

Public HearingOctober 5, 1999

A Public Hearing of the Municipal Council of the City of Kelowna was held in the Council Chamber, 1435 Water Street, Kelowna, B.C., on Tuesday, October 5, 1999.

Council members in attendance were: Mayor Walter Gray, Councillors A.F. Blanleil, M.I. Bremner*, R.D. Cannan, C.B. Day*, R.D. Hobson*, J.D. Leask*, J.D. Nelson and S.A. Shepherd.

Staff members in attendance were: City Manager, R.A. Born; Acting-City Clerk, G.D. Matthews; Director of Planning & Development Services, R.L. Mattiussi; Current Planning Manager, A.V. Bruce; and Council Recording Secretary, B.L. Harder.

(* denotes partial attendance)

1. Mayor Gray called the Hearing to order at 7:00 p.m.
2. Mayor Gray advised that the purpose of the Hearing is to consider certain bylaws which, if adopted, will amend "Kelowna Official Community Plan (1994-2013) Bylaw No. 7600" and "Zoning Bylaw No. 8000", and all submissions received, either in writing or verbally, will be taken into consideration when the proposed bylaws are presented for reading at the Regular Council Meeting which follows this Public Hearing.

The Acting-City Clerk advised the Notice of this Public Hearing was advertised by being posted on the Notice Board at City Hall on September 17, 1999, and by being placed in the Kelowna Daily Courier issues of September 27 & 28, 1999 and in the Kelowna Capital News issue of September 26, 1999 and by sending out or otherwise delivering 106 letters to the owners and occupiers of surrounding properties between September 16-20, 1999.

3. INDIVIDUAL BYLAW SUBMISSIONS

- (a) Bylaw No. 8391 (Z99-1006) and OCP Amendment No. 99-005 – Eric & Lidia Baumgart – 1024 Laurier Avenue - THAT the Future Land Use Designation of Map 15.1 of the City of Kelowna Official Community Plan for Lot 5, D.L. 138, O.D.Y.D., Plan 3999 located on Laurier Avenue, Kelowna, BC, be changed from Multiple Family Residential – Low Density to Multiple Family Residential – Low Density transition;

AND THAT City of Kelowna Zoning Bylaw No. 8000 be amended by changing the zoning classification of Lot 5, D.L. 138, O.D.Y.D., Plan 3999, located on Laurier Avenue, Kelowna, B.C., from the RU6 – Two Dwelling Housing zone to the RM4 – Transitional Low Density Housing zone in order to allow development of the site for uses permitted in the RM4 – Transitional Low Density Housing zone.

The Current Planning Manager indicated the property on maps displayed on the overhead projector and advised that the applicant is proposing to develop four additional care units and a caretaker's suite within the lower level of the existing Group Living Home.

Councillor Bremner entered the Council Chamber at 7:02 p.m. and took her place at the Council Table.

The Current Planning Manager advised that the existing zoning limits the number of boarders and lodgers to 10, including resident staff. If the rezoning application proceeds, a Development Permit would also be required to deal with additional parking required off the lane and some supplemental landscaping, and a Development Variance Permit would be required to allow a reduced lot width. The applicant has registered a restrictive covenant to assure Council and the public that the existing building would remain as will be shown in the Development Permit Application when it comes forward and that the applicant has no plans for a multi-family building.

The Current Planning Manager noted Council raised concerns at initial consideration of this application and clarified that the facility is a boarding and lodging home tailored for seniors but that the facility does not provide licensed care. The basement units would be constructed in compliance with the B.C. Building Code and the applicant advises the rent for the basement units would be less expensive and that those units would be targeted for more active seniors. The existing chainlink fence would be replaced with a cedar fence along both side property lines and 7 parking stalls would be provided at the rear of the facility.

The Acting-City Clerk advised that no correspondence or petitions had been received.

Mayor Gray invited the applicant or anyone in the public gallery who deemed themselves affected to come forward or any comments from Council.

The applicant indicated he had nothing to add at this time.

Steve Brow, 1040 Laurier Avenue, advised he lives next door and that he has problems with people parking in his driveway when they are picking-up and dropping off people at this facility. Also, he has repeatedly asked the owners to rectify the noise problem from an air conditioner beside the complex but nothing has been done. He asked for assurance that the parking area would not be gated and would be accessible for dropping off and picking up people and said he would like to see the fence erected before any further work is done on the project.

