City Council of Peachtree City
Meeting Minutes
August 18, 2016
7:00 p.m.

The Mayor and City Council of Peachtree City met in regular session on Thursday, August 18, 2016. Mayor Vanessa Fleisch called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Others attending: Terry Ernst, Mike King, Kim Learnard, and Phil Prebor.

Announcements, Awards, Special Recognition

Mayor Fleisch welcomed the Freisling Grizzlies Women's Softball Team to Peachtree City to attend a softball clinic and play in a local tournament. Robbie Shelton was recognized as Employee of the Month for his efforts in helping to restore the Fire Department's 1949 fire engine. Fire Chief Joe O'Conor presented certificates of recognition to the volunteers and donors who helped with the restoration of the 1949 fire engine. Fleisch presented K-9 Maik with a certificate of appreciation upon his retirement from the Peachtree City Police Department. The Peachtree City American Little League 11/12 All Stars were recognized upon winning the state championship and advancing to the finals in the Southeastern Region playoffs.

Minutes

King moved to approve the August 4, 2016, regular meeting minutes as written. Ernst seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Monthly Reports

No comments.

Consent Agenda

1. **Consider Alcohol License – NEW – Ginza, 107 Lexington Circle**
2. **Consider Stormwater Maintenance Agreement – Chick-fil-A (East)**
3. **Consider Authorization to Purchase Hydraulic Rescue Tool – Fire Department**
4. **Consider Resolution – Changes to Employee Benefits Program**
5. **Consider Acceptance of Donation from Firehouse Subs Public Safety Foundation**
6. **Consider Request to Surplus Vehicle**
7. **Consider Budget Amendment – FY 2016**

Ernst moved to approve Consent Agenda items 1 – 7. Learnard seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Old Agenda Items

07-16-03 Public Hearing – Consider Request to Rezone 4.88-acre tract within Lexington Circle from LUC-16 to LUC-28

Planning & Development Director Mike Warrix addressed Council, noting the request was for a vacant undeveloped lot within Lexington Circle. The applicant was Dar Thompson with High Sierra Investments, LLC. The tract was zoned Limited Use Commercial-16 (LUC-16), and the current land use was vacant and undeveloped. The requested zoning would be LUC-28, and the proposal was a multi-family loft project with a retail component. At its meeting on June 13, the Planning Commission had voted to not support the request as presented.

The future land use plan designated the lot as future commercial use (COM), and it showed Governor's Row as single-family cluster future development, Warrix said. Governor's Row subdivision and Lexington Village were located adjacent to the tract.

Warrix said the plan included four stories with basement-level parking, up to 100 multi-family residential "loft" style condominiums in a building no greater than 80 feet in height, a ground-level retail component, and development in accordance with site plans and building elevations presented in the application. Warrix said Council would consider two ordinances – a text amendment to the LUC-16 ordinance regarding the maximum number of fee simple townhomes and the ordinance to rezone the tract to LUC-28.

Scott Bennett addressed Council on behalf of High Sierra Investments, LLC, and applicant Dar Thompson. Bennett noted that they had looked at the Planning Commission minutes from June 13, and they had modified the request in response to the concerns voiced by the neighboring subdivisions – Governor's Row, Lexington Village, and Lexington Park. The changes included reducing the size of the development from the 4.88-acre tract to 3.5 acres. The remaining portion of the parcel was located adjacent to Governor's Row, and it would remain as LUC-16. The number of units had decreased from 100 to 80 units. Bennett continued that a balloon test had been performed to get an idea of the scope of the building height.

The product would be a high-end, upscale condominium loft-style development and would accommodate people who did not want any yardwork, basically empty-nesters, and did not want to leave a house uninhabited when they traveled. It would be a secure facility with underground parking. It would not be attractive to young families with children. The purchase price would start at $350,000 per unit, and it would have the amenities, such as a pool and spa, associated with that price point. It would be the first of this type of development on the south side of Atlanta. Peachtree City was unique in its demographics, and Bennett added this project could not be built in Fayetteville or McDonough. This product was for a limited market, and there would not be similar projects built over and over. People wanted this type of product.

