

THE GENEVA CITY COUNCIL

JOURNAL OF PROCEEDINGS

SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING

August 9, 2023 – 6:00 PM

City Hall – Second Floor Conference Room
47 Castle St.
Geneva, NY 14456

Presiding – Steve Valentino, Mayor

1. ROLL CALL

Present: Clr. Regan, Clr. Gaglianese, Clr. Camera, Clr. Salamendra, Clr. Noone, and Clr. Burrall

Absent: Clr. Pealer and Clr. Brimm

2. AMENDMENT TO THE AGENDA

ACTION TAKEN by Mayor Valentino; seconded by Clr. Gaglianese

MOVED THAT a resolution for the marina grant application be added to the agenda

**ROLL CALL VOTE: Aye – Clr. Salamendra, Clr. Regan, Clr. Burrall, Mayor Valentino,
Clr. Gaglianese and Clr. Noone**

Nay – Clr. Camera

Absent – Clr. Brimm and Clr. Pealer

MOTION CARRIED

ACTION TAKEN by Clr. Gaglianese; seconded by Mayor Valentino

**MOVED THAT discussion on “Boards and Commissions” be added to the agenda to
appoint Jeremy Bush to the PBAB (Police Budget Advisory Board)**

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (7-2 absent)

3. RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION OF A LEGAL SERVICES' AGREEMENT RELATED TO PFA'S LITIGATION SERVICES

City Manager Hendrix stated that this resolution, which is about clean drinking water, would allow us to contract with the Law Office of Robert King, PLLC and STAG LIUZZA, L.L.C. about legislation that's happening, and the team they've assembled who are working through PFA's for those who have contaminated waterways. The city qualifies to participate due to our population size and proximity to Seneca Lake. The city manager said our legal council has reviewed and updated this agreement and this will authorize her to execute the legal services agreement with the Law Offices of Robert King, PLLC and STAG LIUZZA, L.L.C.

The mayor opened it up for discussion, to which Clr. Regan asked for clarification if there would be anything due from the city if we don't receive any reward from the effort. The city manager stated there would not be as the city would be opting for the second option available, so we only incur expenses if we win the litigation. Clr. Camera questioned if they were fairly certain that the expenses then would not exceed the winnings of the litigation, and city manager explained that it would be a percentage of the total. Clr. Burrall then questioned what the actual expenses are which city manager clarified were to cover legal costs.

Mayor Valentino stated he has some major issues with this, pointing out that it says in option 2 they collect 25% of the gross amount recovered, but then adds 8.33% on top of that and another 10% on top of that if complexity of legal issues continues. He also pointed out that in the second paragraph under costs and expenses, it states that the attorney would have the right and authority without prior approval of the client to incur such litigation costs and expenses as they feel necessary, which is concerning to him. Under section 3 the mayor expressed his concerns with the last sentence, which states that attorneys should receive a compensation for services and reasonable fees based on all facts and circumstances of its representation, and he feels that should be removed from the agreement. In Section 7 (Termination of Representation) he also didn't like where it says the client acknowledges that they will be responsible for any fees or cost which occurred prior to discharge of extermination, as he feels there is exposure there.

City Manager Hendrix clarified that and that they already discussed some of those issues, such as the percentages in option 2, and plan to adjust accordingly. She also said this has a timeliness factor, possibly even within the next 10 days, which is why it's being brought forward to council. The mayor continued, saying this vote will be providing the city manager, with the help of the City's Attorneys, the authority to work through the agreement with this law firm.

**ACTION TAKEN by Clr. Gaglianese; seconded by Clr. Regan
MOVED THAT this resolution be approved
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (7-2 absent)**

4. RESOLUTION COMMITTING ADDITIONAL CITY FUNDS FOR THE NON-FEDERAL (LOCAL) MATCH REQUIRED FOR THE BIG GRANT APPLICATION FOR MARINA COST

City Comptroller Newcomb presented the resolution, to approve the commitment of additional City funds in the amount of \$59,146.90 for the BIG funding application to reflect the increase in cost from 2018 projections. Saying that, the City of Geneva was awarded BIG funding in Spring of 2019 towards the Seneca Lake Access Improvement (Marina) Project. In 2018 the eligible project costs were \$1,115,803 with a 41% match by the City of \$466,071. In 2023 the City of Geneva received a suggestion from NY Parks to submit for additional BIG funding. The costs have recently been revised to reflect the increase in cost from 2018 of \$141,601. The city match requirement would be \$59,146.90. She also clarified that the scope of the project eligible for BIG funding is mobilization, demo existing facilities, dredging, floating docks including anchorage, marine electrical/utilities and potentially a floating building for harbor master. She explained that we can't receive this match without the grant, but it needs to go with the grant application, as if would save us money if we get the grant.

