

MINUTES OF
SPRING GARDEN TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
April 2, 2024

CALL TO ORDER: The monthly meeting of the Spring Garden Township Planning Commission was held on April 2, 2024, in the Township Municipal Building, 340 Tri Hill Road, York PA. Robert Sandmeyer called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

Present:	Robert Sandmeyer	Dave Davidson, C.S. Davidson, Inc.
	Amy Mitten	Dawn Hansen, Zoning Officer
	Scott Stevens	John DeHaas
	Joel Sears	

REORGANIZATION OF THE BOARD: This has been postponed until a full board could be present.

- Bob Sandmeyer welcomed the new Board member for Ward 4, Joel Sears.
- John DeHaas nominated Bob Sandmeyer for Chairman, seconded by Joel Sears. All in favor – motion approved.
- Scott Stevens nominated Amy Mitten for Vice Chair, seconded by Bob Sandmeyer. All in favor – motion approved.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Ms. Mitten made a motion to approve the minutes of the January 2, 2024, meeting with one change. Change the date of the minutes from January 1, 2024, to January 2, 2024. Seconded by Mr. Stevens. All in favor, motion carried.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: None

ZONING HEARING BOARD APPLICATIONS:

- **2024-01: 913 S. Albemarle – Bryn Lavere Development** has filed a Variance to §310-6.D, minimum lot width. *The property is located at 913 S Albemarle and is zoned R-1 (Residential Suburban).*
- Todd Bowser represents Ross Stanard, the current owner of the property.
- Lots were developed in the 1940's as part of Villa Green.
- The lot is vacant.
- Proposing to build a single floor, single family home on the lot.
- The zoning requires that the lot be 10,000 square feet and this lot is only 6,403 square feet. The zoning also requires a minimum lot width of 80', this lot is only 60', as shown in the exhibits.
- The intent of the builder is to create affordable housing in keeping with the neighborhood with a cottage-style home 28' x 50'.
- All setbacks can be met on the lot.
- The allowable lot coverage is 45% in this Zone. The home, sidewalk, and parking in the rear of the property, only total a proposed lot coverage of 29.5%.
- The hardship was not caused by the owner, it was developed that way in the 1940's.
- Scott Stevens asked if the exhibit provided to the Board showing the proposed home was a sample or the actual home they intend to build.

- Todd Bowser answered both, as it is what they would like to build, and it is the same as what they are building in Upper Dauphin County where there are similar size lots.
- John DeHaas suggested that some pictures of the neighborhood be included in his packet.
- Their goals are to add to available housing stock, which is in limited supply, and stay within the intent of the neighborhood and zoning requirements other than the lot width and lot size.
- They are looking for a recommendation to the Zoning Hearing Board.
- Bob Sandmeyer asked what the price point on the home would be.
- Todd Bowser responded that the price point would be between \$200,000 and \$205,000 range. This is \$40,000 to \$50,000 less than the comps in that neighborhood.
- Bob Sandmeyer asked where the parking would be on the property.
- Todd Bowser said they would be to the rear of the property off Sunflower Alley.
- Bob Sandmeyer suggested that the Alley name be added to the drawing.
- Dave Davidson, Township Engineer, does not feel a variance is necessary due to Zoning Ordinance §310-34 Lots of Record states “On a lot where adjacent lots or land were not owned by the said lot owner or owners, both on the effective date of this chapter and on the date of the request for the erection of a building or otherwise, which does not fulfill the regulations for the minimum lot area and/or lot width for the zone in which it is located, a building may be erected, altered or used and any conforming or permitted use may be established, providing the setback requirements are not less than the minimum specified herein for the zone in which the lot is located.” This seems to say if you have a substandard lot, once you meet the setbacks you can build on it.
- Dawn Hansen, Zoning Officer asked for the Zoning Ordinance section so she could review it.
- Bob Sandmeyer agreed with the Engineer’s opinion and left it up to the Zoning Officer to make the final decision.
- Zoning Officer Hansen agreed that this would allow the applicant to build on the lot with a building permit if the setbacks could be met.
- Bob Sandmeyer asked if he would have to supply stormwater plans.
- Dave Davidson replied that they would have to provide the normal stormwater plans that are required with a building permit for a residential build.
- Motion by Amy Mitten that based on the Planning Board’s discussion, and the Zoning Officer’s agreement, Spring Garden Township Zoning Ordinance §310-34, Lots of Record, determines that a variance is not required, and the developer could move forward with a building permit application. Seconded by John DeHaas. All in favor, motion carried.

