a dozen different local noise ordinances that were tested under Illinois law in the courts so that the standards that they had in place were not a random guess.

Barbara Richards, 20 North Tower Road, unit 8g, said that she checked with Lombard and the speakers at the restaurants located across the street were not outside the buildings. They are only located indoors as well as the music. She walked over there one evening and the music is much softer and is over by midnight the latest. Mr. Lullo had stated that they had speaker music outside the building and they do not.

Margaret Langer, 20 North Tower Road, Unit 8d, offered that they come to her apartment to measure the sound.

Member Young asked whether they knew what the thickness of the building was and whether the windows were single, double or triple pane. He also questioned whether it was central or unit air conditioning.

Ms. Langer responded she did not know and all she wants to be able to do is go out on her balcony. She believed the windows were double pane and has a unit air conditioner that must be on high.

Dennis Hiffman, Chairman and CEO of NAI Hiffman, said that they are a corporate citizen of Oak Brook. He is on the Board of Directors of the Chamber of Commerce. He is on the Economic Development Commission and in addition to being the developer of the Oak Brook Promenade, is also the manager and leasing agent for that property. With all of that being said, the Village is always looking for sources of revenue and tenants that are compatible with the village. Those on the board are constantly looking for tenants. As manager and leasing agent for their properties, they are also constantly looking for tenants. When they can find a tenant with the quality of the Grotto, as well as many of the other tenants in the Promenade, they do everything that they can to help them survive, especially during these very tough times. The shopping center generates approximately $350,000 in sales tax revenue to the village, which should be taken into consideration. The Grotto has contributed at least $100,000 since it has opened. They are doing whatever they can to help the tenants through these very hard times, such as through rent abatement or what ever it takes. He believes they may be turning the corner, but would like the board to take all of this into consideration.

Mr. Lullo commented that he personally attended live entertainment across the street at Champps and Weber Grill, on the patio and decks at those restaurants. As he previously stated, he called all the restaurants that he named at the last meeting, acting as a guest in a random call, saying that he really enjoyed outdoor entertainment and asked if they (the restaurants) were going to have it

again this coming summer. He was told yes and was given the dates that he indicated at the last meeting.

William Lindeman, 11 Pembroke Lane, resident said that he provided a printed document from the website from the Museum of Science and Industry called a Whisper Chamber. He described the chamber and how it worked and suggested that it may similar to the phenomenon that is occurring with the Grotto. He called the Village of Lombard and was told that they have an entertainment permit and only Champps had applied for this type of permit for a game night and on the weekend they listed acoustical music. The speakers at McCormick and Schmick are background speakers. Dancing has not been mentioned, which is linked with live music in the ordinance. He questioned what would happen when the next occupant asks for the same thing. Lombard has a 1% downtown sales tax. He questioned it should be considered what was good for the village not for one business.

Motion by Member Rush, seconded by Member Bulin to continue the public hearing to the June 7, 2011 meeting. VOICE VOTE: Motion carried.

4. B. PRIDMORE – 15 GLENOBLE COURT – VARIATION – FENCE HEIGHT

PRIDMORE – 15 GLENOBLE COURT – VARIATION – FENCE HEIGHT

Chairman Davis swore in all those that would be providing testimony at this hearing. He said that the hearing had been continued in order to receive a

John Riccione announced that he was new counsel for the petitioner

Mr. Kenny reviewed documents to be included as part of the case file. They were as follows: Group Exhibit 4, which were several photos of a trampoline, fence, and an illustration of pictures with fencing drawn. Exhibit 5 is a copy of the fence invoice. He suggested that the determination as to whether the fence contractor was to get the permit, so Exhibit 6 is a blank copy of an invoice that he obtained showing it was not the fence contractor's responsibility to get the permit.

Mr. Riccione objected, stating that the fence contractor was not present to confirm that the language shown on a current invoice was the same as the one given to Mr. Pridmore many years ago in 2001. The fine print on Exhibit 5 is not legible. This is an undated invoice that may have changed over the years.

Chairman Davis admitted it conditionally.

Mr. Kenny submitted a copy of a letter from the school of the Grane's child (610 Lakewood Court) submitted to the Forest Glen Board stating that the fence was necessary. Mr. Riccione did not understand the relevance of the letter or the status of the confidentiality of the letter and would not want to breach any confidentiality of the Grane's, but did not object to its inclusion.