Clr. Gaglianese asked why it seems as though there are grants at our fingertips yet he feels as though we're always late. The city manager replied that we have consultants working on it but currently no one on

staff that writes and tracks grants, although they've looked into adding a position for it in the past. She also clarified that they've known it was coming, just not quite how quickly and that it would require this fast of a turnaround.

Clr. Regan asked if both were to get approved, if this grant just matches half (so simply winning ~\$60,000) or if we'd have to put that much more in. The comptroller clarified that, in theory, instead of covering \$141,601 in cost we would only have to cover \$59,146.90. The city manager also added on to clarify that this is not bonded funding. Clr. Burrall questioned how the numbers add up because it doesn't show a 50/50 match, to which the comptroller replied that it is not a 50/50 but actually roughly a 41% match loosely based upon the scope of project.

Clr. Gaglianese questioned what the backlash would be if the marina were to not go through, such as the penalties we would have to pay, and required to be provided with the number of expenses spent so far. The city manager replied that she could get the number of expenses so far, explaining that those would be lost, the grants would be returned to the state, and that they're already working on estimated projections of revenues and costs for council to look at. The state did also reach out and say to apply for an additional big application because we would likely qualify for it.

Clr. Noone also wanted to know how much has been spent thus far because he feels the taxpayers should know how much has come out of the general fund to be spent and will need to be paid back if the project doesn't go forward.

Clr. Salamendra said she is adamantly opposed to the marina, as she believes it is poor spending of the people's money, and feels we shouldn't sign up to create new infrastructure when we have old infrastructure that is crumbling. She said that she would be against applying for it and instead simply scraping the project completely but recognizes that if the project were to move forward it would be more responsible to the save money that applying for this could provide. She believes there will be a large community pushback, as the people she's spoken to are opposed to this, and she advocates ending the marina project.

Clr. Camera feels as though the cart is before the horse in terms of this project, and that its going to be a huge maintenance cost for our DPW by putting in the marina. He agreed with Laura that if the community goes forward then we should go for the state money as he recognizes the benefit cost analysis but is conflicted as the community may not want to go through with this, much like himself, because he feels there is a better use for our resources.

The mayor said he didn't feel that the cost analysis shown to them previously had any negatives. He related it to a former discussion to have a Boat Museum where the Welcome Center is now and how there was a negative yearly cost impact so they decided not to move forward with it but the marina has not posed a negative impact to imply we should be halting it in the same way we did the museum.

ACTION TAKEN by Clr. Gaglianese; seconded by Clr. Noone

MOVED THAT this resolution be approved

**ROLL CALL VOTE: Aye – Clr. Salamendra, Clr. Regan, Clr. Burrall, Mayor Valentino,
Clr. Gaglianese and Clr. Noone**

Nay – Clr. Camera

Absent – Clr. Brimm and Clr. Pealer

MOTION CARRIED

5. BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

ACTION TAKEN by Clr. Gaglianese; seconded by Clr. Noone

MOVED THAT Jeremy Bush be appointed to the PBAB (Police Budget Advisory Board)

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (7-2 absent)

6. ZONING WORK SESSION

Mayor Valentino began the conversation by pointing to Section 350-7.13, stating that he had a few issues under bullet C. for Keeping of Animals. He felt the first part was a bit confusing and asked for clarification from Neal about whose property it has to be 100 ft from. He also said he can't imagine needing the number 2, or having code that would allow people to have sheep, goats, cattle, etc., and proposed getting rid of it. Neal clarified that he didn't write this but it was possibly put in upon request.

Clr. Camera said he believed mixing so many different animals is difficult and it is too broad to include in one clause. He proposed separating smaller critters, such as chickens and ducks, and recrafting it by striking them and putting them in their own revision. He also brought up 15 head of cattle even following the code, 100 ft from a dwelling, would be a be a lot and separation could mitigate discrepancies such as that between the larger and smaller animals. Clr. Camera asked if it is currently illegal to own chickens in the city, since previous discussions on it had been tabled. The mayor clarified that there are circumstances where it is allowed such as in an industrial zone, like on State Street.