Valerie Halford, president of Friends & Residents of the Abbott Street Heritage Conservation Area Society (FRACAS) advised that her group is interested in this application because there is a developer that wants to do three buildings of this nature in the Abbott Street Heritage Conservation Area. FRACAS is concerned to see that a facility built under RU6 zoning could be changed to RM4 zoning and is concerned about housing our elderly in subterranean rooms. Ms. Halford suggested that congregate care facilities are better equipped to meet the needs of the elderly and stated that FRACAS sees the subject facility as future slum housing for the elderly because it does not provide adequate care for our seniors and does not save money for the public purse because the residents still have to rely on outside care. FRACAS is also concerned that the increasing number of group living homes being built could discourage other care facilities from being built when, according to the newspapers, the biggest crunch is for housing for people needing a higher level of care.

Dave Williams, 781 Rowcliffe Avenue, was concerned that the rezoning would set a precedent, despite the covenant. The area is predominantly RU6 and once the precedent is set, others will take advantage of the opportunity.

The Current Planning Manager advised Council that the requested zoning is less density zoning than what the Official Community Plan would support on this side of Laurier which is identified for potential medium density, multi-family residential.

Eric Baumgart, applicant, advised that he is willing to move the air conditioner to the other side or the rear of the building and suggested that the City put up a no parking sign in front of his neighbour's lot since any signs he has put up have always been vandalized. He took exception to his development being called a slum house and advised that the facility has 4 different kinds of protection in the event of fire so the basement units would be safe and a stairlift would be installed if this application is approved. The windows in the lower units would be 5 ft. by 2.5 ft. which is almost the same square footage as the windows upstairs and it is more comfortable downstairs during the summer months. The rent for the basement suites would be \$900-\$1,000 per month. Mr. Baumgart circulated photographs of his complex and advised that the halls and doorways all meet the standards for intermediate care use and so are adequate to accommodate wheelchairs and with the stairlift, the basement units would be wheelchair accessible. A resident person would live in the facility for personal attention but the facility is not licensed for care. There is a communal eating area and activities are organized for the clients to socialize. The facility is an alternative to staying in the hospital. None of the clients have cars; the parking would be for visitors.

Responding to questions of Council, the Current Planning Manager advised that the covenant would be registered in favour of the City and quit claiming the covenant would require a resolution of Council authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute the necessary documents. The covenant would be registered on title so that prospective purchasers would be alerted that there is a restriction they need to investigate.

Mr. Baumgart assured Council that another floor would not be added to the building as the foundation is only built to handle one floor.

There were no further comments.

- (b) Bylaw No. 8466 (Z99-1048) – John & Jacqueline Garcha (Ian Watson) – 344 Rio Drive South - THAT City of Kelowna Zoning Bylaw No. 8000 be amended by changing the zoning classification of Lot 22, Sec. 31, Twp. 26, O.D.Y.D., Plan KAP54129, located on 344 Rio Drive, Kelowna, B.C., from the RU1 – Large Lot Housing zone to the RU1s – Large Lot Housing with Secondary Suite zone in order to allow development of the site for uses permitted in the RU1s – Large Lot Housing with Secondary Suite zone.

Councillor Bremner advised she resides in Magic Estates and therefore could be perceived to be in a conflict of interest and left the Council Chamber at 7:48 p.m.

The Current Planning Manager indicated the property on maps displayed on the overhead projector and advised that the applicant is proposing to develop a secondary suite within the lower level of a 2-storey single family dwelling currently under construction. There have been no other licensed suites in this area to date; however, bylaw enforcement staff attended a complaint about an illegal suite in the area earlier in the year. Staff recommend favourable consideration.

