

New Castle City Board of Adjustment Meeting Minutes
March 5, 2020 – 6:30 p.m.
City of New Castle Town Hall

Members Present: **Mayor Michael Quaranta**
 Daniel Losco, Esq., City Solicitor
 David J. Athey, City Engineer

Also Present: **Jeff Bergstrom, City Building Official**

Mayor Quaranta convened the meeting at 6:30 pm. Roll call followed and a quorum to conduct business was declared.

27 West 3rd Street – Tax Parcel #21-015.30-174 – Trustees of the New Castle Common

An application has been filed by the Trustees of the New Castle Common, 201 Delaware Street, New Castle, DE 19720 (Owners & Applicants) for a property locate at 27 West Third Street, New Castle, DE 19720, Tax Parcel No. 21-015.30-194 seeking modification of a Special Exception granted by the Board of Adjustment on January 24, 2019 under Section 230-28.1 of the City Code so as to permit the replacement of approved concrete surfaces with asphalt.

For the purpose of considering this application, the Board of Adjustment is holding a Public Hearing on Thursday, March 5, 2020, at 6:30 pm in the Old Town Hall, 2nd floor, located at 2nd and Delaware Streets, New Castle, Delaware.

Mayor Quaranta called the Applicant forward. Andrew P. Taylor, Esquire, of Copeland Taylor, LLC and representing the Applicant, came forward and introduced himself to the Board. Mr. Taylor stated that as a Delaware Lawyer it was not necessary for him to be sworn in; however he requested that he be sworn in because some of what he would say might be taken as factual testimony and to ensure such testimony is part of the Record. Mr. Losco asked if Mr. Taylor would present any other witnesses, and Mr. Taylor stated there he would not. Mr. Losco swore Mr. Taylor in.

Mr. Taylor restated that the application is to seek a modification to the Special Exception already granted by the Board of Adjustment on January 24, 2019 under Section 230-28.1 of the City Code so as to permit the replacement of approved concrete surfaces with asphalt, consistent with City Resolution 2020-06. Mr. Bergstrom confirmed that the property was properly posted. Mr. Taylor added that the Applicant understands that the meeting is not to discuss the pros and cons of a parking lot in the described location because the use as a parking lot has been previously approved and the criteria for a Special Exception for the parking to be there under the City Code has been met; and the only item before the Board is approval of the approved concrete surfaces being changed to asphalt. The Board was provided with the latest approved Site Plan that includes the required reduction of parking spaces from 42 to 32, and Mr. Taylor noted that all criteria has been met through various meetings with the Historic Area Commission, the Planning Commission and the Board of Adjustment.

Mr. Taylor ended his presentation and offered to answer any questions from the Board.

Mayor Quaranta asked if there were any other changes to the prior body of work that the Board of Adjustment had reviewed in the past or any other changes being made to the Site Plan. Mr. Taylor explained that at the Planning Commission meeting of February 24, 2020, the Commissioners requested that a number of items be done before the Certificate of Occupancy was issued: (1) a “No Right Turn” sign at the egress to be approved by the Building Official prior to issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy; (2) the final approval letter of the revised Plans has been received from the Conservation

District; (3) the Planning Commission's approval was contingent on approval of the Board of Adjustment as to the asphalt; and (4) that the location of security cameras would be approved by the City Building Code Official prior to issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy. Mr. Taylor stated that he did not believe those conditions required any revisions to the Plan and the Applicants had agreed to all conditions of the Planning Commission.

Mr. Losco requested confirmation that no changes to the landscaping plan was made subsequent to the Board of Adjustment's approval in January 2019, and specifically, that the only change to the Plan before the Board is the change of material from concrete to asphalt. Mr. Taylor explained that the Board's approval of the Special Exception in January 2019 required a reduction of parking spaces from 42 to 32 and adding more landscaping, both of which are reflected on the current Site Plan. Mr. Losco reiterated that he wanted confirmation that there have been no changes from what was approved in January 2019 other than the switch from concrete to asphalt. Mr. Taylor noted that the Board of Adjustment had not approved the Plan before the Board; however, all changes required by the Board of Adjustment in January 2019 were implemented and are reflected in the Plan before the Board and no other changes are reflected on the Plan that were not previously approved by the Board of Adjustment.

Mayor Quaranta restated that the new submitted Plan accurately reflects the changes that were required in the January 2019 Board of Adjustment Decision and Mr. Taylor concurred.

