

MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING
HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS
SAANICH MUNICIPAL HALL, 770 VERNON AVENUE
MONDAY, OCTOBER 20, 2008 AT 7:30 P.M.

Present: **Chair:** Mayor Leonard
Council: Councillors Brice, Brownoff, Derman, Gillespie, Hunter, Ngai, Sanders, and Wergeland
Staff: Tim Wood, Administrator; Chris Nation, Municipal Solicitor; Russ Fuoco, Director of Planning; Colin Doyle, Director of Engineering; Donna Dupas, Deputy Manager of Legislative Services; and Shirley Leggett, Senior Committee Clerk

Minutes **ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

MOVED by Councillor Wergeland and Seconded by Councillor Brice:
“That the Minutes of the Council and Committee of the Whole Meetings held October 6, 2008 and the Special Council Meeting held October 7, 2008, be adopted.”

CARRIED

BYLAWS

No. 258
ADM40 - Finance
Bylaw 8961

TAX EXEMPTION REAL PROPERTY BYLAW
Three Readings of the “Tax Exemption Real Property Bylaw, 2008, No. 8961”. To provide tax exemption for 2009 for the properties identified.

MOVED by Councillor Gillespie and Seconded by Councillor Brownoff: “That Bylaw No. 8961 be introduced and read.”

CARRIED

MOVED by Councillor Gillespie and Seconded by Councillor Brownoff: “That Bylaw No. 8961 be read a second time.”

CARRIED

MOVED by Councillor Gillespie and Seconded by Councillor Brownoff: “That Bylaw No. 8961 be now passed.”

CARRIED

No. 259
ADM40 - Finance
Bylaw 8962

TAX EXEMPTION BYLAW (CHURCH EXEMPTIONS)
Three Readings of the “Tax Exemption Bylaw (Church Exemptions), 2008, No. 8962”. To provide tax exemption for the churches identified, and to repeal Bylaw No. 8383.

MOVED by Councillor Derman and Seconded by Councillor Sanders:
“That Bylaw No. 8962 be introduced and read.”

CARRIED

MOVED by Councillor Derman and Seconded by Councillor Sanders:
“That Bylaw No. 8962 be read a second time.”

CARRIED

MOVED by Councillor Derman and Seconded by Councillor Sanders:
“That Bylaw No. 8962 be now passed.”

CARRIED

No. 260
ADM40 - Finance
Bylaw 8963

TAX EXEMPTION BYLAW (PRIVATE SCHOOL EXEMPTIONS)

Three Readings of the "Tax Exemption Bylaw (Private School Exemptions), 2008, No. 8963". To provide tax exemption for the schools identified, and to repeal previous school exemption bylaws.

MOVED by Councillor Sanders and Seconded by Councillor Wergeland: "That Bylaw No. 8963 be introduced and read."

CARRIED

MOVED by Councillor Sanders and Seconded by Councillor Wergeland: "That Bylaw No. 8963 be read a second time."

CARRIED

MOVED by Councillor Sanders and Seconded by Councillor Wergeland: "That Bylaw No. 8963 be now passed."

CARRIED

No. 261
ADM40 - Finance
Bylaw 8964

TAX EXEMPTION REAL PROPERTY BYLAW (RIPARIAN LAND)

Three Readings of the "Tax Exemption Real Property Bylaw (Riparian Land), 2008, No. 8964". To provide tax exemption for 2009 for a portion of 203 Goward Road.

MOVED by Councillor Derman and Seconded by Councillor Gillespie: "That Bylaw No. 8964 be introduced and read."

CARRIED

MOVED by Councillor Derman and Seconded by Councillor Gillespie: "That Bylaw No. 8964 be read a second time."

CARRIED

MOVED by Councillor Derman and Seconded by Councillor Gillespie: "That Bylaw No. 8964 be now passed."

CARRIED

No. 262
Douglas Street
Bylaw 8960

3351 DOUGLAS STREET

First Reading of the "Zoning Bylaw, 2003, Amendment Bylaw, 2008, No. 8960". Rezoning from C-8 to C-6DE.

MOVED by Councillor Wergeland and Seconded by Councillor Gillespie: "That Bylaw No. 8960 be introduced and read."

CARRIED,

with Councillor Derman voting against.