The Acting-City Clerk advised that the following correspondence and petitions had been received:

- 24 signature petition of opposition and 15 letters of opposition including 4 letters that were late (as follows) all expressing concerns that property values would decrease, neighbourhood traffic would increase, the rezoning would set a precedent and could potentially change the family-oriented character of the area, lack of on-site parking, and the interest of purchasers should not supersede the interests of the existing community, lack of transit, and lack of control over present and future property owners renting both levels for rental income:
 - Mike & Jennifer McNulty, 348 Rio Drive South
 - Bill & Myrna Nimmo, 340 Rio Drive South
 - Tom & Beverley Maxted, 365 Rio Drive South
 - Dan & Betty Mirva, 321 Rio Drive South
 - James & Dawn Hill, 329 Rio Drive South
 - Gina & Trevor Duckworth, 327 Woodpark Crescent
 - Tom & Anita Heath, 336 Rio Drive South
 - Patrick & Merrie-Jean Mulhern, 349 Rio Drive South
 - Fred & Marilyn Brown, 337 Rio Drive South
 - Don Mellish, 372 Rio Drive South
 - Janice & Martin DeHeer, 353 Rio Drive South
 - Kathy Anderson, 268 Avonlea Way
 - Randy Christian, 258 Avonlea Way
 - Ray & Charlott Stieben, 258 Comelot Court
 - John & Twila Graves, 331 Woodpark Crescent

The Current Planning Manager displayed a map on the overhead projector showing the location of those properties that indicated opposition to the application.

Mayor Gray invited the applicant or anyone in the public gallery who deemed themselves affected to come forward or any comments from Council.

Ian Watson, applicant, clarified that construction of the home is completed, with the exception of the suite; the application process for the 's' zone took longer than it took to construct the building. He advised he has no interest in the property other than in his capacity as realtor for the owners. The suite would be occupied by Mrs. Garcha's parents. Mr. Watson advised that there are currently 6 homes for sale in the Magic Estates area and all have suites, 2 are within a stone's throw from the subject property and one is on Rio Drive. Presumably the suites are not having a big impact or there would have been more than one suite-related complaint lodged with the City.

The Current Planning Manager clarified that houses built before the adoption of City of Kelowna Zoning Bylaw 8000 could have a summer kitchen with an affidavit signed to allow in-laws with separate facilities.

John Garcha, owner, advised that he looked for a place for over a year before deciding to build and that he just moved in Sept 3, 1999. The intent is for his wife's parents to live in the suite and he is just trying to do everything in accordance with the rules in place. The suite would be used strictly for family and they have no intention of renting it to anyone else.

Responding to questions of Council, Mr. Garcha advised that construction of the suite is complete with the exception of the kitchen and the kitchen would not be built if this application is not approved. He added that it seems the biggest concern is devaluation of property, yet there are already a number of non-conforming suites in the area and there is no evidence to show property values would be reduced.

Bill Nimmo, 340 Rio Drive, advised his parents live with him and that he signed a covenant restricting use of the suite to family members. He said the applicant's realtor asked him, before the subject property was sold, whether he had a problem with the applicant putting in a *revenue suite*, not an in-law suite, and that he had said he was very much opposed. Mr. Nimmo was concerned that once the zoning is in place, the house could be sold to someone looking for revenue property and there could potentially be tenants up and down. Rental suites and revenue houses would change the character of the neighbourhood to the detriment of property values and the lifestyle people moved there for. Mr. Nimmo advised that he would not oppose this application if a covenant could be registered saying the suite can only be occupied by family member and not rented.

The Current Planning Manager clarified that the covenant says the entire residence would be used as a single household and not have a self-contained suite.

The City Manager advised that the City moved from covenants to the 's' zoning as a result of legal advice.

Dawn Hill, 329 Rio Drive, advised that it was her who complained about the illegal suite on Rio Drive.

Fred Brown, 337 Rio Drive South, reiterated comments of previous speakers that if the suite could be restricted to only in-laws there would be no objection. The main concern is that the zoning would provide potential for rental property in future and the 's' zone sets a precedent for Magic Estates. Over time suites detract from the value of the home and the ability for resale.

Martin Deheer, 353 Rio Drive South, reiterated the concern that a future owner could purchase the home for revenue income.

Wayne Stann, 303 Avonlea Way, commented that from past experience he knows that problems all start with one incident and that he is very concerned about a precedent being established if this rezoning is approved.

Council considered allowing the applicant to register a covenant.

John Garcha re-addressed Council to state that he applied for the 's' zone knowing what he was applying for and that he would accept whatever Council's decision is. He alleged that Council was changing the rules as they go along and that is unfair and very frustrating because he would have gone the covenant route if that would have been an option available to him.

There were no further comments.

Councillor Bremner returned to the Council Chamber at 8:44 p.m. and took her place at the Council Table.