Mr. Losco asked Mr. Taylor to point out the area that was approved to be concrete and that is being requested to be changed to asphalt for the Record, and Mr. Taylor identified the area on the Site Plan. Mr. Losco further asked for confirmation that no other material changes have been made to the Plan and Mr. Taylor confirmed that no other material changes have been made or are reflected on the Plan.

Mr. Losco asked Mr. Taylor why the Applicants are requesting the change of material. Mr. Athey noted that there was a great deal of discussion in 2019 about materials, and added that he was surprised Mr. Taylor's presentation was so brief. Mr. Athey reiterated that materials have been a big issue and requested that Mr. Taylor explain how and why the matter is back before the Board of Adjustment.

Mr. Taylor stated that concrete seemed to be inconsistent with materials used in other parking lots in the City and noted that the use of concrete would actually be an anomaly. He submitted a list of current parking lots in the City to the Board for the Record. He added that as Resolution 2020-06 indicates, the previous design criteria were not intended to apply to parking lots but were more intended to apply to walking trails, etc. Mr. Athey reiterated that the material was concrete when the Board of Adjustment reviewed the Plan in January 2019 because it was mandated by the HAC Design Guidelines, and Resolution 2020-06 modified those criteria. Mr. Taylor added that the Applicants issued a letter to HAC dated February 18, 2020, requesting approval of the change in materials from brick and concrete to brick and asphalt pursuant to the revised Design Guidelines. The Building Official responded in a letter dated March 5, 2020, stating that the request was reviewed and handled as a Tier 1 and as such it was not required that the request be submitted to the Historic Area Commission for another hearing.

Mr. Athey asked Mr. Taylor to explain the process that was followed in more detail. Mr. Taylor stated that the letter from Mr. Jeffrey Bergstrom, City Building Official, to the Board of Adjustment of March 5, 2020, explains the background of the approval process with HAC, recites to the original Guidelines about trying to minimize the use of Macadam or bituminous concrete (blacktop) and the fact that the City Council passed Resolution 2020-06 modifying the Guidelines to allow the use of bituminous concrete (blacktop) for commercial/institutional/public parking lots. The revised Application was submitted on

February 18, 2020, with the approved changes of parking spaces from 42 to 32 and paving material changes requesting approval that (1) brick paving in parking spaces be asphalt, (2) concrete paving at the driveways and ADA-compliant parking spaces be asphalt, and (3) that the four reinforced turf spaces be replaced with two landscaped areas and two asphalt-paved spaces. In terms of process, the letter recites to the requirement to seek HAC approval, stating it is the purview of the Building Official to determine whether additional HAC review is required. The compliances set forth state:

- The adjustments to the layout reduce the number of parking spaces and increase areas of landscaping which conforms to the intent of the HAC Design Guidelines and Standards to minimize hardscape in the Historic District.
- Following the proposal and adoption by City Council of changes to paragraph 4.3.v of the Design Guidelines and Standards Streetscape Section (Resolution 2020-06) asphalt is now considered an appropriate paving material for commercial/industrial/public off-street parking lots adjacent to historic buildings.

The letter states that the Decision of the Building Official is that these modifications to the previously approved special exceptions are appropriately considered as a Tier 1 matter not requiring further review by the Historic Area Commission itself, and that the proposed modifications conform to the Commission's Design Guidelines and Standards and that they should be and are approved.

Mr. Athey asked for clarification of Tier 1, and Mr. Bergstrom explained that a Tier 2 review goes through the Historic Area Commission review for approval and is intended for additions, new buildings, and substantial modifications to existing buildings. The routine maintenance of buildings and minor changes are considered to be Tier 1, which is approved by the Building Official.

Mr. Athey asked for further clarification, and Mr. Bergstrom said the City Council changed the Guidelines via Resolution 2020-06 so asphalt is an approved material.

Mr. Losco reiterated his question of why the Applicant is requesting a change of materials noting that Mr. Taylor's response was that asphalt was used in other parking lots, and asked if that was the only reason to make the switch. Mr. Taylor referenced the change to the Guidelines. Mr. Losco stated that the subject was vetted by multiple Boards, generated a huge amount of community interest, and was approved in a reduced scale and with other modifications made at different levels; and asked Mr. Taylor to explain why the Applicant is now requesting a change of materials. Mr. Taylor noted that he had been informed that asphalt is a better surface than concrete. During discussion, it was noted that concrete is more durable than asphalt if done properly and that asphalt must be resealed periodically and is much less expensive than concrete. Mr. Athey stated that asphalt has higher maintenance cost and less capital cost. Mr. Taylor concurred that it will be much less expensive to construct the parking lot with asphalt versus concrete. Mr. Losco asked if other surfaces that would be viable and more historically accurate were considered, and Mr. Taylor explained that reinforced turf and concrete lattice-work material were both considered; however, it was ultimately determined that both were not feasible in a parking lot.