Bennett said they were asking that the building height remain at 80 feet, adding it would blend in with the buffer and trees. One of the concerns had been that people on the roof would look down into the other subdivisions. Bennett said the deck on the roof looked down on the common area of the development and the commercial area. The people buying the units would want privacy as much as the people who lived around the development. The traffic study had been done based on 100 units and the planned retail. The number of trips would be cut from 2,500 per day to 1,250 per day for 100 units, and there were be fewer trips for 80 units. There was a natural decrease in intensity when going from commercial zoning to residential zoning.

Bennett continued this would be a good product for the City. As opposed to amending LUC-16, they wanted to separate the tract so everyone would know exactly where the building would go within the development. Bennet reiterated that the original plan for 4.8 acres was now on 3.5 acres.

Fleisch asked if the average size of the units would change. Bennett said the size of the units would stay the same. The original concept was for 80 as the maximum number of units in this building. The other building shown on the original concept would house phase two of the project. The remaining units would have gone on the 1.3-acre portion of the original tract, which was closest to Governor's Row.

King asked if the developer would ask for a four-story building on the remaining acreage in four or five years. Bennett said they did not know. The demand was there for 70 – 80 units. Commercial properties changed hands, and If someone came back with a plan for the other part of the tract, then this building would be there and they could see how it worked. It was hard to visualize the concept because it was different. But approval of the same concept for the remaining land would depend on what Council thought was best for the City. They could not demand the zoning. King said if a plan came for another 20 units on the remaining part of the tract, and it was approved, then there would still be 100 units. Bennett said if Council approved it.

Fleisch opened the public hearing.

Jack Miller said he had seen a lot of growth since he moved to the City in 1971 when the population was 800. The growth had been controlled by other Councils, and he appreciated it. He presided over a couple of trusts that owned 4.5 acres located between the proposed development and Holy Trinity Catholic Church. At this time, the property was not for sale and there were no plans for development. He did not know Thompson, but what he saw looked good to the people he was involved with. Over years, they had talked to a lot of developers, and they had all said this area was the only place in the City where there was a unique opportunity for a community within a community, to be able to walk to stores. It was a virtually self-contained area and minimal change would be needed to the infrastructure. This was a great opportunity to complete this project. Miller said whatever happened with the trust parcels had to be for the betterment of the City.

Melissa Griffis of Rosenzweig, Jones, Horne & Griffis represented the three property owners in Governor's Row that were closest to the proposed development – Curt and Linda Hirsch, 128 Middleton Drive; David and Christine Hader, 126 Middleton Drive; and Don and Barbara Robinson, 124 Middleton Drive. Griffis asked that an ante litem notice sent to the City earlier that day be made part of the record. She continued that they hoped Council would uphold the zoning ordinance and follow the lead of the Planning Commission in denying the request.

Griffis continued that three stories with parking was allowed now. Four stories and a parking garage would result in a five-story building looming over her clients' backyards. It would block their view and the scenery they had. They enjoyed using their backyards, and they did not want to have people on their own back porches looking down at them. At the time they purchased their properties, they had relied on the zoning that was in place to protect them. The rezoning proposal would adversely affect the existing use and usability of their property and their neighbors' property. Amending the request and taking out the 1.2 acres allowed for spot zoning, which was typically not something the City approved. Once the door for spot zoning was opened, a precedent was set.

Griffis continued Thompson had noted in his e-mail correspondence that he had something in mind for the 1.2 acres that would not be included in this project. If the 3.5 acres were spot zoned to LUC-28, the City would have given Thompson an open door to request another rezoning in the future. Council would create a situation for the developer by approving the LUC-28 at 3.5 acres rather than 4.88 acres. He would be able to say he took out the acreage because of negative comments, and he could not do anything with the property that would be compatible in the area. There would be an opportunity for Thompson to say Council had created the situation.

The rezoning proposal would create a nuisance for the adjoining landowners and neighbors, Griffis said. It would damage her clients on a continual and daily basis. She appreciated the traffic reports, noting it had taken her 10 minutes to turn left onto Walt Banks Road after meeting with her clients before school was back in session. It would be more difficult with school traffic and the addition of the commercial elements included in the project. The proposed development was not in conformance with the policy and intent of the Land Use Plan as adopted by the City.

Griffis showed a photo of the balloon test, which showed the balloon above the established vegetation. The conceptual plan showed the building below the trees, but the balloon test had shown otherwise. She also had photos of the area between her clients' backyard and the proposed development that showed flooding after a rain storm. Griffis said there were already stormwater problems in the area, and a new development would further contribute to that. Griffis asked Council to deny the request for rezoning.