SUBDIVISION/LAND DEVELOPMENT PLANS:

- **Regents Glen – Lot 78: Inch & Company** – Final land development plan originally proposed for 24 dwelling units and has been updated with a new submission showing 21 dwelling units and other site changes.
 1. Josh George of Landworks Civil Design provided a summation of their intent to seek a recommendation from the Planning Commission to construct a 21-unit apartment building in Regents Glen at the intersections of Crest Way, Heritage Way, and Indian Rock Dam Road. It is unique in that it has triple road frontage and is directly adjacent to the golf cart underpass that goes under Indian Rock Dam Rd. It is almost as if there are four roads on the sides of this property if you include the golf cart path.
 2. This applicant has been before the Planning Commission many times before.
 3. The outstanding items have been whittled down, but the two biggest outstanding issues are the parking and the dumpster location.

4. One of the significant changes to the plan is the reduction of the number of dwelling units from 24 to 21, and the increased number of parking spaces from 34 to 42 so that there are now the required two spaces per unit. They have met the requirements of the ordinance.
5. Amy Mitten asked why the dumpster could not be in a rear parking space.
6. Josh George responded that the space is not large enough for a dumpster or for the truck to empty the dumpster
7. Bob Sandmeyer asked Dave Davidson to comment on his concerns with parking.
8. Dave Davidson commented that this is a large lot that includes Turnberry Green, including the three garage units at the north end of Regents Glen Blvd. Those spaces are leased and cannot count towards available parking. Which means the lot as a whole is still 14 spots short.
9. Josh George disagrees because in this context there is an existing situation, a pre-existing non-conformity, and they are providing 21 units with 42 spaces required for this unit.
10. Dave Davidson does not agree.
11. Bob Sandmeyer asked the Zoning Officer for her comments.
12. The Zoning Officer commented that technically they meet the requirements of the ordinance for this building.
13. John DeHaas asked Dave Davidson for more of an explanation on his concerns with the parking situation.
14. Dave Davidson explained that presently the existing parking is lacking in parking spaces. They are adding 42 parking spaces, so the deficiency is the same after the review of this plan as it exists now. It is not improving the situation. There have been parking issues with different phases of Regents Glen and this seems like an opportunity to correct it. Why would you add 21 more units to a lot that already has parking deficiencies? This lot includes the existing condos and Turnberry Green. All those dwellings are included on this lot.
15. John DeHaas clarified that this is not a separate parcel of land. The parking is currently non-conforming, and asked Josh to explain his opinion.
16. Josh George argued that he said *if* it was non-conforming. There are numerous land development plans that tally the parking for the overall lots. Keeping in mind that Turnberry was the first piece of Regents Glen to be developed. There has been a change in the ordinance requirements for parking over the years. So, what was done years ago was compliant at the time it was approved, or it would not have been approved. Regardless of deficiencies at this point it is irrelevant because this project must meet the current requirements of the Ordinance. 21 Units have been proposed, 42 parking spaces have been proposed, and as the Zoning Officer stated, this meets the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance for this building.
17. John DeHaas would like to have a summary added to this plan that shows the history of why there is an existing deficiency in parking on the existing part of the parcel.
18. Scott Stevens asked if the area where the proposed dumpster is located on the plan is existing parking?
19. Josh George explained that the macadam that is existing was put there when they built 1050 Crest Way. They were planning to build this next phase on the original plan, and it is not existing parking. This will be used as part of the entrance and new parking lot.
20. Scott Stevens wants it to be clear that it is not being used for parking currently. If it is, then that is creating more of a deficiency in the required parking.
21. The Zoning officer clarified that it is not parking for the existing buildings, just black top that was installed to prepare for the next phase of building that was not constructed.
22. Joel Sears asked if 42 spaces proposed on the plan will be available immediately when the building is built.
23. Josh George said they will be built simultaneously when the building is built.
24. Joel Sears asked for clarification on the leased parking spaces.

