



LAWRENCE BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
MINUTES FOR **OCTOBER 4, 2018**

Members present: Clark, Gascon, Harrod, Shipley, Wilbur, Wisner
Staff present: Dolar, Miller, Mortensen, Pepper, Weik

TAKE A ROLL CALL TO DETERMINE IF THERE IS A QUORUM OF MEMBERS PRESENT

ELECTION OF OFFICERS FOR 2018-2019

Accept nominations for and elect Chair and Vice-Chair for the coming year.

Wilbur announced his plans to resign at the end of the year.

Gascon said he's happy to continue serving as Chair or Vice -Chair. He asked if anyone else was interested in a nomination.

Clark said he was interested in Vice-Chair.

ACTION TAKEN

Motioned by Gascon, seconded by Wisner, to elect Gascon as Chair and Clark as Vice-Chair for 2018-2019.

Unanimously approved 6-0

Motioned by Wilbur, seconded by Gascon, to elect Katherine Weik as the staff liaison.

Unanimously approved 6-0.

ITEM NO. 1 COMMUNICATIONS

- A. Acknowledge communications to the come before the Board.
- B. Disclosure of ex-parte communications and/or abstentions for specific agenda items.

Clark said that the applicant for Item 5 is a neighbor who reached out to him because he had a similar variance request in the past. He said he advised the applicant to speak with staff, discussed the process and provided notes from the meeting.

Gascon asked if he might provide a biased decision-making process or whether he's simply acknowledging the communication.

Clark said he was just acknowledging communication.

Gascon said he would abstain from Item 6 since he's the applicant.

C. There were no agenda items deferred.

ITEM NO. 2 MINUTES

Consider approval of the minutes from the September 6, 2018 meeting of the Board.

ACTION TAKEN

Motioned by Shipley, seconded by Wilbur, to approve the minutes from the September 6, 2018 meeting of the Board.

Unanimously approved 6-0.

BEGIN PUBLIC HEARING:

ITEM NO. 3 VARIANCES FROM THE PARKING STANDARDS AND MAXIMUM IMPERVIOUS COVER FOR A RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT; 1917 NAISMITH DRIVE

B-18-00436: A request for a variance as provided in Section 20-1309 of the Land Development Code of the City of Lawrence, Kansas, 2018 edition. The first request is for a variance from the 25 foot parking area setback standard required by Section 20-908(b) of the City Code for a Residential District. The applicant is seeking a variance from this code standard reducing the parking setback to a minimum of 25 foot parking setback to a minimum of 11 feet from the eastern property line, a minimum of 8.5 feet from the norther property line, and a minimum of 0 feet from the southern property line adjacent to W. 19th Terrace. The second request is for a variance from the 70% maximum impervious cover standard required by Section 20-601(a) of the City Code for the RS7 (Single-Dwelling Residential) District to 75.5%. The property is located at 1917 Naismith Drive. Submitted by Hernly Associates, Inc. on behalf of North American Islamic Trust Inc., property owner of record.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Pepper presented the item.

Wilbur asked if the uniqueness criteria not met is due to surrounding buildings with similar conditions.

Pepper said she knows that there are properties which have met the parking setbacks but does not know the specifics behind each that needed a variance.

Gascon clarified that staff felt the subject property does not meet criteria for uniqueness but acknowledged similar surrounding properties that were granted a variance.

Pepper said that's correct.

Shipley clarified that staff does not know the details of the other variances granted.

Pepper said no.

Gascon asked why uniqueness is met for impervious but not parking.

Pepper explained that they are working toward compliance with that and proposed changes to remove parking in the right-of-way isn't accurately reflected on the site plan because it is outside the property line. They also lost right-of-way due to intersection improvements and have a public sidewalk on their property which contributes to their impervious surface calculations.

Shipley said the site plan provided is from 1980.

Pepper said that's the most recent approved site plan. The pending site plan is also included in the packet.

Shipley asked why they won't rezone it.

Pepper said that has not been requested. She explained that the amount of parking needed is based on use, not zoning.

Gascon said zoning would be a Planning Commission matter.

Pepper said they are surrounded by residential zoning.

Wisner asked if the portion that doesn't meet code is the parking lot adjacent to West 19th Terrace.

Pepper said all parking areas adjacent to roadways are not in compliance, so the variance would bring existing conditions into compliance.

Gascon asked how the need for this variance came about.

Pepper said it was identified during the review of their site plan application for a building addition for a women's prayer hall.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION

Mr. Mike Myers, Hernly Associates, said Ms. Asma Zaidi would like to explain the reason for the site plan application which prompted the need for the variance request.