Curt Hirsch said their home was built in 2003 (128 Middleton Drive). Since then they had made many improvements, including the addition of a backyard fireplace. Having a building that would overlook their backyard would interfere with their quality of life and enjoyment of their property. The building would not be covered by trees. In the mornings, especially when school was in session, Hirsch said it took five to 10 minutes to get out of their subdivision. He asked Council to deny the request for LUC-28 zoning and to stay with the current LUC-16 zoning. They understood what could be built in the LUC-16 zoning when they purchased their property, and Hirsch said he was sure Thompson had understood the same when he purchased the 4.88 acres.

Glenn Wright said he had lived in a building similar to what was proposed in Marina del Rey, California. It was very difficult to sleep when car alarms went off in an underground garage. Even though the water table was fairly high, there were issues with leaking in the garage. There were no other underground garages in the City. There was a rooftop area for recreation. He said he could already hear people talking as they were coming out of World Gym. He was concerned with the density, building height, and the underground garage.

Lynn Wallace was concerned about how the development would impact the Lexington Village townhomes. She was very opposed to the development and how it could impact Lexington Village. The plats she had seen appeared to show that High Sierra owned their street (Lexington Village) and the south entrance into their townhome community. She noted the Lexington Village entered Lexington Circle at the roundabout, adding Lexington Village was a private road maintained by the homeowners association (HOA). She asked who owned Lexington Village Road. She asked what High Sierra's intentions were, asking if the access to their 46 homes would be limited. Wallace said the south entrance to the townhomes was the location of the gated entrance to Lexington Lofts. Their community would be left with one entrance. If there were a great deal of traffic, public safety vehicles, postal services, and garbage collectors would find it difficult to get in and out of Lexington Village. High Sierra could decide to make it a dead end street. If the street remained open, there would be a traffic density problem since their residents would still be using the south entrance and the Lexington Lofts residents would use the gated entrance. She asked Council to deny the rezoning request.

George Harrison noted he had been asked by several Governor's Row residents to speak about the universal opposition to the rezoning and the project from the neighbors. He reiterated that they had all understood LUC-16 was the governing status for density in the area when they purchased their property. They were not opposed to growth, but it could be done within the existing LUC -16 zoning. Seventy-five residences in that area considerably expanded the density envisioned in LUC-16. The traffic study was limited and did not address the impact on SR 54 East, Walt Banks Road, or Peachtree Parkway, which were already areas of concern with the existing density during times of maximum usage. Another concern was the proportion of rental property there could be in the new development. They were against the development as stated and any rezoning. They would support development within the LUC-16 strictures.

Roger Milam said he and his neighbors had understood the development would have 75 units. There had been a neighborhood meeting where they had discussed what the project meant to them in terms of quality of life and property values. Everyone was against it, and a petition had been sent to Council stating their opposition to the rezoning and the project. They had been invited to meet with Thompson, and they had an open discussion with him. After that, they had attended the Planning Commission meeting, adding there had been a unanimous rejection of the plan as proposed. There were other issues that should be considered. It seemed as though more residents in high-rise buildings wanted to have dogs, and Milam noted there were not many walking areas in the plan. Their neighborhood could become the walking area for those dogs and their owners. Lexington Village had more greenspace and provided plastic bags for clean-up. This was a great idea, but the wrong place.

Fleisch started to close the public hearing, and Bennett asked to respond to some of the comments.

Bennett addressed the issue of spot zoning, saying that he had served as a city and county attorney and had done a lot of zoning work. Spot zoning would not be a concern. Bennett continued that rezonings were proposed because there was no viable economic use as currently zoned. The rezoning would not set a precedent, and just because the neighbors did not like it did not mean the rezoning could be denied. Just because a neighbor rezoned a tract to commercial did not mean it had to be approved by an adjacent property owner. They had heard over and over that the property should be developed under LUC-16. Bennett said the neighbors might find the LUC-16 uses were more objectionable than this project. The LUC-16 zoning did limit buildings to the three stories; however the height of the building was not limited. A three-story hotel with a basement could be built, and it could be taller than what they were proposing. There were more intense uses than condominiums, which was something the City should consider. Retail would create more noise and more cars. This property would be used. It was right in the middle of the City. Families that could afford the lofts would come and go on a leisurely basis, would not impact the schools, and would spend money. They would already be in the City but no longer wanted to take care of a house and yard. Council should also consider what could be done under the current zoning without the applicant asking for anything. People would be unhappy.