25. Josh George explained that the detached garage building next to 1010 Crest Way is leased units.
26. Joel Sears clarified that these 42 parking spaces are dedicated to this new building.
27. Josh George confirmed.
28. Josh George said the other outstanding item was the dumpster location. There is not a great location for the dumpster with triple frontage and the golf cart path. The SALDO states that dumpsters need a 6-foot fence, and the Zoning Ordinance states that a 6-foot fence cannot be placed in a front yard. This property has three front yards. There are not many places where it can be located after the Zoning Officer's determination that the front yard goes back to the face of the building at 1050 Crest Way. There is no reasonable area to put a dumpster that has a 6-foot fence. The initial submission in September showed the dumpster in a different location. It was moved to its current location, which still does not meet the requirements of the ordinance. It was discussed with the Zoning Officer, and a location next to the proposed building that was shown in the original plan submission was suggested. At this location it could be screened with 6-foot vegetation, and a waiver could be requested from Section 275-40.1.G(1)(b) in the Subdivision Land Development Plan that states that the dumpster must have 6-foot fencing. They believe they can protect the dumpster with a 4-foot fence and screen three sides of it with 6-foot vegetation because 6-foot vegetation is fine in a front yard. The two parking spaces that would be removed to place the dumpster in the newly proposed location would be moved to where the dumpster is currently shown on the plan. There is already existing pavement there. Given the constraints of the property, it is felt that this is the best approach to the problem.
29. Scott Stevens would like to know the definition of fence given that they are using a four-foot fence and using 6-foot vegetation to act as fencing.
30. Josh George responded that the 6-foot vegetation would act as screening not fencing. The ordinance specifically talks about fences and walls.
31. Amy Mitten feels this is a much better option than what is shown on the plan currently.
32. Bob Sandmeyer says that this is a better option physically and aesthetically because where it is shown currently it stands out. With it located next to the proposed three-story building it will blend in with the building. He feels a four-foot fence with six-foot vegetation would be adequate. It will fit better in the corner as well. You won't be looking at it when you pull into the lot, and the golf carts will not have to drive past it.
33. The Zoning Officer is fine with the new location with a waiver and vegetative screening. They should ask for the Waiver for Section 275-40.1.G(1)(b) for the fence height requirement.
34. Bob Sandmeyer went over the additional outstanding items.
 - Provide the lighting fixture specifications on the plan.
 - Developers Agreement with how the Maintenance will be shared.
 - Bob Sandmeyer asked Dave Davidson to elaborate.
 - Josh George said there are many HOA documents to review and anyone in the community who is a member of the Club, or a homeowner must follow the HOA requirements.
 - Dave Davidson says the concern that was expressed was all the other HOA involved owners and this is a rental unit. The responsibility for participation in maintenance of the roads or infrastructure won't fall to the renters. Who does it fall on?
 - Josh George said it would fall on the owner of the building.
 - Dave Davidson said this should be reflected in the Developer Agreement.
35. John DeHaas mentioned that the change of the landscaping will need to be a condition of the plan.