Ms. Asma Zaidi, Islamic Center of Lawrence, said they are seeking support of their proposed expansion of the Islamic Center. She explained the center's history, planned activities, and stressed that the surrounding areas are growing. She noted that the current women's prayer hall is way too small.

Myers said the site is ideal for the Islamic Center, and most existing parking was there before they took over, although a small strip was added when it was resurfaced, expanding the existing nonconforming use. He discussed parking patterns in the neighborhood and explained parking details of the site plan application.

Clark said aerial photos appear to show double stacked parking and that the proposed changes would eliminate nine parking spaces. He asked if that would affect occupancy.

Myers said they currently have a parking overage, and calculating occupancy in a prayer hall is difficult because it's based on prayer rugs, but they believe losing those spaces will not be an issue. He said they proposing landscaping (16 new trees and 12 shrubs) and other improvements and ultimately are creating more pervious surface than impervious surface.

Clark asked how many spaces would be lost if the property was pulled into strict compliance.

Myers said he wasn't sure.

Mr. Baha Safadi, Islamic Center of Lawrence, said it would reduce the parking spaces to 56.

Wisner asked how much area was lost due to intersection improvements.

Myers said around 740 square feet. He added that the public sidewalk is on their lot, which adds to their impervious surface.

Gascon asked if the land change affected the northeast corner which shifted the sidewalk onto the property.

Myers said he wasn't sure when the sidewalk was constructed.

Gascon asked about occupancy.

Myers said occupancy for a religious institution is normally calculated based on pews, but this is just a big space, so their occupancy is based on how many prayer rugs might fit.

Gascon asked how many prayer halls exist in Lawrence.

Safadi said just this one.

Gascon said that seems unique.

Shipley asked where people park when the lot is full.

Safadi said they might find empty spaces on the street or they'll just turn away. He noted their busiest time is around noon on Fridays.

Gascon asked if they use the neighboring church parking lot.

Safadi said they have.

Shipley said that due to peak times KU parking areas would not be available.

Safadi said that's correct.

No public comment.

ACTION TAKEN

Motioned by Wisner, seconded by Harrod, to close public comment for the item.

Unanimously approved 6-0.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Wisner said he felt it's unique.

Wilbur asked if there's ever been a residential structure on this site.

Pepper said she didn't believe so.

Gascon said that also makes the request unique, as does the use of a prayer hall which has no set parking measurement.

Wisner said the orientation of the building on the lot is a factor, and it's abutment to 19th Terrace will be greatly improved by the proposed. Most importantly he felt the intersection improvement which resulted in a reduction of their land area and a public sidewalk on their property makes it very unique.

Gascon noted that a neighboring residence is using a turnabout within the setback due to similar existing conditions. He said he's confident that this meets the other variance criteria as well.

ACTION TAKEN

Motioned by Wisner, seconded by Wilbur, to approve the variances for both parking and impervious surface based on having met all five conditions for granting a variance.

Unanimously approved 6-0.

ITEM NO. 4 VARIANCE FROM THE PARKING AREA SETBACK FOR A RESIDENTIAL DWELLING; 1300 TENNESSEE STREET

B-18-00433: A request for a variance as provided in Section 20-1309 of the Land Development Code of the City of Lawrence, Kansas, 2018 edition. The request is for a variance from the 25 foot parking area setback standard required by Section 20-908(b) of the City Code for a Residential District. The applicant is seeking a variance from this code standard reducing the parking setback to a minimum of 3 feet to allow for the construction of a parking area. The property is located at 1300 Tennessee Street. Submitted by Paul Werner Architects on behalf of Jess D. Paul Jr., Trustee, property owner of record.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Weik presented the item.

Clark asked about the sight triangle.

Weik said it's a conflict between the sight triangle requirements of 25 feet and the accessory structure requirements of 10 feet.

Gascon asked if that's on a corner lot.

Weik said that's correct.

Wilbur asked if the use of the structure is a factor.

Weik said the BZA doesn't have purview over use, but parking requirements are determined by use and intensity.

Gascon asked if it's currently being used as parking.

Weik said it appears so but the property is currently vacant.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION

Mr. Paul Werner, Paul Werner Architects, said they were disappointed with the staff report and felt a lot of information didn't belong in the staff report. He talked about the property history as indicated in the Polk Directories. He said the property was appraised as four units but likely has six or seven. They would like to renovate the house, but only four parking spots would mean a single family home. He explained that they'd like to register the property as a non-conforming but can't produce a building permit prior to 1969, which he felt was a huge burden on the property owner. He also explained their proposed parking configuration.