Clr. Salamendra said she believed it was said that if State Street (Geneva Peeps) was a success, others would then also be allowed to have chickens in the city. She said that some people are 20 years behind the times and science because she feels they aren't recognizing the numerous benefits, such as getting fresh eggs rather than ones from the factory. She said she supports allowing chickens and hopes others who have been opposed will listen to scientists who make it clear keeping of chickens is safe and healthy.

Clr. Regan said when she spoke with Jeff Henderson, the founder of Peeps, who wouldn't sign on at the start of the organization because he was appalled the city wouldn't agree to chickens if Peeps was a success. She also addressed she feels there are many misconceptions with chickens, explaining that it is roosters that are loud, chickens are quiet, and that they don't smell when taken care of. She feels there are enough regulations in the code, and if there needs to be more then that can be addressed. She also agreed with Clr. Camera's suggestion to remove geese, fowl cattle, horse, sheep, and goats from this section.

Clr. Gaglianese said, in reference to Clr. Salamendra's comment about scientists, he feels that there are pros and cons of keeping chickens on both sides from scientists. He also asked who determines whether State Street (Peeps) is considered a success or not. He pointed out that he has seen and received complaints about overgrowth, to which others replied it is the garden that is overgrown and doesn't have to do with the chickens. Lastly, he added that he feels if people really want chickens, then they could always move to the country.

Clr. Noone said he reviewed his emails from 2020 of people he surveyed about the chickens, and found only 5 said they were for it and the rest were against it. He also said that just because people can have chickens doesn't mean they should or can care for them, just like how many people who have cats or dogs shouldn't, and animal abuse could be a concern. Clr. Noone brought up his concern that there are chickens in the city already, and he feels the codes department is not doing their job to enforce it since it is currently happening despite not being allowed, so he questioned how they would be able to handle the additional work if chickens were permitted in the city. He proposed if we do allow chickens, we should look into what Canandaigua has, which he feels is more clearly outlined, and would require more ownership being taken from city management and codes. He said is definitely not in support of allowing chickens in the code, and is especially against the other animals listed such as cattle, horses, etc.

Mayor Valentino asked Clr. Noone to clarify what he means about codes not doing their job, to which Clr. Noone questioned if chickens aren't allowed in residential areas how are people are being allowed to have them. Mayor Valentino explained it isn't that they're being allowed to have them, but rather a capacity issue, and if codes was fully staffed enforcing everything would be more manageable. Clr. Burrall defended codes, saying he was under the impression they're a complaint driven organization, so he feels if they are not addressing the chickens in the city, it is because there are no complaints about them. He went on to say that the 100ft buffer space is a critical part to recognize in this code, as it eliminates most the properties, because there are very few in the city where a resident would want to have chickens that is also 100ft from any other dwelling. He also addressed Clr. Gaglianese's comment earlier about the grass on State St., saying the property is owned by Children's Hours Preschool and if the grass was over 6" then they would be in violation of the ordinance but the grass has not been that high.

Clr. Burrall asked for clarification on what other animals would fall under the title of fowl in the code, some answers included peacock, quail, and pheasants. He then said he felt okay with eliminating fowl and cattle, however, he feels horse owners are not going to keep horses in the city unless they can graze and there would only be a few lots where they could fit to do so. As far as ducks and geese he feels it requires a water source such as a pond, which he feels the city doesn't have so he has no problem with them. He said he doesn't see much of a demand for sheep or goats except in areas where it wouldn't be an issue, so he doesn't feel strongly either way.

Clr. Burrall elaborated more on Peeps, saying they currently have 59 chickens, he feels they barely make any noise, and the coop is only cleaned once a week so it smells no different than a litter box. He said while it is always important to ask people their opinions, we also have to also ask them to give a reason as to why they do or don't want chickens allowed in the city. He feels its easy for people to just answer yes or no, but he hasn't heard any actual reasons for people opposed to them. One line he expressed hoping to get rid of in the code is the line stating coops have to be cleaned every 24 hours and to sealed in airtight containers to be disposed because he feels it's unnecessary and difficult to enforce. Overall, he feels it is long overdue to allow chickens in code and believes the way it's written is airtight, especially with the 100ft regulation.