- Provide financial security.
 - Signatures of the Owner, Engineer, and Landscape Architect.
 - Provide a Fee-in-lieu of recreation.
 - Stormwater Management approval.
 - Dave Davidson said they are continuing to work on the Stormwater plans.
36. Bob Sandmeyer discussed the condition of establishing access for residents and for Inch & Co to build.
- Bob Sandmeyer asked if there has there been any communication regarding this.
 - Josh George explained that it will be just as all the other developments have been built. The developer comes through the gates, builds their building, and then leaves the property.
37. The Zoning officer asked if they were going to touch on her comment letter item number 5 regarding the Declaration and Restrictive Covenants. A copy of the proposed Declaration and restrictive covenants and proposed Homeowners Agreement be furnished to the Solicitor for review. These should address the responsibility for maintenance of Regents Glen Infrastructure (streets, etc.) in a manner acceptable to adjoining HOAs. This should also address parking (use and maintenance of the parking lots and access drives, and the allocation of parking spaces among the various units)
38. Bob Sandmeyer would like to see the landscaping plan with the 30% native plants and parking lot requirements.
39. Scott Stevens asked if there was going to be signage to mark the one way in and one way out to keep people from going the wrong direction off Heritage Lane?
40. Josh George said signiation and pavement markings would be used. Angling the parking spaces would have made it difficult to provide the required amount of parking. This is currently in compliance with the ordinance as far as parking space size and driveway width is concerned.
41. Dave Davidson mentioned that when Josh George was asked about the parking spaces being dedicated to this building the answer was yes. It is true that they are here because of these units, but he also thinks it is true that residents from the other units could park on this lot and vice versa.
42. Josh George agreed that this is theoretically true, however each time he viewed the existing parking lot at 1030 and 1050 Crest Way, there were an excess amount of available parking spaces. They recognize that there are never enough parking spaces at Stonegate, however they believe that spaces being provided here meet zoning requirements but do not create an undue burden on anyone and they will not be designated specifically for that building.
43. The Zoning officer asked if Sam Saxton would explain the type of units being proposed in the new building.
44. Sam Saxton of Inch and Company explained that it will be a three-story building with 7 units on each floor. There will be four two-bedroom apartments, two studios, and one one-bedroom on each floor.
45. The Zoning officer pointed out that with studios and one-bedroom apartments, it is less likely that there will be a concern of multiple cars for each unit.
46. John DeHaas asked if these would be upper end housing.
47. Sam Saxton explained that they will be market rate, a similar product to what you would expect to see in Regents Glen.
48. Josh George said they would be available to anyone who can pay the market rate.
49. John DeHaas asked the developer to explain the nature of their business philosophy of adding rental units into an owned-occupied type of neighborhood staying within the nature of the current community. Will this change the nature of the community?

50. Paul Minnich of Barley Snyder, Council for the Developer replied that this is a legitimate question and concern. Society has changed and many people are in rental housing by choice. There is a presumption, that may have applied decades ago, that if someone is renting it reflects the socioeconomic status being lower, or if they aren't an owner, they are less likely to take care of properties. Today, many young people graduating are not in that same position. Many are transitory. Regents Glen is in relative proximity to Wellspan Hospital and a lot of important businesses in our community. Many do not know if they will stay in York, or they may not have the time and energy to maintain a property. There are many reasons why people choose to rent, and it is not a reflection of them being bad people. The developer could have proposed Condos that were rentals. Inch was clear that these are going to be rentals. Inch owns the Country Club and has a substantial economic development in Regents Glen with the development of White Oaks. Inch has more reason, given its collective investment in Regents Glen, to ensure the integrity of the development and not devalue it. There is value in having versatility and a mix of housing. You can live in a desirable community even if you can't afford to buy at this very moment. Having 21 rental units in the totality of this development they don't think is harmful or devalues it. It would not make sense to put up subsidized housing that would adversely impact the livability in the community when they have just invested millions of dollars in acquiring the property.

51. Bob Sandmeyer opened the floor for public comment:

- Roger Gorman - 1128 Greenleigh Dr – Expressed concern about increased traffic on Heritage Way and Indian Rock Dam Rd.
- Mark David Frankle – President of 1030/1050 Crest Way HOA – Expressed concern over rentals in the neighborhood designed to be an owner-occupied community. He is also concerned about them having access to build on the property and for the renters living in the building. They need permission from the HOA. He is concerned that Inch has not communicated with the HOA. He also has concerns about a shortage of parking. He is also worried that if there are problems with renters no one will do anything about it. He is concerned about what kind of people will be renting there. He doesn't like the look of the building and feels that Inch is ruining their community.
- Theresa Dawson – 1131 Turnberry Ln. – Concerned about the placement of the dumpster and how it will be emptied.
- Anthony Hutchison – 1426 Copper Beech Dr. – Concerned about the amount of parking for the building. If there are just enough spaces for this building, what happens when there are visitors, where do they park? Questions about how the maintenance of the roads will be shared with renters. Also, concerns about future development in Regents Glen and more rentals possible.
- John DeHaas commented that this will all be addressed in the Declarations and Covenants as part of the conditions of the approval of the plan. The parking issues are something that occur in high-density shared parking lots face.
- The question was raised about the size of the dumpster, how many dumpsters, and if there would be a recycling dumpster.
 - The Zoning officer mentioned that recycling is mandatory and would require a dumpster.
 - Sam Saxton said that concerns over trash and the dumpster can be addressed with multiple collections.
- Linda Avillo – 1021 Crest Way – Is concerned that there will be accidents with people driving on the golf cart path and more traffic on Crest Way. It is a disaster waiting to happen.