A woman appearing on behalf of the property owner said her father was the original owner and detailed the family's history with the property, noting it has historically been used for student housing. She added that the property always had at least five units or more and five parking spaces or more.

Gascon said they appreciate the position the property owner is in and may completely agree with their intentions for the property but are bound by conditions of the code.

The property owner's representative said she understood, and in the event five spaces can't be approved they would appreciate some alternative options so the building renovation can move forward.

Gascon asked if the building is unoccupied.

Werner said yes.

Gascon asked if the burden of proof for the building permit is to establish previous use.

Werner said it's to establish that five units were created legally.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Candice Davis said that for the last 18 years she's been involved with many neighbors in an effort to stabilize the neighborhood. She said it once was zoned single family with single family homes on small lots that could never accommodate the RM32 zoning designation. She appreciates that the property owner is willing to improve the structure but that there are many ways to go about renovation. She noted the Oread Overlay District and felt it's a hardship for others when the existing code isn't followed- an illegal use in the past shouldn't be allowed to continue. She felt the rental registration program should also help to regulate those uses. She did not feel the request was unique, and noted that a similar variance request was denied.

Gascon asked what specific outcome she is seeking for this particular property.

Davis felt they could still renovate the structure perhaps without the number of units they are seeking.

Gascon asked what she meant by "stabilization of the neighborhood".

Davis said there is a lot of rental.

Gascon asked why that's bad.

Davis said that multi-family designations drive away single family ownership, which she felt was negative. She added that when areas become largely multi-family the properties aren't maintained as well and there are issues with crime, violence, noise, and trash.

Gascon asked if a single family home would be her preference.

Davis said a single family home or maybe 4 units.

Gascon said he was just curious why she felt that people who can't afford to buy a home somehow deteriorate a neighborhood.

Davis said she wasn't saying that they do, but they should be able to live in a reasonable structure.

Gascon said he must have misunderstood when she said that rental units destabilize a neighborhood.

Davis said that homeowners tend to move out due to issues created by multi-family properties.

ACTION TAKEN

Motioned by Harrod, seconded by Wisner, to close public comment for the item.

Unanimously approved 6-0.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Clark asked if there is an opportunity to convert to a legal nonconforming property.

Weik said it's possible but staff has not received an application or request for legal nonconforming so that has not been evaluated.

Wilbur said he was having trouble connecting the dots between the missing building permit and how that affects the parking.

Weik explained that an application for nonconforming use could be submitted and doesn't necessarily require a building permit as evidence, it could show a multitude of evidence such as Polk Directories or affidavits from property owners.

Gascon asked if the material in this application could be used.

Weik said it could but it would require separate review to determine whether that was sufficient.

Gascon asked if that's an administrative review.

Weik said yes.

Gascon asked if that can be appealed to District Court or the Planning Commission.

Weik said it would require a determination from the Planning Director and possible hearing by the BZA.

Gascon said it could come back around to the Board but for a different issue.

Weik said yes.

Gascon asked if a variance brings them into conformity.

Weik said the use may not be conforming but they would be permitted to park in those spaces and the variance runs with the land.

Clark asked about the need for a variance if it's converted to legal nonconforming.

Weik said it would depend on what was provided by the applicant. She explained that until an application is submitted any determining factors about allowed parking if legal nonconforming is unknown at this point.

Gascon said the right-of-way area seems uniquely large for an east-west street.

They measured the right-of-way distance and compared it to other right-of-way areas.

Gascon asked what it is zoned and when that zoning designation was assigned.

Weik said it's zoned multi-family, so the proposed use is permitted, and the parcel was previously zoned RD (Residential Dormitory) from 1966-2006.

Gascon asked the age of the structure.

Werner said it was constructed in 1918.

Shipley said she didn't find this unique. She felt they had plenty of options for renovation and questioned whether it is their job to bend the rules or to apply them uniformly.

Gascon asked how Shipley felt about the other four conditions.

Shipley said it's against the spirit and intent of the chapter, noting the zoning and the neighborhood plan. She said the applicant could still have four units.

Werner said they can't have four units because they can't park four cars.

Gascon said he could park two cars.

Shipley said a garage sounds like a viable option.

Gascon said they agree there's a question on uniqueness. He asked if she felt it adversely affects the rights of adjacent property owners.

Shipley said she could debate that too, and she felt it's a slippery slope when approving things every time.

Gascon asked if changing the setback of 25 feet to allow for existing parking affects the adjacent property owners.

Shipley said that's a possibility.

Wilbur said he doesn't know how they can determine if it adversely affects the rights of property owners if there isn't a clear direction moving forward.

Gascon asked if he's uncomfortable making a decision because it's unclear what the use might be.