Mr. Riccione said that the Zoning Board had heard many hours of testimony on this matter. In the Zoning Ordinance under 13-3-6B (fence) that they be allowed to keep the fence, which is 6 inches higher than the allowed 42-inch high fence. The fence has been in existence for approximately 10 years. Former counsel testified to the standards for the variation. Mr. Pridmore submitted as requested and under a confidentiality agreement, a letter from the child's treating physician who has been treating the child for the past two years. An agreement was reached with Mr. Kenny in regards to an attorney's eyes-only confidentiality agreement and he was then shown the same letter that was viewed by the Zoning Board as confidential.

He asked if it was reasonable to leave a 48-inch high fence for a special needs child installed, when the Pridmore's could have constructed a 42-inch high fence that was allowable.

Mr. Riccione said that there is a confidentiality agreement with Mr. Kenny and any cross-examination; Mr. Pridmore has been instructed not to reveal the nature of the child's particular physical condition, treatment, and any diagnosis from his physician and any information that would be protected by HIPPA. He would be fearful that a closed taped record would be inadvertently released to the public or placed on u-tube.

There was a discussion that the cross-examination of Mr. Pridmore would be done in the presence of the attorney's and the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Mr. Kenny suggested that it be taped on a separate video tape to be held by petitioner's counsel after the closed session.

Member Young questioned that the closed session action would not violate the open meetings act.

Chairman Davis noted that the board can go into executive session, which is done by boards all the time.

Motion by Member Rush, seconded by Member Young to adjourn the public hearing session of the meeting and to go into executive session at 8:10 p.m.

VOICE VOTE: Motion carried

Chairman Davis called to order the public hearing portion of the meeting and to reconvene the meeting: at 8:46 p.m.

PRESENT: Chairman Champ Davis, Members Jeffrey Bulin, Natalie Cappetta, Baker Nimry, Joseph Rush, Steven Young and Wayne Ziemer

Mr. Riccione said in closing that in many cases an opinion from an expert is necessary and the lawyers will do all but write the actual opinion of the expert. In this case they let the doctor write his own opinion and he wrote one; and it did not say a lot of things, but it was truthful and it says enough. Counsel proffered pictures as evidence, one being a trampoline with a huge cage around it and another with a sandbox that has since been torn down, and he made note of various alleged unsafe conditions around the property. The Pridmore's are on constant alert in trying to improve the safety of their property on a daily basis. Danger is a constant threat for their child and they consistently and continually try to improve the safety of their property. The question is if it is reasonable to leave the 48-inch fence up to accommodate a special needs child. A doctor has submitted an opinion that this is a special needs child. They have a right to maintain a 42-inch high fence without the need for a variance. The homeowner's association has had six months to proffer evidence that this is not a reasonable accommodation. All that has been heard to date is that they have this rule against fences and they don't like fences. Mr. Peters is deathly afraid that fences are going to pop up all over the place. Counsel Mueller indicated earlier that 10% of the interior lots already have fences. He dared anyone to eyeball those fences and get an accurate read whether they are 42, 48 inches or 5 feet in height. They have clearly established a right to have the fence. They acknowledge that the fence has been in place for a long time, but now there is clearly a reason to accommodate a special needs child. It is a very basic and reasonable accommodation and nothing more. They would offer that if the Zoning Board of Appeals would recommend the allowance of the fence, then in the event the Pridmore's sell the property, or in the event the child is no longer a special needs child, or moves out, they would bring the fence back into the then stated compliance.

Mr. Kenny said in closing that Mr. Riccione misspoke when he suggested it would be reasonable to let the fence remain at 48 inches high. The Zoning Board has to determine whether the request meets the findings, not that it is found to be reasonable. The petitioner has failed the burden to meet the standards of the zoning ordinance. The board should deny the request and

order that the fence be reduced to 42-inches.

The Forest Glen subdivision is one of open character and one of the significant factors that defines that character pertains to fences in the interior lots. They allow fences 48-inches high around swimming pools because the Oak Brook Building Regulations mandates fences around pools as a safety factor. Forest Glen restricts 48-inch high fences in the interior lots other than that, which is part of the recorded covenant for the subdivision. The Pridmore's fence is going to alter the essential character of the community since the late 1970's.

If allowed, it will set a precedent for other property owners to seek fence height variations not based on established land use considerations, but based on medical conditions of occupants. Approval of the variation would open the flood gates to 48-inch fences on the interior lots in Forest Glen.

Harry Peters has been on the Forest Glen Board for 16 years and testified on the issue of the character of the community as an open space character along with the winding road and two ponds. They have the authority to restrict fences within its covenants. Oak Brook permits 42-inch high fences in its Zoning Ordinance. He cited restrictions within the Forest Glen subdivision, where fences are not allowed in the interior lots without the approval of the Forest Glen board. The policy has been in existence since the late 1970's. There are 102 interior lots in the subdivisions. Eight lots have swimming pools with 48-inch high fences. One lot with a disabled child has a fence and the Pridmore's fence.