Bennett noted the problem with stormwater, saying part of the reason was the water was currently not controlled as it should be. The water was running off the natural land. If the property was developed, they would have to control/alleviate the runoff problem, not exacerbate it. The concept was designed knowing they had to control the stormwater. Thompson was the principal of High Sierra, and he was a major investor in the City, Bennett said. He lived here with his family, and he did not want to hurt the City. He was not a stranger that would throw something up and leave, hoping everything worked.

The lofts would not be filled with rental units, and there were factors in place to prevent that, according to Bennett. Investors would not be buying units at the proposed pricing; there was no market for it. Bennett noted the price point was one issue, as well as the financing which required at least 70% of the lofts to be owner-occupied or Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac would not buy the notes. There had to be some leasing available or the federal government would think they were trying to keep people out of the development. Leases could not be prohibited, but there would be covenants that would restrict leases to a 10 – 15% rate. This would be an expensive product that would not be easily conducive to rentals. There were restrictions on the number of units one investor could buy. A 10% limit on rentals meant eight units in an 80 unit building would be available. They were asking Council to allow a residential product where a commercial product would otherwise be built. People usually welcomed a down zoning, but the concern was there was nothing there now. The City would get a good neighborhood and tax asset. Overall, it would be a benefit for the City. Bennett noted he had not seen the amendments to LUC-16, and they would like to see what would happen with the remaining acreage.

Milam said that the lofts would be nice, but they did not know what would happen to the rest of the tract in four to five years. He wanted Council to remember the photo of the balloon.

Fleisch closed the public hearing.

King noted the Planning Commission had voted no on the proposed rezoning, but the commissioners had also liked the idea and the project. King liked the idea of the project, but he had a problem with the density. There would be a traffic issue on Walt Banks Road. He said they could build three stories with a basement and 34 units in LUC-16, which would not meet the requirement of the bottom line to purchase the property. He asked if they could agree on a compromise of maybe 50 units.

Prebor said he had also attended the Planning Commission meeting. The location was a good fit for the City. He said he had many customers who left the City but had not wanted to, and they were looking this type of product. The homes in Lexington Circle and St. Simons Cove went quickly, and some did not make it to market. Part of reason they went so quickly was because of their proximity to shopping areas. The Lofts project would provide easy access to Sprouts, Publix, Stein Mart, and other businesses. People would be able to walk to the grocery store and nearby amenities. Prebor said he was looking for a place like this for his own parents, a place where they did not have to drive and fight traffic. People were looking for places with nearby amenities that they could walk to. When the project was originally proposed, the building had backed up to the homes on Governor's Row, but it had been moved away from that area. The garages on the Governor's Row homes would be between the lofts and the homes. The original plan also had 100 units and a second building. He said the alternatives were scary.

Learnard said she had some questions for staff. The core issue was not a yes or no on this request, but that something would be going in there and would it be this development or something else. She wanted to understand what something else would look like.

Warrix said the permitted uses in LUC-16 included single-family detached residences, multi-family residences, and commercial and office uses such as retail sales; personal services; offices for service-oriented businesses; a commercial recreation facility; a building, facility or land for non-commercial park, recreation or open space; private or semi-private club, lodge or social center; building, facility or land for off-street parking; restaurant/lounge; theatre, movie and/or live dinner theatre; and a hotel/motel. Learnard asked what the height limit was under LUC-16. Warrix said that the uses in LUC-16 included three-story buildings with a basement, but specific heights were not referenced nor were individual stories. The Fire Department might have some input regarding building height and the height of a story.

Learnard said what had been presented was not a small change, and included a reduction in acreage and the number of units. She was concerned about the homes on Governor's Row that were closest to the proposed development. City Manager Jon Rorie noted that the proposed changes moved the development further away from the backs of the homes on Governor's Row. Learnard said she believed this was a modification by a developer that wanted to do what was best for the City.

Some residents raised their hands to speak, and Fleisch reminded them that the public hearing had ended.