Wilbur said in part, yes.

Gascon asked how he feels about the fact that there is five existing parking spaces and there has been for quite some time.

Wilbur asked for clarification.

Gascon said he views the property as a 5-plex that has existed for a long time. He noted that there may have been a different setback code that applied to this property at one time.

Weik said staff did not research that.

Gascon said it's possible that the parking was ok and within setbacks when constructed.

They further discussed the five conditions and whether the request does or does not meet those conditions.

Clark noted that the sight triangle is a safety component.

Gascon didn't feel that the request would have a material impact on the sight triangle. He brought up the 25 feet setback on corner lots which he felt was excessive and not applicable to original town site lots.

Shipley said she didn't feel it's their job to debate whether the setback or sight triangle is dubious.

Gascon said the intent of setbacks is for street expansion.

Shipley said there is no sidewalk and 13th Street could be expanded.

Gascon said he couldn't see any scenario for the widening of 13th Street that would require eminent domain of that land, noting that there are already multiple building within that setback zone. He reiterated that there isn't a strong argument for uniqueness.

Clark said he didn't feel it's a variance with a purpose.

Gascon said there's a low income housing issue in the community and every unit that is shut down in the urban core is displaced to the outskirts of the city with high infrastructure costs.

Harrod said that Ms. Davis' concerns were well taken, but for generations, there were not seas of apartments around town available to students and the only game in town was the Oread Neighborhood. The applicant is simply asking to use the property the way it's been used for at least 50 years, yet there is a desire imposed by the code to claw the structure back into compliance with the existing code.

Gascon noted that the existing code also post-dates the structure, and the code doesn't acknowledge a natural increase in intensity of use.

ACTION TAKEN

Motioned by Wisner, seconded by Wilbur, to deny the variance request.

Clark asked if the variance is denied if they're able to reapply for the variance if they gain legal non-conforming status.

Weik said there's a one year waiting period before they can reapply, unless they came back with a substantially different request.

Clark asked if the applicant can withdraw.

Weik said no, and it could also not be deferred at this point.

Motion carried 4-2, Gascon and Harrod dissented.

ITEM NO. 5 VARIANCE FROM THE PARKING AND DRIVEWAY STANDARDS FOR A DETACHED DWELLING; 718 ASH STREET

B-18-00438: A request for a variance as provided in Section 20-1309 of the Land Development Code of the City of Lawrence, Kansas, 2018 edition. The request is for a variance from the surfacing requirements for parking and driveway standards required by 20-913(e)(1) of the City Code for a detached dwelling. The applicant is seeking a variance from this code standard to allow for the construction of a gravel driveway. The property is located at 718 Ash Street. Submitted by Stephen Evans, property owner of record.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Mortensen presented the item.

Gascon asked if staff had direct communication with the neighbor.

Mortensen said not until the staff report was completed.

Wisner said the adjacent property owner is ok with the gravel but staff was not aware at the time the staff report was written.

Mortensen said correct, and the application was submitted for 718 Ash Street only.

Wisner asked if the staff report would have been different had that information been provided.

Mortensen said it could have.

Wilbur asked about the previous variance mentioned by staff.

Mortensen said that variance was for an existing driveway whereas this is a brand new house and driveway.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION

Mr. Stephen Evans, property owner, explained ongoing plans for developing his property and 722 Ash Street. He discussed the prevalence of gravel in the area and sustainability concerns in support of his request.

Mr. Ken Peters, said he's the project contractor and property owner of 722 Ash Street, with a contract to sell the property to Kent Williams. He discussed the proposed construction methods of the driveway and expressed his support for the variance.

Mr. Kent Williams said his interest is in the 722 Ash property. He expressed support for the variance request and the proposed approach to move forward with the properties.

Wilbur asked what they feel is a hardship.

Evans said he struggled with that criteria because he felt it was the right thing to do as opposed to being a hardship.

Gascon clarified- he asked if flooding is an issue on the property.

Evans said it's a threat. He added that one hardship might be the sequencing of the construction.

Gascon asked if Peters agreed that the sequencing of the construction is a hardship.

Peters said generally, yes. He further explained the plan for constructing the driveways.

Clark asked if they could speak to the condition of the south side of Ash Street between 710 and 740 when it rains.

Peters said absolutely. He explained that it's not a direct problem for their properties, but if they were to add concrete to their properties it would directly affect others with runoff.

Clark said he lived at 730 Ash Street for several years, and rain in that section immediately pooled.

Peters added that there are no culverts under the driveways.

Harrod asked about the option of semi-permeable pavers.

Peters explained that they just trap the water and then it must evaporate.