Clr. Camera proposed crafting this code to permit chickens, and leave the rest out, if everyone feels that would suffice. Clr. Salamendra agreed and stated she is also for removing the 100ft restriction, despite the votes not being there. Clr. Regan agreed with her, saying that we put up tons of stop signs, even though not everyone always completely stops, because we hope they will follow the rules, and this code is the same so we have to trust people and shouldn't dismiss the keeping of chickens in case a few

people don't care for them correctly like Clr. Noone suggested earlier. She said many of her emails have been very positive, and the few negative ones were based on smell or noise which aren't realistic issues.

Neal clarified that council does want to create guidelines to keep chickens, but right now they're just voicing that this is the direction they want staff to go in. Clr. Salamendra and Clr. Camera agreed with him, suggesting Neal write it up, and that right now council is providing the direction to remove geese, fowl, cattle, horses, sheep and goats.

Mayor Valentino said he has spoken with someone from Peeps and this person was concerned that since there is a lifespan to a chicken's egg laying, and at that point they are unable to be killed to be eaten, that they are simply living to produce eggs. The person he spoke with was concerned about this being inhumane to the chickens, breeding them for the eggs, before getting rid of them. Clr. Salamendra clarified that although one way to get rid of the chickens is to kill them, but there are other ways, so we shouldn't be making assumptions of what people will do with the chickens once they can no longer lay eggs. Clr. Burrall added that 100% of the chickens that were no longer able to lay eggs were sent to a farm on the other side of the lake to live out the rest of their lives, and none have been killed. He feels that chickens who are raised solely for chicken wings are treated more inhumanely in those slaughter houses than laying eggs.

Clr. Camera brought the 100ft regulation back up which he feels was drawn up arbitrarily, saying that it should be changed to 75ft instead, which wouldn't make much of a difference to neighbors but would increase the eligibility. Clr. Salamendra and Clr. Regan agreed they're also for reducing the it to the 75ft. Clr. Burrall said the last time the Town of Geneva did their zoning they slipped in chicken to residential areas, and suggested looking to see if they have a distance restriction, saying we don't have to copy what they're doing but it may be good to know.

Clr. Noone asked if there were complaints outside of the Peeps Co-Op for livestock in the city, and if implemented would codes be able to properly enforce. Neal stated he does currently receive complaints about chickens. Clr. Salamendra asked for clarification on what the complaints are. Neal explained that the complaints could simply be that someone has them in their backyard. Further, they try to look around to see if there is a chicken there but if it is in the back yard then they can't necessarily just go onto their property and therefore can't do anything. He also said that since they're not licensed if you do catch one you don't know who owns it. Overall, he said it is hard to enforce when they do get complaints on occasion. To answer Clr. Noone's second questions Neal said that if it was allowed through code that when there is a complaint, just like now, they have to respond, but they can't always solve the issue such as when they don't always know whose it is. Clr. Salamendra pointed out she feels it sounds like if there was a code, and there was a loose chicken it would be easier to find out whose it is, and there would be less complaints because there would no longer calls about concern that chickens aren't allowed.

Mayor Valentino stated that Canandaigua code could help as a reference and pointed out he loves the detail in the code for cats and dogs (77.19), asking if the current code for dogs and cats would be going away once this was adopted. The city manager clarified that dogs and cats fall under the general municipal code which is different so that wouldn't go away, but what is being adopted currently would completely erase and replace the current zoning under 350-7.13 or any other section they decide to revise and amend. Neal confirmed that the other code wouldn't go away but they would need to line up with this so that there aren't contradictions between the two. Neal also said there are times where one refers to the other, and Mayor Valentino said he feels it would be a good idea to point to the section on dogs or cats.

Clr. Regan began a new discussion by asking, in reference to Restaurants and Taverns (section 350-7.17), if there is any need to insert cannabis in with liquor distribution in regulation with NYS Liquor Authority. The city manager agreed, since the city did opt in for cannabis legislation, but explained when this was first being written it was not a consideration. The city manager also clarified there is regulatory authority coming out from the state, which we can start to pull from, and she has heard from two businesses who wish to come before council at some point and discuss their cannabis distribution plans. Neal suggested since we don't try to itemize what the liquor authority already controls, it just states the liquor authority, we could reference the state regulations in the same way for cannabis. The city manager stated what we could do is point to OCM (Office of Cannabis Management) since dispensary regulations are final and the only place they aren't is for restaurants, lounges, etc. which are still coming forward.