Mr. Pridmore states that the fence does not affect the character of the neighborhood. The fence was erected without a permit and in excess of the height restrictions and had he followed the law, the fence would never have been allowed. He also believes since the fence has been there for a while he should be entitled to keep it.

The fence on Lakewood Court is at the home of an autistic child and the lot backs up to a retention pond, which is about 10-feet deep. The property owners submitted a letter from the school that the child attends in a special ed program for autistic students and the child needs constant supervision with clear boundaries so that the child cannot flee.

Mr. Pridmore never submitted a letter to the Forest Glen board seeking approval of the fence and in all communications never once mentioned his special needs child. That was not disclosed until an application was submitted for the variance in January 2011.

Testimony was received that the Forest Glen board tried to resolve the issue, but Mr. Pridmore would not address the issue with the board when they tried to work it out.

The fence on Lakewood Court was approved conditioned upon the owner obtaining a permit from the village, complying with all zoning, which would have restricted the height to 42 inches, so it is not justification for Mr. Pridmore to have a 48-inch high fence.

Mr. Pridmore has failed to meet the standard that he created the hardship that exists. He bought the property in1998 and he admitted that he constructed the fence in 2001 to contain his dogs. The fence was not built for the special needs child that was not yet born at that time. This matter would have been avoided had he gotten a permit and complied with the law. He is not truthful about not having the responsibility to obtain the permit.

The board is responsible to ensure that the standards of the Zoning Ordinance are met and the evidence should be considered in the medical condition of the child, but the board cannot abdicate its responsibilities for the fence height variation and turn it over to a doctor especially when the evidence shows that he did not have all the relevant facts. He requested that the board recommend the denial of the fence variation and that the fence be reduced to 42 inches.

Mr. Riccione said that in response to Mr. Kenny's statement that the homeowner association is fearful of the precedent that this request may set, perhaps the subdivision does not want families to move into subdivision who might be disabled persons or have family members that may have special needs. They asked that the board accommodate this particular family and other families that may have special needs for a variance. They asked that the board recommend approval to allow the fence to remain. He clarified that this response was in response to counsel for the homeowners association who stated in his closing that the approval of the variance for the reason of special needs would set a precedent and everyone would start to install fences in the subdivision.

Member Nimry raised concerns that there was no agreement between the property owner and the homeowner association regarding the removal of the fence.

Director of Community Development Kallien noted that several years ago a variation was granted for a driveway gate with the stipulation that the gate be

removed should the property ever be sold. In order to ensure that a covenant with a deed restriction was signed and recorded against the property.

Member Young questioned that with all the litigation that has occurred between the parties had anyone ever talked about trying to come together and put some restrictions on the property in order to reach a happy medium.

Mr. Kenny commented that the board made many overtures before litigation was filed. They did not want to sue a resident until there was no other alternative.

Mr. Peters said that they made several overtures to the Pridmore's and did not know that there was a special needs child until January of 2011.

Mr. Riccione said that everyone would agree that the specific offer made by his client to the Zoning Board was never offered to Mr. Pridmore by the homeowners association.

Chairman Davis asked Mr. Peters if the proposal that was made by the Pridmore's to remove the fence should the property be sold, the child no longer would be a special needs child, or if the child moved that the fence would be returned to the lawful condition would be of value to the homeowner's association

Mr. Peters responded no.

Chairman Davis said that it then would not have mattered had the offer been made by the Pridmore's.

Mr. Peters said that they had made that offer through their former counsel in July of 2007, which was refused and were told that they would see the homeowner association in court

The members reviewed all of Mr. Kenny's evidence.

Member Ziemer said that it is regrettable that the permit was not taken out in the beginning because it has caused a lot of heartache. He questioned that the condition came to light because some of the landscaping had been removed. He asked if Mr. Pridmore would agree to install additional landscaping that would be maintained.

Member Young asked the cost difference of reducing the size of the fence.

Mr. Pridmore responded that the fence only goes around the patio and is basically 3-sided. The only thing missing was a pine tree that had died.

Member Cappetta noted that none of Mr. Pridmore's neighbors came in or complained about the fence. Mr. Degerstrom testified that the homeowner association board was told by him and knew about the fence 10 years ago and they did nothing about it, so there is conflicting testimony. Mr. Pridmore has offered a good concession to remove the fence and the homeowners association has made deals like this with other people and will make a deal like this next month where a condition changes or a child moves out and the fence would be required to come into compliance. Although the board states that it is an open character that they want, but if there were bushes around it that it could not be seen it would be okay. The fence is more open than bushes located all around it, which is a little contradictory. It was done without a permit which was wrong, but that issue is not what is in front of the Zoning Board today; the variation is based on the need as it exists today, not whether it was done 10 years ago for the dogs. Everything the Zoning Board does sets some type of precedent. Every decision made sets up the next decision, but the board has to be reasonable.