Ernst asked if there was an answer regarding the Lexington Village Street. City Attorney Ted Meeker had looked at the plat, noting there was an 80-foot egress and ingress road and utility easement in that area. It would be reflected in the deed for the overall property. What was proposed would not change the property owners' rights in that area. The road bed was clearly shown on the plat. Some lines might infringe on the area, but that would not infringe on the other property owners' rights. Ernst verified that the road could not be closed to the townhome residents. Meeker said it could not.

Learnard said this was a much needed project that would have a lot of interest for people who did not want to leave the City and wanted to downsize. There was nothing else like this in Fayette County. It would be part of a walkable community. A hotel/restaurant or more retail would bring more traffic than this project would. It should increase the property values for Lexington Village. The location was favorable to restaurants and retail, which would bring truck noise. An underground parking deck was not a new concept. Learnard said she understood the neighbors' concerns, but to deny the rezoning would leave the City with a terrible unknown that represented worse concerns. She had a friend who sold her house in three hours after a bidding war. The City had no inventory, and this was a unique and smart development that fit in a walkable community lifestyle. She said they were not here to talk compromise, saying there was a tipping point for profitability.

Ernst said the reality was there would probably be 68 – 72 units rather than 80, which was the high end. One of the concerns was another rezoning in four to five years, which could happen. He disagreed that approving one rezoning meant Council had to do it for everyone. Each rezoning was considered on a case-by-case basis, and he was not concerned about setting precedence. This project had been cut down tremendously and was a great fit for that area of the City. It was the right time to give it a shot.

Fleisch asked if there was any additional traffic information. Rorie said there was a trip generation report, and he asked City Engineer Dave Borkowski to discuss it.

Borkowski reiterated this was not a true traffic study, but gave an idea of the trip numbers, which he said made sense and were what was expected. Residential developments would not generate as much as retail stores. He said the report had three tables – Table 1 was for a 48,000 square-foot shopping center, Table 2 was for a 10,000 square-foot retail area with 100 condominium/townhome units, and Table 3 compared the trips between the current zoning conditions and the proposed zoning conditions. Table 1 (developed under current zoning) showed 2,964 trips in 24 hours (included reductions for pass-bys as 10% of daily volume), Table 2 (developed under proposed zoning) showed 1,469 trips in 24 hours (also included reduction for pass-by trips), and Table 3 showed a difference of 1,495 between Tables 1 (LUC-15) and 2 (LUC-28), or a 50% reduction in trips between the current zoning for LUC-16 and the proposed zoning of LUC-28.

Fleisch noted that when she first was elected to Council there had been a lot of vacant land in Lexington. Someone on staff had told her that, commercial-wise, the actual square footage allowed in Lexington was comparable to the square footage in Kedron. The choice was retail versus residential. She believed that commercial use would be far more intense. She noted that because of how the area was zoned, the developer of the Sprouts shopping center had not had to come to Council for any approvals. She was inclined to support the rezoning now that it had scaled down.

Learnard asked what the motion should be. Meeker said, based on the information given prior to the meeting, that approximately 1.3 acres along the southernmost portion of the tract had been removed from the request.

Learnard moved to approve the request to rezone the 3.5-acre northern tract in Lexington Circle from LUC-16 to LUC-28 as presented. Ernst seconded. Motion carried 4-1(King).

Learnard moved to adopt the amendment to the LUC-16 ordinance. Ernst seconded. Motion carried 4-1(King).

New Agenda Items

08-16-12 Consider Real Estate Acquisition

Meeker said the property (Zenco property on Robinson Road) had been subject to much discussion over the last year and a half. Staff had discovered some significant issues regarding stormwater and the cart path location. There had been tentative discussions with the property owner to purchase it for the amount stated in the memo ($300,000). With Council approval, the matter could be closed by the end of the month.

Ernst moved to approve New Agenda Item 08-16-12 Real Estate Acquisition. King seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

08-16-13 Appointment of Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee

Warrix asked Council to make appointments to the steering committee, saying five members were needed.

Rorie said staff was asking for each Council Member to recommend one citizen for the committee. All of the meetings would be public, and they would be advertised. Council would be able to attend the meetings. He asked Council to reach out and ask a citizen to serve on the community.

Fleisch asked if the proposed members had to be full-time residents or could be property or business owners in the City since it was a comprehensive look at the City. Warrix said it depended on how Council wanted to compose the group. Ernst asked if Council should submit the names to Rorie. Rorie said yes, as long as they had discussed serving on the steering committee with the person whose name was submitted. Rorie said they would need names by September 1.