Clr. Regan said her second question in regards to restaurants is that there is a new law for composting in restaurants, so under section d would it be possible to insert composting and recycling with the waste management plan. She feels it will be required eventually anyways so if we make this change it will prevent this document from needing modifications as soon. Clr. Burrall asked if she was suggesting that composting be put in as something that "should" be done or "shall" be done. Clr. Regan explained she would want it to say shall since it is a law, she looked it up quickly, but feels it will only expand over time. Clr. Camera explained, while visiting Toronto, he went to a restaurant and spoke with the owner who told him that it is a law there that everyone (restaurants and individuals) must compost. Mayor Valentino suggested we point to the NYS law if it were to be written in.

Clr. Camera said he wanted to go back to Short-Term Rentals (section 350-7.18), specifically the parking, to ask for clarification about what compact spaces such as downtown and if they have to provide parking when it is so limited. Neal explained that if there is a municipal lot within 500ft it satisfies the parking spot requirements. Clr. Camera also questioned if locations such as Pulteney Park and South Main Street, which are similar to downtown where they don't always have driveways, should be sectioned off and said they'll be treated like downtown. Neal agreed, saying he has the same question, and explained these rentals do currently require one parking spot, per bedroom in the house, off of the street. Mayor Valentino said he would like to see the 500ft radius of the public parking lot to which Neal said he would guess most of the downtown buildings are within 500ft of one of the public lots. David West explained that there is a process to go to the planning board and go through a provision to have a development review and potentially get the parking requirement reduced or waived. He agreed that the parking requirement can be a lot more for a building with a short-term rental than the same building as a regular residence, but there is a process in place to have it waived, or potentially making exceptions for different zones. Clr. Camera asked if everyone was okay with providing the direction to factor in the rowhouse section South Main Street and Pulteney Street to be given special treatment due to the unique nature of the structures creating a parking situation and no one opposed.

Clr. Regan asked that right now since council choose to separate it out, is it just a discussion to work this into the ordinance, and then have it become a part of the zoning. The city manager clarified that the next version of the draft ordinance will have additional revisions, right now this is to provide direction to staff, and that's why she made sure to have the packets colored so it was visible what was changed. The mayor also clarified it will be embedded into this once it is passed and effective.

Clr. Camera went on to point out that the maximum occupancy is currently 10, more specifically its 2 people per bedroom up to 4 bedrooms plus 2 people, and he feels the extra two people should simply be removed, leaving the maximum occupancy at 8. Neal explained what could be done is to have it guided by bedroom size, only allowing a certain number of people based on square footage of the bedroom, so size of bedroom will legally dictate the number of people per building code therefore there will be two sort of guidelines. Clr. Camera said he has comfort knowing that when the property is inspected there won't be rooms counted for more people than there should be but he still wants to see it go from 10 to 8 maximum just so its crystal clear. Clr. Regan said that the occupancy limit is for 24 hours so that would mean they can't invite anyone over and Clr. Burrall agreed saying that the 10 wasn't how many people could spend the night, but just how many people can be over.

Clr. Camera said the limit would be good because part of what this is trying to achieve is limiting the number of parties. Clr. Salamendra agreed, saying even though she believes people should be able to go see their family, she's heard from neighbors that parties are a big problem and need to be shut down. She feels any language that can be used to diminish the disturbance of parties should be, such as saying if the police are involved it will count as a violation. She also brought up buffer zones, which a resident mentioned at the last meeting, saying she feels they should be established to eliminate the disturbances and confrontation. Clr. Camera agreed, saying the situation of this resident is dire, and this needs to be policed to get it stopped which is why he's asking for the reduction from 10 to 8. Clr. Regan said Airbnb is also responsible but Clr. Gaglianese pointed out they aren't all booked through Airbnb. The city manager agreed saying even if it is booked through Airbnb the way that they take and handle reports is different and she's unsure how they're followed up with. Clr. Salamendra said she would like to see longer penalties, like two months, which Clr. Camera agreed with her saying it should be clear so it is easily enforceable.