Mr. Losco asked if Mr. Taylor could explain how or if asphalt would change the aesthetics of the parking lot, and Mr. Taylor noted that much of the parking lot is not visible due to the topography and the most visible area is the entrance-way, which will remain brick. With the elimination of the four parking spaces in the front, additional landscaping in that area will also screen the parking lot from public view, which Mr. Taylor felt improved the aesthetics of the parking lot. During discussion, Mr. Losco noted that the

parking lot could be viewed from the second floor of residences across the street, and the type of plants at the front of the parking lot were identified including some with a height of 6' to 7'. Mayor Quaranta added that taller plantings will need to be set back so that sight-lines are not obstructed for exiting vehicles. Mr. Bergstrom offered an artist's rendering of the parking lot from the Packet submitted by the Applicant for reference.

Mr. Losco asked if there would be any delay in the commencement of construction and Mr. Taylor stated that it was anticipated work would begin in the Spring of 2020. Mr. Losco added that the prior Board of Adjustment Decision from January 2019 required that work commence within two years and asked if the Applicants can hold true to that January 2021 deadline. Mr. Taylor said the work would commence prior to the deadline and no change to the start date is being sought by the Applicants.

Mr. Athey asked for clarification of the HAC Guidelines, and asked if they were true "guidelines" or if they were rules. Mr. Bergstrom explained that the Guidelines are followed very closely and Mr. Athey clarified that they were for more than just guidance. It was noted that City Council instructs the HAC as to what has to be enforced. Mr. Losco noted that the Guidelines actually prohibit certain things, i.e., the old Guidelines prohibited asphalt. Mr. Athey reiterated his opinion that the Guidelines are requirements.

Mr. Athey asked Mr. Bergstrom if there are any other parking lots in process in the City or if Resolution 2020-06 was deliberated because of the Bowling Alley Parking Lot. Mr. Bergstrom replied that there are other parking lots contemplated in the City; however he did not believe any other submission has been received for a parking lot in the Historic District. Mr. Taylor added that the Resolution is broad and also addresses walking trails and other areas in addition to parking lots.

Mayor Quaranta asked Mr. Bergstrom to review the list of parking lots in the City and advise if, in his 29 year tenure with the City, he was aware if any of the parking lots were constructed during that time. Mr. Bergstrom stated that several parking lots that were already in operation were increased in size. The Mayor asked Mr. Bergstrom if, in his role as Building Official, he has any evidence or recollection of public comment in opposition to any of the materials used in constructing the parking lots on the list, and Mr. Bergstrom stated that he is not aware of any opposition being lodged with the City.

Mr. Losco noted a correction to the Record: Not all the lots are in the Historic Area. Some are listed as R2, Open Space, DG, and they may have asphalt, but they are not all in the Historic Area.

Mr. Athey asked how the parking lots in the Historic Area constructed with asphalt were approved, and Mr. Bergstrom explained that the HAC Guidelines were adopted in 1990 and the parking lots listed were built prior to the adoption of the Guidelines. He added that most of the parking lots listed with different zoning are across the street from the Historic District and would be considered to be in the Historic District if there were residential properties across the street from them.

Mr. Losco asked if Mr. Bergstrom is aware of any parking lots that were approved and built after the adoption of the Guidelines that are asphalt, and Mr. Bergstrom stated that all the parking lots were constructed prior to the adoption of the Guidelines. Mr. Losco clarified his understanding that Mr. Bergstrom is not aware of any parking lots post Guideline-adoption that were approved with either asphalt or concrete in the Historic Area until the issue before the Board.

During discussion, it was noted that the Library parking lot is newer, and Mr. Bergstrom explained that the library building was increased in size with the result of the loss of parking spaces, and he did not

know when the Library building was originally built. Mayor Quaranta noted that the materials have been consistent throughout and Mr. Bergstrom stated that asphalt is a much more common material for parking lots than concrete.