Chairman Davis said that Mr. Kenny was formerly a fine Chairman on the Zoning Board of Appeals, and his mentor. Although he argued the concern for setting a precedent, the Zoning Board of Appeals does not really rely on precedents. Each case is different and a hardship must be shown in each case. He did not believe that the flood gates would be opened and fence after fence would be built by people claiming this hardship. If people claim hardship and have to go what both sides have gone through along with the cost and expense, he would suspect that no one would want to build a fence again. The huge financial cost to both sides would be a deterrent to anyone trying to build a fence. He was sorry that the parties could not seem to work anything out. The conditions agreed to by Mr. Pridmore are reasonable.

In his view he believed for variation standards had been satisfied. The plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances one being that the health conditions of the child and the fact that the fence has been up for ten years. He did not think that the fence would change the character of the locality, not when it has been up for ten years and when no one has complained about it. If it were going to alter the essential character of the locality, there would have been complaints over the last ten years. A matter of 6-inches will not alter the character of the neighborhood. The request would not generally be applicable to other properties in the area, since if it would be approved in one instance does not

mean that it could be done elsewhere. Each situation considered by the Zoning Board is unique and the granting of a variation would not be detrimental to the public welfare. The homeowners association may not like the granting of the variation, but from the standard of the public welfare it would not be detrimental. The variation will not impair the light or air to adjacent properties.

Member Young added that from a precedence standpoint, there is plenty of case law where these issues have been argued for fences that are much higher, with other requirements imposed when approved.

Chairman Davis said that he would not recommend the variation without the condition that if the property is sold, or if the child is no longer a special needs child or if the child leaves the home, the fence would be reduced to 42 inches at the expense of the property owner. The homeowner association should be kept informed of its status because they do have a legitimate interest in the aesthetic standards, which are important. The original mistake with the erection of the fence could have been between the property owner and the fence contractor because the language as to who was to obtain the permit and the language was not legible on the original invoice and it happened a long time ago.

Member Nimry said that you cannot just think about the child, the homeowners association has to be considered and what they go through. People will try to put up fences.

Chairman Davis responded that his comments on precedent views were that of the Zoning Board requirements and the request for the variation.

Member Nimry raised concerns that you are looking for trouble when approval is given to this type of circumstance where the work was done without a permit.

Member Young said that what the Zoning Board does is for the public, for the children, not what a homeowner association does. From a public policy standpoint the Zoning Board should take a look at the children, not the interest of the homeowner associations.

Motion by Member Rush, seconded by Member Ziemer to recommend approval of the requested variation to allow the existing 48-inch fence to remain on the property subject to the following conditions:

> If the property is sold, or if the child no longer has special needs, or if the child leaves the home, the fence would be brought into compliance with the zoning regulations at that time and at the expense of the property owner.

ROLL CALL VOTE:
Ayes: 5 – Members Cappetta, Rush, Young, Ziemer and Chairman Davis
Nays: 2 – Members Bulin and Nimry. Motion Carried.

5. NEW BUSINESS

NEW BUSINESS

A. GRANE – 610 LAKEWOOD COURT – VARIATION – FENCE HEIGHT

GRANE – 610 LAKEWOOD CT – VARIATION – FENCE HEIGHT

Chairman Davis said that a request had been received from the Applicant requesting the public hearing be continued to the next scheduled Zoning Board of Appeals meeting.

Motion by Member Nimry, seconded by Member Bulin to continue the public hearing to the June 27, 2011 meeting. VOICE VOTE: Motion carried.

6. OTHER BUSINESS

OTHER BUSINESS

A. RESCHEDULE THE REGULAR ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING DATE FROM JULY 5, 2011 TO JUNE 27, 2011

RESCHEDULE ZONING BOARD MEETNG DATE TO JUNE 27, 2011

Due to the Independence Day holiday on July 4, 2011, and the possibility of a bare quorum, the members agreed to reschedule the July 5, 2011 meeting to June 27, 2011.

Motion by Member Bulin, seconded by Member Ziemer to reschedule the regular meeting date from July 5, 2011 to Monday, June 27, 2011 at 7:00 p.m. VOICE VOTE: Motion carried.

7. ADJOURNMENT:

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Member Ziemer, seconded by Member Bulin to adjourn the meeting at 9:36 p.m. VOICE VOTE: Motion carried

ATTEST:

Robert Kallien, Director of Community Development
Secretary