Clr. Burrall brought back up that there are several dozen units in the city without off street parking, so he doesn't get why there would be a parking requirement based on the type of occupancy if the demand could be exactly the same. He gave an example that a long-term rental could be a 5-bedroom row house and that same rowhouse, when rented as short-term, could have exactly the same demand for number of parking spaces but the short-term would be required to have 5 parking spots. He said between South Main St. and North Main St. there used to be 3 B&Bs with 3-4 bedrooms, where the owners used to use their driveway, but now have to let the guests use it so there is off street parking provided. Another issue being that these driveways are single width so there is inconvenience when one guest needs to move to allow another to leave is something else that he mentioned. The city manager explained a part of it is that there is a difference between residential verses business use, and it was likely done because the short-term rentals were initially looked at in comparison to hotels. Neal elaborated saying there is a heavier potential use and it's an attempt at site management.

Clr. Salamendra said she sympathizes with people who don't have off street parking but she feels its also important to recognize how many people try to park in their neighborhood and bring items into their home and can't because the Airbnb next door invited a bunch of people over and took up all of the parking. She also said she gets that these are businesses and they are money making properties but the resident who spoke last week told her that for his wife's business, which only requires one person at a time, they too had to make sure there was a parking spot which cost him money.

Clr. Camera said he feels the city manager and economic development team should legislate for the 90% of rentals because there will always be people with unique circumstances, and those can be handled

as they arise. He proposed permits be issued in these specialty situations, which are always bound to come up, rather than tailoring to them. He said by putting in a provision it allows people in those specific situations to come to city hall and figure out how to handle those differently. Neal replied that in the zoning code short-term rentals have to go to the planning board for a special use permit, while the current ones are grandfathered in. Clr. Noone said he feels there they shouldn't be grandfathered in to but the city manager clarified the provision says the grandfathering is short extension of time of ~30 days. Neal further explained that currently the short-term rental provision only refers to the rental permit and not a special use permit with the planning board so that will need to be added.

Clr. Camera said he is still really concerned about the large lot residential because he feels it is unfair to the rest of Geneva. Neal clarified for him that the large lot residential is currently labeled agricultural residential, between Route 14 and Slosson Lane, and is a 20,000 sq ft minimum now. Clr. Camera said he feels it is out of community character to create this large lot residential. He read an article, written by Jackie Augustine, in the newspaper that said:

Here is what we collectively agreed Geneva should be: Beautiful, Prosperous. Equitable. Connected. Sustainable. The plan reads, "This is the Geneva we want to leave to our children. With our richly textured history, uncommon lakeshore setting, civic pride, architectural heritage, and cultural diversity, we Genevans feel justifiably lucky. Our small city is a great place to raise a family and to be connected within a community of caring neighbors. We come together for community events, at high school commencements, for coffee downtown, along the lake, at church, in city council sessions, in the stands of our ballfields to cheer, and at the grocery store. We know and care for one another. We love Geneva. Though we are a small community, we are urban. And because we possess a collection of assets few other places in America have, we are unique.

Clr. Salamendra asked if the new economic developer has had a chance to look at the area proposed to be rezoned as large lot residential, to which David replied he has not had much time to spend over there. Clr. Regan said she thinks its important for people to realize this would not change Slosson Lane itself, which neighbors were concerned about, just the undeveloped lane between Route 14 and Slosson Lane, and that traffic is the only thing it would possibly change.

Clr. Regan asked to amend Section 350-19.2 under B. Membership and Terms where it still says 9 members and since that was just changed to 7 at the last meeting. She also pointed out it says the mayor appoints the planning board members and then it is approved by city council and City Manager Hendrix said it may be old language and she will check the charter to be sure.

Clr. Burrall said he had a question for Neal about what the current minimum residential lot size for large lot residential, because the change is reading at 20,000 sq ft. Neal explained that it is currently zoned as agricultural residential and has a 20,000 sq ft minimum. Clr. Burrall further clarified that this would mean there isn't a change to lot size, just the name of zoning. Neal agreed, saying he would have to check the uses, but the lot size wouldn't be changing.

Mayor Valentino suggested all councilors look to the clearly marked boxes on the sides of the pages to provide the best direction to staff and to be sure to answer the questions that have been asked of council.

7. ADJOURNMENT

**ACTION TAKEN by Clr. Gaglianese; seconded by Clr. Salamendra
MOVED THAT the meeting be adjourned at 7:55pm
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (7-2 absent)**

Nicole Wright

City Clerk