There being no further questions, Mayor Quaranta opened the meeting to Public Comment.

Christopher Castagno – 19 East 5th Street

Mr. Castagno stated that he is the Treasurer of the Trustees of the New Castle Common and made a point of clarification regarding parking lots in the Historic District that the Historic Area Commission governs the Historic District, which is from the river to approximately 6th Street, regardless of zoning. He added that the parking lots on the list, with the exception of the St. Peter’s School, are technically in the Historic District and every lot in the City of New Castle is asphalt.

Roderick Gillespie – 24 West 4th Street

Mr. Gillespie displayed an aerial view of the area and stated that the proposed parking lot is not a minor project. He estimated out the project at a cost of approximately \$646,000 including design fees and contingencies, using concrete and with 42 spaces. He opined that the cost is driving the change from concrete to asphalt. He added that some of the parking lots being cited are not technically in the Historic District. Mr. Gillespie read from City Code 230-28.1:

Paragraph G: “All special exception applications for parking lot usage shall require prior review and recommendations from the Planning Commission before being submitted to the Historic Area Commission or the Board of Adjustment.”

Paragraph H: “For public or commercial parking lots proposed for the Historic Residence District or the Historic Commercial District, the Historic Area Commission shall have reviewed and approved the application prior to submission to the Board of Adjustment.”

Mr. Gillespie also read from Resolution 2020-06:

Paragraph v: The use of Macadam or bituminous concrete (“blacktop”) is **NOT** appropriate adjacent to historic buildings, with the exception of (1) code-mandated barrier-free access amenities such as handicapped accessible parking spaces and access paths, which require hard-surface materials suitable for wheelchair use, and (2) commercial/institutional/public parking lots.

Mr. Gillespie stated his understanding that you can use asphalt in the Historic District, but you do not have to use asphalt. He added that if the Historic Area Commission wishes to use an alternate approved material it is their right. Mr. Losco opined that when the Historic Area Commission made its Decision, asphalt was not an approved material and therefore was not an option.

Mayor Quaranta noted that at a previous City Council Meeting discussion of Delaware Street Mr. Gillespie represented that in his estimation concrete was not as historic as asphalt. Mr. Gillespie explained that he is very interested in legality and saving money for the City of New Castle and the Trustees, and during the Delaware Street discussion he passed on that the cost of concrete underpinning with brick over top was much higher than asphalt. During discussion it was also noted that Mr. Gillespie stated that asphalt is more historically accurate than concrete, and Mr. Gillespie spoke to the history of concrete and asphalt, and noted that the longevity of either is dependent on workmanship and inspection.

During further discussion, Mr. Gillespie opined that the proposed parking lot is the same size, if not larger, than the M&T parking lot. Mr. Gillespie also noted that the materials approved by the Historic Area Commission are aesthetically pleasing, more human-friendly and better for the neighbors. Mr. Losco asked if the concrete material is more contrasting and intrusive next to the asphalt of the M&T parking lot, and Mr. Gillespie opined that concrete would be an improvement. Mr. Losco asked why asphalt is less desirable than concrete, and Mr. Gillespie said he felt the HAC approved materials show a design sense that is missing with asphalt. Mr. Gillespie also spoke to environmental issues between the two materials. During further discussion, it was noted that the Conservation District had approved the drainage Plan.

Karen Whalen – 17 West 3rd Street

Ms. Whalen reiterated Mr. Gillespie's reference to the City Code and the Codification of Ordinance 510, Chapter 230-28.1H. She stated that the process for passage of a project is a three-step process that includes HAC, and the use of asphalt was not brought to a HAC meeting for review; thus, the process was not followed. She submitted an August 9, 2019, letter from The Weekly written by Ms. Linda Ratchford in which she explained the three-step process to pass a project. Ms. Whalen added that any change or modification to a plan should go back through the three-step process. She also submitted an excerpt from the City Code. In summary, Ms. Whalen stated that the process laid out in the law is not being followed. She also stated that she knows and has evidence that Ordinance 510 and the entire process was specifically for "this pre-ordained site" (*Bowling Alley Parking Lot*). She added it was not a generic Code meant for expansion or the construction of new parking lots throughout the City, but was setting up a process for "this pre-ordained site" (*Bowling Alley Parking Lot*). She added that she has a letter dated November 16 written by Ms. Ratchford that clearly delineates this fact. She also inferred that discussion throughout the City was that this site was specifically wanted, and things were done to whitewash the process as legitimate to have the parking lot built. She added that the Trust was set up for the benefit of the residents and Trustee funds are not private funds. She further stated that AECOM's study clearly indicated that before any new parking lots were built it was to be shown that existing parking lots were being utilized effectively and were expanded upon. Ms. Whalen also stated that the Boards and Commissions of the City should be working on behalf of the residents of the City.