RESOLUTIONS FOR ADOPTION

No. 263
ADM115 – CRD
Proposed RGS
Amendment -
Highlands

CRD JOINT STATEMENT FOR FINAL PROPOSAL ARBITRATION OF DISTRICT OF HIGHLANDS PROPOSED RGS AMENDMENT

Memorandum dated October 20, 2008 from the Manager of Legislative Services recommending Council approve the joint statement prepared by the CRD further to the RGS arbitration on the proposed District of Highlands amendment.

MOVED by Councillor Gillespie and Seconded by Councillor Brownoff: “That Council approve the following joint statement prepared by the CRD further to the RGS arbitration on the proposed District of Highlands amendment:

The issue in dispute is: The amendment of the Regional Growth Strategy (RGS) to extend the Regional Urban Containment and Servicing Policy Area (RUCSPA) within the District of Highlands in order to extend services and accommodate a comprehensive development area.”

CARRIED

Adjournment

On a motion from Councillor Brownoff, the meeting adjourned at 7:35 p.m.

The Meeting reconvened at 9:10 p.m.

Recommendations

RECOMMENDATIONS

From the Committee of the Whole Meeting held October 20, 2008

No. 264
Viewmont Avenue
Restrictive
Covenant

4536 VIEWMONT AVENUE – REQUEST TO AMEND RESTRICTIVE COVENANT

MOVED by Councillor Gillespie and Seconded by Councillor Brownoff: “That:

1. **The proposal to amend the covenant on Strata Lots 1-46, Section 9, Lake District, Strata Plan VIS6501, to lower the minimum age to no less than 55 years of age be approved; and**
2. **The process and costs of securing the necessary agreement of all parties to execute and register the above change be borne by the developer and/or strata council.”**

CARRIED

No. 265
Harrop Road
Development
Variance Permit

1449 HARROP ROAD – DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMIT – NEIL NEATE, P. ENG.

MOVED by Councillor Hunter and Seconded by Councillor Gillespie: “That Council approve and issue Development Variance Permit No. DVP2008-00013 on Lot 1, Section 32, Victoria District, Plan 18542 (1449 Harrop Road).”

CARRIED

In Camera Motion **MOVED by Councillor Gillespie and Seconded by Councillor Hunter:
“That the following meeting be closed to the public as the subject
matter being discussed relates to the provision of advice that is
subject to solicitor-client privilege.”**

CARRIED

Adjournment On a motion from Councillor Gillespie, the meeting adjourned at
9:11 p.m.

.....
MAYOR

I hereby certify these Minutes are accurate.

.....
MUNICIPAL CLERK

MINUTES OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE MEETING
 HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS
 SAANICH MUNICIPAL HALL, 770 VERNON AVENUE
MONDAY, OCTOBER 20, 2008 AT 7:36 P.M.

Present: **Chair:** Councillor Sanders
 Council: Mayor Leonard and Councillors Brice, Brownoff, Derman, Gillespie, Hunter, Ngai, and Wergeland
 Staff: Tim Wood, Administrator; Chris Nation, Municipal Solicitor; Russ Fuoco, Director of Planning; Colin Doyle, Director of Engineering; Donna Dupas, Deputy Manager of Legislative Services; and Shirley Leggett, Senior Committee Clerk.

Cedar Hill Road
 Development Permit
 Amendment

3787 CEDAR HILL ROAD – DEVELOPMENT PERMIT AMENDMENT – DONALD STORCH

Supplemental report of the Director of Planning dated September 15, 2008 recommending Development Permit Amendment DPA2008-00010 be approved, and that prior to ratification the applicant submit a Letter of Commitment to implement the recommendations contained in the parking and TDM Study prepared by Boulevard Transportation Group dated August 14, 2008.

Mr. D. Storch, applicant, Chair, Lutheran Church of the Cross Congregation, stated:

- At the Committee of the Whole meeting in May 2008, further consideration of the Church’s application was postponed in order for them to submit a plan that included a parking study and traffic demand management (TDM) strategies; subsequently Boulevard Transportation Group was hired to undertake a study.
- There were four recommendations that resulted from the TDM study which pertain to overflow parking arrangements, controlled use of Church space, sustainable transportation elements, and parking reconfiguration.
- The Church is undertaking discussions with two businesses which do not operate on Sunday mornings to develop an arrangement to accommodate overflow parking.
- The Church Council will not authorize the simultaneous use of the upper and lower levels by different groups at the same time.
- The Church is in the process of becoming an accredited “green parish”; they have implemented a number of TDM initiatives which include carpooling and a sign-up sheet, public transit route maps and schedules which are posted on their bulletin board and in the newsletter; they installed a bike rack and a shower and change room facilities will be installed in the development of the lower level assembly space.
- If the demand for parking increases, they can reconfigure the three lots in order to create additional parking spaces.