- Den Lankford – 1431 Turnberry Ct. – Very concerned about parking and feels the Board needs to listen to the Township Engineer about parking issues. He brought up the Public Offerings Statement from 2004 and wanted to know why the Township isn't following the document. Wanted to know if the units are for single families or if more than one family can live there.
 - The Zoning Officer mentioned that per the Ordinance only three unrelated people may live in a unit.

Mr. Lankford went on to say that no business could be in Regents Glen, only single-family residents. He considers a 21-unit apartment building a business and would not be allowed according to the Public Offering Statement. Rental Units are not defined. An apartment building would be a business and should not be in this community.

- The Zoning Officer mentioned that all of Regents Glen is in Apartment-Office Zone and apartments are considered residential units.
- Amy Mitten pointed out that this document is from the HOA Board not a Planning Commission Board and the Board has no obligation or relationship or affiliation with the HOA Board to be making decisions as to whether you can have an apartment complex or apartment building in Regents Glen. That is up to the HOA to deal with, not a question for the Planning Commission.
- Amy explained that the Planning Commission's job is to determine if the plan that they are proposing meets the ordinances as they are written now in Spring Garden Township. The Planning Commission has been working with the developer for many months to get this ironed out and are now in a position where the ordinances are met. They have brought the plan to a point where they are only requesting one waiver for the dumpster because of the fence height. They have met the parking requirements for that building without including existing parking for the other buildings. They have made the changes and effort to accommodate the ordinances as they are written.
- Amy thanked the residents for bringing the golf cart safety issue to the Board's attention and encouraged the residents to bring it up to the Board of Commissioners as it is not anything that the Planning Commission can address.
- Bob Sandmeyer pointed out that Regents Glen was a master planned development. When it comes to traffic concerns this area was already designed and had accounted for traffic with traffic studies and the number of proposed buildings for this development. The proposed 21 units have already been included, and even more were accounted for in the Master Plan for this development. PennDot access and egress, sewer and water issues have already been accounted for in the master plan ages ago before this plan was submitted. This is a very small part of something that was approved a long time ago and would have been part of your HOA.
- Karin Coldren - 1449 Turnberry Ct. – Has concerns about not enough parking in Regents Glen. Also has concerns about the units being rental properties and who will be living there.
 - Amy Mitten asked her if the HOA has addressed any of the parking issues. The Planning Commission cannot do anything about the existing parking deficit. This would be a conversation to be had with the HOA. These are not public streets, and the HOA would be responsible for installing any signage.
 - Bob Sandmeyer explained that the plans are always reviewed by emergency services.

- Peggy Ebersole – 1050 Crest Way – Had concerns about who would be paying for the maintenance of the parking lot since their HOA fees pay for the upkeep. More cars mean more wear and tear on the parking lot.
 - Bob Sandmeyer suggested that they take the issue to their HOA and ask for more parking.
- Emanuel Strategos – 916 Stream View Lane – Has concerns about increased auto traffic by the golf cart path and blames the ordinances for causing the parking problems they have now.
 - John DeHaas explained that Ordinances have changed over the years to address these issues for the current plans.
- Denise Hutchison – 1426 Copper Beech Dr. – Asked the Zoning Officer about the Apartment Office Zone and how it became zoned that way as it is neither apartments nor office.
 - The Zoning Officer responded that this would have come about via the Comprehensive Plan. This Zoning allows for higher density land use.
- She asked for clarification that a regular residential community would not allow apartments.
 - The Zoning Officer explained that there are three residential zones. One is the Apartment Office which allows for higher density and professional offices, Residential-1 which allows for single family homes which requires a special exception for multi-family properties, and Residential-2 which allows both single family homes and multi-family homes.
- Ms. Hutchison said you would not allow apartments in the Residential-2 neighborhood.
 - The Zoning Officer said yes, it does allow for apartments in an R-2 Zone.
- She asked if the 6-foot fence for the dumpster was to keep animals out or just for aesthetics. She does not understand how a 4-foot fence will screen the dumpster and wondered if the residents get a say in what type of plants can be used.
 - The Zoning Officer confirmed the fence is for screening purposes and the Subdivision Land Development Ordinance provides the type of vegetation that can be used in landscaping. This is available on the website under Codes and Ordinances.
- She feels an allowing an apartment building will significantly change the character of the community. You don't know who you are renting to, you cannot discriminate. She has concerns about college kids renting there. This is an over-55 community and is concerned it will cause problems.
 - The Zoning Officer pointed out that one of the conditions the Planning Commission is proposing is the submittal of the Declarations and Covenants to be reviewed by both the solicitors so than agreement can be reached regarding access issues and maintenance of roadways and parking lots.
- Todd Marsteller – 946 Stream View Lane – Wanted to clarify that under the ordinance three unrelated people can live in an apartment.
 - The Zoning Officer confirmed that up to three unrelated people may live in any dwelling unit, apartment or single family.
- He is concerned that the apartment building will not be contributing to the maintenance of the roads and parking lots and this building will add to an already existing parking problem.
- Gary Dawson – 1131 Turnberry Ln. – Concerned about the dumpster location.