- (c) Bylaw No. 8467 (Z99-1007) and Official Community Plan Amendment No. 99-006 – Aberdeen Holdings Ltd. (Grant Maddock, Protech Consultants (1989) Ltd.) – 2350 Burtch Road - THAT Map 15.1 – General Future Land Use of Schedule “A” of the Kelowna Official Community Plan (1994 – 2013) Bylaw No. 7600 be amended by changing the Future Land Use designation for part of Lot 4, D.L. 136, O.D.Y.D., Plan 1562, Except Plans 41601 and KAP46155, located on Burtch Road, from the Single/Two Family use to Mobile Home Park use as shown on Map “A”;

AND THAT City of Kelowna Zoning Bylaw No. 8000 be amended by changing the zoning classification of part of Lot 4, D.L. 136, O.D.Y.D., Plan 1562, Except Plans 41601 and KAP46155, as shown on Map "A" attached to the report from the Planning & Development Services Department dated August 18, 1999, located on Burtch Road, Kelowna, B.C., from the A1 – Agriculture 1 zone to the RM7 – Mobile Home Park zone in order to allow development of the site for uses permitted in the RM7 – Mobile Home Park zone.

Councillor Day declared a conflict of interest because a direct member of his family owns property in the area and left the Council Chamber at 8:44 p.m.

The Current Planning Manager indicated the property on maps displayed on the overhead projector and clarified that although the requested zoning is mobile home park, the intent is to develop the site for modular homes which are homes on a permanent foundation that have the ability to be moved. Approximately 233 modular home lease spaces are proposed for development. The property would be subdivided by the re-alignment of Guisachan Road to line up with Byrns Road. The residual parcel would remain zoned A-1 and is not part of the subject application. The application was reviewed and supported by the Advisory Planning Commission with suggestions that the access to the site be moved to the north, that the curvature of Guisachan be changed, and that a traffic study be done. The application has addressed two of the suggestions. At this point the City's Works & Utilities Division have not requested a traffic impact study.

The Current Planning Manager advised that the requested zone is a multi-family zone and therefore the City of Kelowna Official Community Plan designation of single and two family residential would have to be amended. Staff recommend support of the application, with a note that there is some concern about the amount of adult orientated mass housing in this area, with Sandstone to immediate southwest, Sandhaven across the street and Sunrise Village to the immediate south. Although there are no provisions within the sector plan to limit the amount of this type of housing, it is contrary to what was initially being considered for the area when Guisachan Village was originally considered.

The Acting-City Clerk advised that the following correspondence and petitions had been received:

- letter from Brenda Thomson, Central Okanagan Naturalist Club conservation committee, advising that the proposed development would cover an unconfirmed wetland, and asking that a ditch on the property that is still being used and has historical connections with Kelowna's irrigation systems be retained for environmental purposes and for the benefit of the residents.
- petition with 73 signatures opposing the application because the road design would encourage shortcutting between Burtch Road and Guisachan Road.

Public HearingOctober 5, 1999

- letters of concern from the Sandstone Strata Council and from Ross Hamilton, 1201 Cameron Avenue, asking for clarification of the "mobile home park" zoning designation and seeking assurance that trailers or pre-constructed structures would not be towed onto the site.
- late letter of opposition from Lynne Anderson, 1120 Guisachan Road, saying roadways are too narrow and will not accommodate the traffic from the development.

Mayor Gray invited the applicant or anyone in the public gallery who deemed themselves affected to come forward or any comments from Council.

Grant Maddock, applicant, explained how the proposed realignment of Guisachan Road and closing off the east end of Guisachan at Nelson Road would eliminate the concerns about shortcutting as well as eliminate concerns about vehicle headlights for the owners of Lot 3 at Guisachan/Nelson Roads. He advised that they have asked the City's Works & Utilities Division to install 4-way stop signs at the intersection of Wilkinson and McBride and at the Cameron/Stillingfleet intersection. Mr. Maddock advised that based on the results of a mini-traffic study that they undertook of the traffic going in and out of Sandstone, the traffic that would be generated from the proposed development would be about 3.5 vehicles per-unit/per-day. He pointed out that the OCP and Transportation Plan for the City both identify Guisachan as an arterial road, following close to the proposed alignment and advised that it was always the intent to close off the east portion of Guisachan. Mr. Maddock showed photos of the existing Guisachan Road looking east from the intersection with Stillingfleet and another shot superimposed showing what the road would look like with the improvements that are a requirement of this application. He also showed slides of the proposed landscaping plan.