Mr. K. Whitcroft, 1044 Inverness Road, stated:

- In 2005 when the rezoning of the subject property was approved, the Church agreed to create a green wall on the west side of the building through the use of a trellis and climbing plants.
- The Church is in the process of becoming an accredited “green

parish” so he hopes they will continue to work towards completing the green wall.

MOTION: MOVED by Councillor Derman and Seconded by Councillor Gillespie: “That it be recommended that Council approve and issue Amended Development Permit No. DPR2005-00001 on Lot 1, Sections 39 and 40, Victoria District, Plan 31105 (3787 Cedar Hill Road).”

Councillor Derman stated:

- He is very appreciative and congratulates the Church for their efforts to address the TDM issue and for taking steps to become an accredited “green parish”.

Councillor Brownoff stated:

- She appreciates the measures the Church took to analyze the parking needs and for undertaking the TDM study.
- She is excited to hear that the Church is in the process of becoming an accredited “green parish” and hopes there will be other churches to follow.

Councillor Sanders stated:

- She thanks the Church for their efforts and hopes that the green wall progresses.

Mr. Storch stated:

- The vines were planted to create a green wall and they are slowly growing.

The Motion was then PUT and CARRIED

Viewmont Avenue
Restrictive
Covenant

4536 VIEWMONT AVENUE – REQUEST TO AMEND RESTRICTIVE COVENANT

Report of the Director of Planning dated September 18, 2008 recommending the restrictive covenant be amended to reduce the minimum occupancy age to no less than 55 years, and that the process and costs of securing the necessary agreement of all parties to execute and register the covenant amendment change be borne by the developer and/or strata council.

Mr. J. Gardiner, applicant, 4043 Braefoot Road, stated:

- The original concept was for the subject building to have “hotel services” for seniors and the disabled, and for reduced parking requirements; this concept was also a factor in the neighborhoods’ support for the proposal.
- However, it became clear that the management systems necessary to sustain “hotel services” for seniors would likely have significant operational issues so the building became a conventional strata building.
- At the time, he did not think it would be difficult to market the units to seniors 65 years or older; however, the current housing market is down and only 24 of the 46 units have been sold.
- He feels that the age restriction is limiting sales and occupancy of

the building so he is asking that the covenant be changed to lower the age restriction from 65 years of age or older to 55 years of age or older.

- All but one of the current tenants in the building support lowering the age restriction.

In response to questions from Council, Mr. Gardiner stated:

- The units are being marketed as having only one parking space per unit.
- He feels that the repairs to the boulevard fronting 4565 Viewmont Avenue have been adequately addressed and that the boulevard matches how it previously looked.

Ms. C. Bailey, 407-4536 Viewmont Avenue, stated:

- Initially there were four residents currently residing in the building that did not support lowering the minimum age but they have changed their minds and she has letters of support from them; all of the residents are now in favor of reducing the age limit.

Ms. E. Hietkamp, 108-4535 Viewmont Avenue, stated:

- She feels that lowering the minimum age restriction from 65 years to 60 years would be more appropriate than 55 years as many people who are 55 years old are still working or have children living at home.
- She is concerned that there will be vehicles parking on the street; only about two thirds of Viewmont Avenue has a sidewalk and there are many children who live on the street.

Mr. G. Holloway, president, Royal Oak Community Association, stated:

- The Association has no objection to lowering the minimum age limit; the Association spoke to some of the residents in the area and there were some concerns with respect to traffic and parking but in general they did not object to reducing the age limit.