Ms. Whalen reiterated that the law should be adhered to. Ms. Whalen submitted both documents to the Board for the Record.

Roderick Gillespie – 24 West 4th Street

Mr. Gillespie noted that he could see a good case for an asphalt parking lot, and added that the difference is between putting it in a residential neighborhood and putting it in a different location. He stated that the location of the proposed parking lot is in a very residential area and it is not the right location for an asphalt parking lot.

Andrew Taylor, Esquire

Mr. Taylor stated that with regard to the process, the Applicant has very carefully followed the process and clarified that the date the request was presented to HAC was February 18, 2020, and the response from HAC was dated March 5, 2020. He added that it was the City's determination to review the application as Tier 1. The Applicants have been back to the Planning Commission and received letters to the Board of Adjustment and HAC memorializing the approval of the Plan before the Board of Adjustment.

Mr. Taylor also noted as clarification that the design engineer for the Plan explained to the Board of Adjustment at a previous meeting that the Plan is engineered to handle two times the runoff from the proposed parking lot and is designed to handle the up flow from the M&T parking lot. Mr. Losco asked if it made a difference to water flow if the material is concrete or asphalt and Mr. Athey stated there is no appreciable difference.

There being no further public comment, Mayor Quaranta called for a Motion to close the hearing.

Mr. Athey made a Motion to close the hearing and move into the business session. The Motion was seconded and unanimously approved.

Mayor Quaranta closed the hearing and moved the meeting into the business session.

Mr. Athey stated that the Application might have gone back to HAC, but if that had been the case, at this point asphalt would be an approved material according to the HAC Guidelines. He noted that City Code Section 230-28.1 states “Planning Commission before being submitted to the Historic Area Commission **or** the Board of Adjustment.” (*emphasis added*) Mr. Losco added that the argument presented was interesting, but it was made without harmonizing all the provisions of the Code. In Section 230-51 E, Council had modified the HAC Ordinance to create the Tier 1 and Tier 2 reviews, and states “The Building Official shall have the authority to issue historic review certificates **on behalf** of the Historic Area Commission, without the Commission's independent review ...”. (*emphasis added*) The review required by 230-28.1 is effectively done at the Building Official level under the modified Guidelines because of the amendment to 230-51.

Mayor Quaranta asked Mr. Losco if it would be correct to say that Tier 1 approvals are within the authority of the Building Official because the replacements are in kind or the applications are clear. Mr. Losco stated that Tier 1 requests are specifically permitted under the Guidelines and what the Applicant is asking for does not need approval from the Historic Area Commission. Mr. Losco added that had the current Guidelines been in place when the Application was first submitted asphalt would have been an approved material and as such, HAC would not have been able to prohibit the use of asphalt.

Mr. Athey expressed his appreciation for the comments about saving the City and Trustees money; but added that both City Council and the Trustees are elected positions and if decisions are made that the public does not agree with, those officials can be voted out of office. He suggested that the Board could put some conditions in place to ensure maintenance; noting that asphalt doesn't wear as well as concrete and that could be a legitimate concern.

Mr. Losco noted that it is Council's direction per Code that HAC review under Tier 1 level is done by Mr. Bergstrom. He added that if asphalt had been an approved surface when the Application first came before the Board of Adjustment in January 2019, he could not think of any reason why the Board would not have approved it. Also, the Trustees, as private owners, have the right to choose asphalt as their parking lot surface; and if asphalt is permissible by right in the Historic District, then, absent a compelling reason, the Board of Adjustment should not interfere with the owner's decision.

Mr. Losco noted that he had asked pointed questions as to whether or not the aesthetics of the parking lot would be changed by moving from concrete and brick to asphalt, stating he felt that is a bigger issue for the Board to consider. He added that aesthetics is incredibly subjective and shifting from concrete to

asphalt could cause a problem, noting that whereas Mr. Gillespie did not want to see a large area of blacktop, Mr. Losco wondered if other individuals would be equally opposed to concrete.