Responding to questions of Council, Mr. Maddock advised that the proposed development would be upscale from Sunrise Village, the bike lane would extend from Gordon Drive to the completed new intersection, a 5 ft. concrete fence would be constructed along the property boundary along with associated landscaping as a sound barrier for the enjoyment of the people living in the development. The proposed development would provide affordable housing intended for adult living. The homes would have a 3 ft. crawlspace instead of a basement and would be from 1,200 to 1,550 sq. ft. in size. There would be considerable space around the recreation area where a tot lot or other activities could easily be incorporated for grandchildren.

Council and the applicant discussed potential routes for traffic movement in the area.

Dale Harder, on behalf of Mr. & Mrs. Heinz Heimann, 1360 Guisachan Road, advised that the Heimann's feel the proposed development would effectively destroy the neighbourhood they have lived in for 20 years. They are not opposed to the concept of the development but they are opposed to how it affects them because they feel they would be injuriously affected by the increased noise, traffic and crime and that their property would will descend in value.

Responding to questioning by Council, the Current Planning Manager advised that eventually there would be boulevards on both sides of Guisachan Road; the applicant would only be responsible for the south side of the road other than on the north side of the realigned portion of Guisachan when the residual parcel develops.

Alan Lund, 1480 Denver Road, enquired about traffic movement from Nelson Road and the Current Planning Manager clarified that there would be no movement from Nelson or the easterly end of Guisachan onto the realigned portion of Guisachan. Mr. Lund asked that signs be put up on Denver indicating the change in traffic pattern.

Bob Fowler, 102-1201 Cameron Avenue, representing the Sandstone strata council, advised they have no objection to this application but are concerned about the traffic that would be added onto Stillingfleet Road. The strata council has petitioned the City for stop signs at the corner of Cameron/Stillingfleet. The strata council is also concerned about the 'mobile home park' zoning because they would not support putting trailers or mobile homes on the site and suggest that there be a caveat against the land to not allow trailers or mobile homes.

Steve Day, advised that his family owns about 40 acres at 1909 Byrns Road and an additional 30 acres at 2050 Byrns with Byrns Road bisecting the two. He was concerned about the impact on their farming operation if Guisachan and Byrns Roads are to become arterial roads. He read a prepared speech about the farm use of those roads and how it would be difficult to farm on both sides of the road if Byrns was to become a major road. He pointed out that the land is in the Agricultural Land Reserve and therefore cannot be developed. To preserve the agricultural sustainability of the area and allow them to continue to farm the land safely and without interference, he asked that Council consider closing Byrns Road at Benvoulin, eliminating left turns from Benvoulin to Byrns, or installing a series of speed bumps or other speed control on Byrns to make it safer for farm traffic. He expressed disappointment that no-one tonight has questioned the impact of increased traffic on the 400 or so acres of farm land on that road. Mr. Day advised there are only about 12 residences on Byrns Road and commercial farmland is not compatible with traffic going through it. He asked Council for a commitment to support the farmers by keeping the traffic out.

Council discussed ways to mitigate the impact of the additional traffic on the farm operations on Byrns Road such as an overpass, underpass or agricultural traffic light, but Mr. Day gave reasons why none would help and again asked that Council try one of his suggested solutions. He advised that if his concerns can be addressed, then he would have no objection to the subject application; otherwise he would be opposed.

Councillor Leask left the Council Chamber at 9:56 p.m.

Herb Schroeder, 1450 Guisachan Road, expressed concern about construction traffic going past his house noting he already has problems getting into and out of his yard because of traffic. The Current Planning Manager advised that phase 1 of the development would create 40 lots at the west end of the site and at that time the developer would improve Guisachan Road up to where the new alignment starts. At phase 2, the realigned section of Guisachan would be completed and the easterly end of the existing Guisachan Road would be closed off. For all phases, access to the subject property would be from Burtch Road. Mr. Shroeder suggested that more stop signs are needed on the side roads to discouraged motorists from using them as a shortcut route.

Dave Beauchesne, 2240 Nelson Road, advised he is responsible for the petition of opposition that Council has received. He expressed concern that at the Advisory Planning Commission meeting of March 30, 1999 the public was told that the residual triangular portion of land could be developed with low rise multi-family apartment buildings. He was also concerned about increased traffic and urged Council to ensure that there be noise attenuation done on the north side of Guisachan Road too.