MOTION:

MOVED by Councillor Gillespie and Seconded by Councillor Wergeland: "That it be recommended that:

- 1. The proposal to amend the covenant on Strata Lots 1-46, Section 9, Lake District, Strata Plan VIS6501, to lower the minimum age to no less than 55 years of age be approved; and**
- 2. The process and costs of securing the necessary agreement of all parties to execute and register the above change be borne by the developer and/or strata council."**

Councillor Derman stated:

- He supports amending the covenant to reduce the minimum age requirement; he feels it is a reasonable request.
- The units are not very large and may not appeal to families; the number of vehicles owned by the residents in the building may not be an issue.

Councillor Brice stated:

- She will support reducing the minimum age requirement; however, she does not generally like the idea of amending covenants once they are in place.
- In this case, the current housing market is a factor; if there are any problems associated with lowering the age requirement it will likely be because of parking issues.
- The subject area is an ideal location as it is close to amenities and public transit and could be attractive for prospective purchasers with either one or no vehicle.

Councillor Brownoff stated:

- She is happy that the current residents support reducing the minimum age limit; she will support it as well.
- If residents of the building start parking their vehicles on the street then it will be an issue.

Councillor Sanders stated:

- She will support amending the covenant; however, she does not want to deal with any future issues associated with vehicles parking on the street.

The Motion was then PUT and CARRIED

Harrop Road
Development
Variance Permit

1449 HARROP ROAD – DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMIT – NEIL NEATE, P. ENG.

Report of the Director of Planning dated September 24, 2008 recommending approval of Development Variance Permit DVP2008-00013.

Mr. R. Salmond, owner, 1449 Harrop Road, stated:

- The proposal is to subdivide the subject property and create one additional lot; the existing dwelling will be retained on proposed Lot A and a new house will be constructed on proposed Lot B; both of the lots will be sold.
- He has some concerns with the location of the recommended building envelope on proposed Lot B and feels that it should be set further back on the lot.
- There is an existing 20 foot high hedge on the east side of the property adjacent as well as a very nice garden bed; if the building envelope is moved then the two Oak trees that are being recommended for protection could be removed and the large Oak tree at the front of the property could be saved; perhaps there could be some other kind of control on where the building envelope will be situated.
- His parents planted the existing Eucalyptus tree when he was a child and it should be removed as it has gotten to be too tall and is dangerous.
- The detached garage will be removed.

In response to questions from Council, Mr. Salmond stated:

- He and his sister will be selling the proposed two lots; they will not

be constructing a new dwelling on proposed Lot B.

Mr. P. Destrube, 1642 Athlone Drive, on behalf of the Garry Oak Meadow Preservation Society (GOMPS), stated:

- GOMPS mission is to make sure that the public is aware of the serious problem that the Garry oak meadow ecosystem is facing.
- What used to be a dense forest of Garry oak trees in this part of the world has been reduced to about five percent of its original size.
- Garry oak trees take a long time to mature; GOMPS is happy to hear that covenants are proposed to protect the existing Garry oak trees on the subject property.
- One of the existing trees close to the proposed building envelope is a Twin Oak tree which could also be preserved by moving the building envelope further to the east side of the property where the dense Cedar hedge is located.
- There are techniques such as cabling, bracing, etc. that can be done on trees that are located close to foundations so that their root systems will not be impacted.

Mr. K. Whitcroft, 1044 Inverness Road, stated:

- The urban forest is slowly being reduced; we need to take measures to preserve it and take into consideration how valuable urban forests are to our communities.
- Perhaps when the new house is being designed for proposed Lot B it could incorporate the existing trees into the design so that they can be preserved; the building envelope could also be reduced in size; if the Eucalyptus tree was pruned it could likely be preserved as well.

Mr. D. Shaw, 1450 Wende Road, stated:

- He has lived in his present location which is adjacent to the subject property for the past 32 years.
- He has some concerns with the existing Cedar hedge; it is between 20 and 30 feet high and runs the length of his property which is about 100 feet.
- He agrees with a suitable hedge protection covenant but he would also like a suitable height included in the covenant such as 15 feet.
- There is a drain that runs from the south of his property through the hedge to the subject property and then it runs into the open ditch at the front of the property; he would like that drain protected in some way as it has been there for more than 30 years and it still functions.

In response to questions from Council, the Director of Planning stated:

- The recommendation is to refer the siting of a new dwelling to the Approving Officer; the recommended building envelope was arrived at on the premise that it was intended to preserve as many trees as possible.
- The Approving Officer has dealt with covenants pertaining to hedges on numerous occasions to ensure that they cannot be removed or laterally topped lower than they should be.