Fleisch asked if any of the Council Members had an issue with selecting someone who owned a business and/or property since land use was involved. The consensus was that was acceptable. Rorie said staff had meet with staff from other municipalities in the County, and they wanted to look for consistencies, especially for transportation.

No action was required.

08-16-14 Consider Revisions to Ethics Ordinance

Meeker noted that there was a change to the proposed ordinance on the dais where some of the language had been "tweaked," and Meeker asked Council to disregard the additional document and consider the ordinance presented in the agenda packet. He explained that if a hearing officer found an ethics complaint to be frivolous, the hearing officer could also require the person who filed the complaint to pay the costs incurred. It would be a separate finding. A finding that a complaint was without merit or there was no complaint would not automatically trigger the reimbursement of the expenses. The separate finding that a complaint was frivolous would be sent to Council as any other finding and would be subject to approval by majority vote by those who were able to vote on the issue. Meeker said Council had three options when a hearing officer's decision came before Council – the findings could be confirmed, Council could accept the findings and change the penalty or imposition, or Council could take away the hearing officer's decision and move forward with their own hearing. This would be one additional finding. Meeker said he had patterned the language after the Georgia statute that pertained to frivolous litigation so there would be guidance for the hearing officer when making the analysis.

Learnard moved to approve the revision to the Ethics Ordinance. Ernst seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

08-16-15 Consider Extension of Mowing Contract

Public Works Supervisor Scott Hicks said the request was to extend the contract with Landcare (formerly TruGreen) for FY 2017 for right-of-way mowing for all state highways, City primary streets, secondary streets, and ancillary areas, and animal removal for their not to exceed annual quote of $273,240. The current agreement would expire on September 30, 2017.

Rorie said the company was holding the contract price for the fifth year. A decision would need to be made during the FY 2018 budget process on whether to rebid those areas or to bring them in-house. There would be a price increase after year five. This would provide time for staff to evaluate how to provide the service using internal personnel versus the opportunity cost. He continued that, if the City asked Landcare to continue the right-of-way tree trimming through the winter, it would cost $130,000.

King moved to approve the extension of the mowing contract with Landcare for the sum of $273,240. Ernst seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

<u>Council/Staff Topics</u>

Rorie said he had driven down MacDuff Parkway that week, and incredible progress had been made. The basecoat was down on a portion of the road, and the curbing and stormwater were in place. Progress had also been made on Senoia Road, and the grading was underway. He had also driven to North Kedron Drive, and they had been working that day. Another drone flight had been ordered for September 1. Staff kept getting questions about the CSX permitting and the completion of the parkway. Rorie noted that CSX had a flagman on site and they were working in the CSX right-of-way, which was an indication of permission.

Borkowski reported on the increase in building permits, noting there had been a 34% increase from 2005 (895) and a 115% increase from 2012 (558). In 2015, 1,199 building permits had been issued. In 2008, the City had four employees working on plan review. In 2013, there were 2.5 employees. Approximately 1,200 permits had been issued to date for FY 2016, and Borkowski said he was the only one reviewing permits currently. He pointed out that construction in the Everton subdivision was underway, and construction had not started yet in Cresswind.

Rorie said staff was feeling the impact daily of the growth. Another engineer would start work on September 12. The Planning and Engineering departments were extremely busy. More plan review was being outsourced. Staff was responsive, but things were difficult at this time.

Fleisch noted that the City did not have that much vacant land. She said most of the land in Lexington had been foreclosed on, and things were just picking up. She predicting there would be a lot more requests in the next two years. MacDuff Parkway was permitted in 2008, and there had been several iterations of The Overlook. People had been sitting on the sidelines waiting for the market to improve, and things were happening now. The City was a very hot market, and it was listed as number 41 for interest on Realtor.com. The City had reduced staff and outsourced.

Meeker said he had been at the Peachtree City Athletic Center over the weekend with his daughter who played club soccer. He said he had been very impressed with the work done on the fields and the care used in taking care of the park. Fleisch noted that the Little League teams who had come to the City during the play-off season had said the same thing. Kudos were given to Recreation.

There being no further business, Learnard moved to adjourn the meeting. Ernst seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 9:05 p.m.

Pamela Dufresne

Pamela Dufresne, Deputy City Clerk

Vanessa Fleisch, Mayor