Mr. Losco referenced the Applicant's point that it is a well-landscaped lot and it has gotten to the reduced scale as a result of the process under Ordinance 510, and he opined that overall the system has worked properly to produce something that is sensitive to the Historic District and that should be aesthetically pleasing. He added that the increased landscaping would probably offset the radiant heat created by the asphalt. Mr. Losco also noted that he felt the Board, having approved the Plan with concrete, would not have rejected it with asphalt if the new Guidelines were in place and did not see a good reason to say that asphalt is not equally acceptable to the original concrete.

Mayor Quaranta stated that he had served on the Historic Area Commission in the past when the HAC had a reputation for being consistently inconsistent, and opined that one of the most important things the HAC has to do is to be consistent in its treatment of every Applicant. He added that he looked at the various parking lots in the City and spoke with people who served in public life and neighbors who live near those parking locations, and no one said mistakes had been made. In fact, many residents take full advantage of that off-street parking where it is available. The Mayor added that he concurred with Mr. Losco's opinion that if the current Guidelines were in place when the Board made its Decision in January 2019, and the Applicant included asphalt in the Application, there would have been no cause for denial or change. Mr. Losco added that he felt it would actually have been expected to approve asphalt if were an approved material in January 2019.

Mr. Athey stated he is not making a recommendation, but he stated that he concurred with Mr. Gillespie that concrete has a longer lifespan than asphalt, asphalt needs to be maintained on a more frequent basis, and workmanship and preparation are critical in the process; however, if the Board is inclined, he suggested that the Board could mandate that some type of a maintenance plan or schedule be imposed, as well as having a third party inspection of the site during construction. He added that he was making no accusations and felt the Trust would not skimp on workmanship or construction of the parking lot.

Mayor Quaranta said that other lots under the stewardship of the City are being well maintained. Mr. Losco pointed out that the original Special Exception from the January 24, 2019 Decision was conditioned on the landowner being "perpetually responsible" for maintenance of the two security cameras, landscaping in and around the storm water management facility and landscaping around the site on the final approved Plan; however, the Decision does not specifically refer to maintaining the parking lot itself. During discussion, Mr. Losco asked if the Board's Decision is conditioned on the adoption of a maintenance plan approved by the Building Official, how that condition would be enforced. Mayor Quaranta added that if the Building Official is aware of a condition in the parking lot that needs to be fixed, he has the existing authority to enforce corrective maintenance.

Mr. Losco made a Motion to approve the Applicant's request for a material change from concrete to asphalt as depicted upon the Plan submitted to the Board of Adjustment at its March 5, 2020, hearing, on the requirement that the start date for construction remain the same at no later than January 24, 2021. Mr. Athey seconded the Motion.

There being no further discussion, Mayor Quaranta called for a vote.

Mr. Athey stated that if the issue went to HAC for a full review, asphalt would still be approved, and added that Mr. Losco's point that if asphalt was an approved material in January 2019, the Board would

have approved the Special Exception. He added that there were some interesting observations brought up about the intent of City Code that were clarified by Mr. Losco, and that the Building Official has the ability to act as he did. For those reasons, Mr. Athey votes in favor of the Motion.

Mr. Losco stated that he adopts Mr. Athey's reasons, noting that the narrow issue before the Board is the change in materials from concrete to asphalt. He also stated additional reasons that: he did not see any significant aesthetic differences between the two materials; it is largely a private property owner's decision how they want to build the parking lot if it is otherwise permitted; he did not see any harm to the community as the result of the change in materials; the request is reasonable and appropriate; it is compelling that asphalt is consistent with virtually every other parking lot in the City regardless of whether it is in the Historic District or not; and he has no reason to think that there is any kind of damage to the City or any resident as a result of the material change. For those reasons, Mr. Losco votes in favor of the Motion

Mayor Quaranta stated that he associates himself with the comments of both Mr. Athey and Mr. Losco. He added that his earlier comments were about consistent treatment with all the other parking lots constructed over the decades and the public's attitude toward them then and today. For those reasons, Mayor Quaranta votes in favor of the Motion.

Mayor Quaranta declared the Motion is approved on a vote of 3 in favor and none in opposition.

There being no further business, Mayor Quaranta called for a Motion to adjourn.

Mr. Athey made a Motion to adjourn the meeting. The Motion was seconded by Mr. Losco. On vote, the Motion was unanimously approved and the Meeting was adjourned at 7:47 pm.

Kathy Weirich
Stenographer