In response to a question from Council, the Director of Engineering

stated:

- There is currently an easement along the east boundary of the subject property which is intended to protect storm drain infrastructure.

MOTION:

MOVED by Councillor Derman and Seconded by Councillor Gillespie: "That it be recommended that Council approve and issue Development Variance Permit No. DVP2008-00013 on Lot 1, Section 32, Victoria District, Plan 18542 (1449 Harrop Road)."

Councillor Derman stated:

- He feels that the proposed subdivision is reasonable; the subject property is close to major roads and amenities.
- It is important to preserve as many Garry oak trees as possible and perhaps the Approving Officer can think of some creative ways to achieve that.
- The hedge provides an enormous amount of privacy so having a covenant to protect it is a good idea.
- We need to start thinking of alternative methods for managing stormwater such as rain gardens.

Councillor Brownoff stated:

- Our urban forests are very important; we need to start building homes that fit in with the environment.
- It has been proven that if a tree is treated well during the construction phase that it can be saved.
- She supports the proposal and hopes that the Approving Officer will use some creativity with respect to preserving the existing Garry oak trees.

Councillor Wergeland stated:

- The proposed subdivision is a good opportunity for infill development as it is close to amenities.
- He agrees that trees can be retained close to building footprints if they are well protected during the construction phase.
- We need to preserve as much of our urban forests as possible.

Councillor Sanders stated:

- She agrees that it is important to preserve as much of our urban forests as possible.
- The owner has stated that he will not be building the new house on proposed Lot B; hopefully whoever does build the new dwelling will take into consideration how important the trees are to the neighbourhood.

The Motion was then PUT and CARRIED

ADM75/ADM40
Recommendations
from Committees
and Presentations

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM COMMITTEES AND PRESENTATIONS

Memorandum from Councillor Brownoff dated October 14, 2008 recommending that Legislative Services provide a report to update Part 5, Section 29 of the Council Procedure Bylaw 8840 to provide for recommendations from committees to be part of the Committee of the Whole agenda, and provide a report on how to allow presentations to be handled as part of our regular Council meetings.

Mr. H. Charania, 757 Genevieve Road, stated:

- There are two issues to consider: the first one deals with the recommendations from the advisory committees and the second one deals with the access of information to Council and presentations by organizations and community associations.
- He strongly believes that the recommendations from the advisory committees should be brought to the Committee of the Whole meetings for public input and debate.
- He feels that to short circuit or curtail public input is an erosion of democracy and an abdication of the Council's responsibility and obligation to seek public input; this is an opportunity for Council to demonstrate their progressiveness and leadership.
- The second issue goes with the principle of good government; access to government is an essential feature of a good government; good government also means to be informed and make informed and considered decisions.
- There are many reasons why organizations and groups should be allowed to speak to Council; if these people were to write their report or presentation to Council, some Council members may not review the presentations and there would not be an opportunity for questions to these presenters.
- Therefore, he believes it is wrong to deny these organizations access to Council through Committee of the Whole; a time limit of 10 to 15 minutes could be assigned depending upon the subject matter.
- Additional information or response could be provided by those presenters and also the community might benefit from those presentations.

Mr. G. Holloway, 4745 Rosehill Road, stated:

- The report from Councillor Brownoff was circulated among the executive and the Royal Oak Community Association but they have not really had a chance to discuss it, however, there is a lot of enthusiasm.
- There are issues about how to make this a manageable process; the community is very encouraged by this kind of initiative and is delighted to see it go forward.

Mr. D. Murdock, 405-899 Darwin Avenue, stated:

- He would like to congratulate Council for being one of the most open and accessible Councils in the region and for being the most accessible form of government in Canada.
- As a long term member of a community association, and a long time observer of Saanich Council, he feels there has been a regression in the openness and accessibility of Council, and in particular, the

Committee of the Whole.

- There have been presentations moved from the Committee of the Whole portion of the agenda to advisory committees to which the general public is typically not invited nor made aware of a presentation.
- With presentations there is the opportunity for members of the general public to speak and provide input which he believes is the most crucial portion of a decision making process; you cannot go wrong from inviting the public and engaging them in the decision making process as it will only improve the final product.
- He concurs with the recommendations provided by Councillor Brownoff and hopes that they will be given serious consideration.