Ken Day advised his family has farmed in the Benvoulin Road area for a long time and that they not only own the property Steve mentioned but also the property on the corner next to the proposed development. He submitted that if the land is to stay in the

Agricultural Land Reserve, then there has to be a commitment to keep the traffic off Byrns Road because otherwise they will not be able to continue to farm their land. He advised that he is not opposed to development but submitted that Council should not allow development to affect farming operations that have been there for years. He commented that the State of California does not even allow roads in their farm areas and pointed out that Byrns Road is a non-traffic generating area and so the proposed upgrade of the road would be simply to move traffic to and from other areas of the city.

Bob Mandryk, 1430 Guisachan Road, was generally in support of the subject application but was concerned about traffic. He felt that there should be a stop sign at Wilkinson/McBride because there is a playground in close proximity, and that the cut off at Guisachan/Nelson should be blocked permanently not temporarily.

Grant Maddock responded to comments made, advising that the temporary cut-off is only until the urbanization is done on the north side of Guisachan and to his knowledge that upgrading is already scheduled for 2002. The subject development is not forcing the traffic to go down Byrns Road – that is a long term plan of the City and there are other options available. They are just following the City's requirements for future alignments of roads. Aberdeen Holdings would be building all the housing to ensure quality control.

In response to questioning by Council, Mr. Maddock confirmed that they were forced to isolate the residual parcel of land because of the City's traffic plan.

There were no further comments.

Councillor Day returned to the Council Chamber at 10:22 p.m. and took his place at the Council Table.

- (d) Bylaw No. 8468 (Z99-1047) and Official Community Plan Amendment No. 99-017 – Sylvia & James McCormack and Richard & Lorna Highfield (Porter Ramsay, Tom Smithwick) – 665A and 625 Ford Road - THAT Map 15.1 – General Future Land Use of Schedule "A" of the Kelowna Official Community Plan (1994 – 2013) Bylaw No. 7600 be amended by changing the Future Land Use designation of; Lot 8 and Lot 9, Sec. 26, Twp. 26, O.D.Y.D., Plan 9958, located on Ford Road, from Multiple Family Residential – Low Density to Multiple Family Residential – Low Density Transitional as shown on Map "A";

AND THAT City of Kelowna Zoning Bylaw No. 8000 be amended by changing the zoning classification of Lot 8 and Lot 9, Sec. 26, Twp. 26, O.D.Y.D., Plan 9958, located on Ford Road, Kelowna, B.C., from the RU6 – Two Dwelling Housing and RU1 – Large Lot Housing zones to the RM4 – Transitional Low Density Housing zone in order to allow development of the site for uses permitted in the RM4 – Transitional Low Density Housing zone.

Councillor Hobson declared a conflict of interest because he is a Director of the Regional Health Board that approved the contract for this facility and left the Council Chamber at 10:23 p.m.

Public Hearing

October 5, 1999

The Current Planning Manager indicated the property on maps displayed on the overhead projector and advised that originally 3 properties were rezoned for a senior housing development ranging from independent living to full licensed care. Since then the subject two lots have been acquired and the intent is to consolidate these two lots with the other three lots to create one parcel which would then be subdivided to create two lots in order to give separate title to the independent living units. The stub road off Ford Road would be closed in exchange for widening on Rutland Road.

The Acting-City Clerk advised that the following correspondence had been received:

- letter of concern from Alex Roth, president of the Father Delestre Society requesting that access to the development include Ford Road as well as Rutland Road.

Mayor Gray invited the applicant or anyone in the public gallery who deemed themselves affected to come forward or any comments from Council.

Tom Smithwick, applicant, circulated artist's renderings of the proposal and advised that adding the two lots to the development site has delayed the project which is on tight timelines. If the bylaws are adopted tonight, construction would start tomorrow.

The Current Planning Manager responded to the letter from the Father Delestre Society advising that Works & Utilities staff had indicated they would consider an access from Rutland Road through the site to link to Ford Road but in the end it was decided that would detract from the quality of life of the people living in the proposed facility.

There were no further comments.

4. TERMINATION:

The Hearing was declared terminated at 10:31 p.m.

Certified Correct:

Mayor

BLH/bn

Acting-City Clerk