- Anthony Hutchinson – 1426 Copper Beech Dr. – Concerned how the renters will have access to the gates and roads. He states that after the installation of the last gate, all the gates will be closed, and you will have to have a clicker to get through the gate. He does not believe that two dumpsters will fit in the proposed location.
 - Scott Stevens stated that the HOA will have to deal with it. The gates are always open.
 - The Zoning Officer explained that all that will be addressed in the Declarations and Covenants.
- Don Griffin – 1433 Turnberry Ln. – Concerned that allowing apartments in this area will set a precedence for the rest of Regents Glen.
 - John DeHaas said it is Zoned Apartment Office and therefore they could build more apartments.
- Bob Sandmeyer said they are making a recommendation on the building not whether they are apartments. The Planning Commission has its limits as to what they can recommend.
- Bob Sandmeyer closed the public comment section.
- John DeHaas was disappointed that there was not more of an effort made by the developer to connect with the HOA to work out some of these issues as they had months to work this out. He encouraged this meeting in November and there was only one meeting a week ago. Having conversations, even if you don't come to an understanding, works to resolve issues.
- Sam Saxton stated that he reached out in November for a meeting and that was followed by nasty emails from the HOA. They tried multiple times to set up meetings until finally last week they were able to set up a meeting. He just wanted to defend his integrity in that he attempted to reach out to the HOA.
- Bob Sandmeyer asked for a recommendation.
- Motion by John DeHaas to make a recommendation to the Board of Commissioners for approval with the following conditions:
 1. A note be added to the plan to give the Township a historic summary of the parking ordinances, and whether they lived within that ordinance at the time.
 2. Request a Waiver for Section 275-40.01.G(1)B for the fence height to allow a four-foot fence around the dumpster. To include 6-foot-high vegetative screening materials.
 3. Update the plan to show the new location of the dumpster.
 4. Update the landscaping shown on page LS1.
 5. Provide the lighting fixture specifications on the plan to show the light spread.
 6. A Development Agreement, prepared by the Township's solicitor, shall be executed, and recorded by the Township prior to the release of the Plan for recording.
 7. Request a Waiver of the Preliminary Plan.
 8. Engineer's seal and signature required.
 9. A copy of the proposed Declaration and restrictive covenants and proposed Homeowners Agreement be furnished to the Solicitor for review. These should address the responsibility for maintenance of Regents Glen Infrastructure (streets, etc.) in a manner acceptable to adjoining HOAs. This should also address parking (use and maintenance of the parking lots and access drives, and the allocation of parking spaces among the various units). (§275-6)
 10. Security for proposed improvements (sewers, landscaping, stormwater, streets, lighting, erosion control) must be posted before final plan approval (§275-24.D.5, SALDO).

11. Dedicated recreation or fee-in-lieu (§275-38 SALDO). Note 28 on Page 2 should list the number of units, cost per unit, and total required for Recreation fee-in-lieu. This should be paid prior to recording the plans.
 12. A note on the plan that there are no deed restrictions.
 13. Owner's notarized signature (§275-24.C(22), SALDO)
 14. Landscape Architect's seal and signature.
 15. Stormwater Management approval.
- Motion seconded by Amy Mitten. All in favor. Motion approved.

OTHER BUSINESS: None

With no further business to address, motion to adjourn by Mr. DeHaas, seconded by Mr. Stevens. All in favor. The meeting adjourned at 8:10 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Dawn Hansen, Zoning Officer

APPROVED