Mr. K. Whitcroft, 1044 Inverness Road, stated:

- He has been attending Council meetings for a number of years and has seen changes to the format of the agendas and agrees that there has been a slow erosion of public input.
- When there is public input it provides an opportunity for people to take the time to voice their opinions on issues they are concerned about or interested in; the proposed recommendations are a good step forward in keeping in contact with the public.

Ms. B. Meek, 3909 Mildred Street, stated:

- Input from citizens is valued in Saanich and involvement from the grassroots is also valued; however, the only time that the public gets to speak at the Committee of the Whole is when there is a development issue or a planning issue; smaller issues are dealt with by the advisory committees however the public does not generally provide input.
- If recommendations from advisory committees were to go to the Committee of the Whole, then there would be an opportunity for organizations and associations to speak to them; it would also give Council a broader view in their thinking.

MOTION:

MOVED by Councillor Brownoff and Seconded by Councillor Derman: "That:

- 1. Legislative Services provide a report to update Bylaw 8840, Part 5 – Council Proceedings, Order of Business, s. 29, to provide for recommendations from committees to be part of the Committee of the Whole agenda; and**
- 2. Legislative Services provide a report on how to allow presentations to be handled as part of the regular Council meetings."**

Councillor Brownoff stated:

- Our website does not clarify how public input happens; she is asking through the recommendation, for a report back from Legislative Services of how many presentations we actually have had over a number of years prior to not allowing them at Council, and with any remarks they could provide us with respect to comments coming from the general public with respect to the recommendations.

Councillor Derman stated:

- In the past few years, he has had a number of inquiries with respect to public input; when they are told that a specific issue will be on the Council portion of the agenda and that they will not be able to address Council, they are disappointed.
- Many of the reports come from our advisory committees and some come from initiatives from individual Councillors; advisory committee agendas are not commonly known by the general public, nor are they commonly publicized through the media.
- There are many members of the public that would like to comment on issues and they should be permitted to do so; it enriches the debate, the decision, and Council.
- If the general public had an opportunity to attend a presentation in the Council Chambers on a topic such as, light rail transit, for instance, it would be extremely beneficial to all involved.
- He does not feel there are any negative aspects to this type of initiative; it is simply something that broadens the process of democracy and makes for better decisions; he is happy to support it.

Councillor Wergeland stated:

- He agrees that we have to be sure that the process really does enrich the end result; it is also important to look at how community associations relate and communicate to Council and vice versa, and how associations communicate with their residents.
- He feels there may be an opportunity for a change in the current process.

Councillor Gillespie stated:

- Most of all of us on this Council try to bring information forward to Council from the advisory committees they chair.
- He agrees that it is important to debate important issues such as affordable housing and secondary suites but we need to decide how long we want these issues to drag on for before we find a solution.
- He feels that overall the people of Saanich get a fair opportunity of being heard by Council; we are a very open Council and he has heard that from many other municipalities; Saanich Council is admired for how they operate and he is very proud of it.

Councillor Brice stated:

- She supports the recommendation; the reports that are called for in the recommendations will bring these issues forward and we can make some logical decisions.
- She feels that this is an open Council; this is an appropriate time to consider how we do our business; she looks forward to those reports.

Councillor Sanders stated:

- There are two issues here: the recommendations that are brought forward into the Council meeting and presentations.
- She has a concern with the issue of recommendations: she can remember a time several years ago when an issue came forward

that was very sensitive to the public, however, it was on the Council portion of the agenda and the community was not able to speak to it.

- Although we are an exceptionally open Council, there are more and more items coming forward as recommendations during the Council meeting which does not give the public the opportunity to speak.
- The other issue is presentations: she had two situations with her CRD Arts Committee and the Environmental Advisory Committee, where there were presentations that went forward to each of the committees, but what they really wanted was to bring their presentations forward to Council so that they could get feedback from the public as well.
- It is important for us to have that opportunity but be vigilant; there are times when we could allow a presentation because time would warrant.

The Motion was then PUT and CARRIED

Adjournment

On a motion from Councillor Hunter, the meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

.....
CHAIR

I hereby certify these Minutes are accurate.

.....
MUNICIPAL CLERK