Mortensen clarified that staff couldn't make a decision on the permeability issue without considering 722 Ash Street.

No public comment.

ACTION TAKEN

Motioned by Wilbur, seconded by Clark, to close public comment for the item.

Unanimously approved 6-0.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Harrod asked if there were similar variances granted in the area.

Mortensen explained that there have been similar variance requests both granted and denied.

Clark reiterated his comments about flooding on Ash Street.

Gascon asked if the ditches or street floods.

Clark said both, but mostly the culverts because there is no drainage. He said the subject properties are at the crest, and the flooding might be a bigger issue for their neighbors.

Gascon said another compelling hardship is the use of the property as a whole and the potential loss of trees.

Harrod said they should view the criteria as a whole.

Wilbur said the flood hazard should be a consideration.

Gascon felt adjacency to the river levee makes it unique.

Shipley said she was leaning toward uniqueness due to the flood hazard on Ash Street.

Gascon said they're in a unique position of being at the crest where the water comes from. He felt a compelling hardship argument was the requirement for creating a curb cut to gain occupancy and then having to possibly rip it back out.

Wisner concurred that the conditions are intertwined- he could make an argument for all five conditions being met. He agreed that gravel was the best option.

Gascon noted that the hardship of flooding has nothing to do with FEMA floodplain guidelines.

Wisner agreed but said that staff can't deviate from those standards. He felt the staff recommendation was appropriate but the Board can make an alternative judgment.

Wisner said he would be comfortable approving the variance.

Board members agreed the conditions were satisfied.

Mortensen clarified that the variance is only for 718 Ash Street.

ACTION TAKEN

Motioned by Wisner, seconded by Clark, to approve the variance request and that all five conditions have been met.

Unanimously approved 6-0.

They took a five minute break and Gascon recused himself from the Board.

**ITEM NO. 6 VARIANCES FROM THE SETBACK STANDARDS AND FENCE HEIGHT
FOR A RESIDENTIAL DWELLING; 941 PENNSYLVANIA STREET**

B-18-00429: A request for a variance as provided in Section 20-1309 of the Land Development Code of the City of Lawrence, Kansas, 2018 edition. The first request is for a variance from the 5 foot interior side setback standard required by Section 20-601(a) of the City Code for the RS5 (Single-Dwelling Residential) District to 1 foot. The second request is for a variance from the 20 foot front setback required by Section 20-601(a) to 7 feet. The third request is for a variance from the 20 foot front setback required by Section 20-601(a) to 5 feet. The fourth request is for a variance from the 5 foot interior side setback standard required by Section 20-601(a) to 0 foot to construct a retaining wall/fence totaling 8 feet in height. The property is located at 941 Pennsylvania Street. Submitted by John A. Gascon, property owner of record.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Mortensen presented the item.

Clark asked if there is an elevation drawing.

Mortensen said the applicant might be able to provide one.

Clark asked if the height change is over 945 Pennsylvania Street.

Mortensen explained that 945 Pennsylvania Street was regraded so it now sits higher than 941 Pennsylvania Street.

Clark asked if the height of the fence will be 8 feet at 945 Pennsylvania Street and 6 feet at 941 Pennsylvania Street because it's at a lower grade.

Mortensen said the height of the retaining wall and fence has yet to be determined but the applicant can address that question.

Wilbur asked about the 10 feet max height guideline.

Weik said she would find that code language.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION

Mr. John Gascon, applicant, explained that the max height of 10 feet is allowed when there is a difference in zoning- such as residential to commercial- otherwise residential code is capped at 6 feet. He explained that there are grade changes that will ultimately affect the height of the wall and fence. He noted that the house was built before existence of code, and explained the variance requests. He added that the request will also go to the Historic Resources Commission (HRC) because the house is in environs. He explained that a tree fell on his home and the various repercussions of that incident.

Shipley asked if the HRC had to review the foundation work.

Gascon said he did, it was approved administratively.

Harrod asked the applicant to explain the drainage issue.

Gascon explained the natural slope of the properties and the consequences of the recent changes in grade.

Harrod said the retaining wall will stop the migration of soil and water toward his property but also helps soil erosion on the neighbor's property.

Gascon said the soil would be retained and the water would be re-directed toward the alley.

Harrod asked if he's aware when that permit was pulled if anyone was aware of the collateral consequences.

Gascon explained that he's done some research on water intrusion and case law is mostly related to agricultural uses.

Shipley asked if they plan to list the house on any historic register.

Gascon said the house doesn't have much historic character- it's had six additions- so he didn't feel it would be eligible.

Shipley asked about the front yard setback variance request.

Gascon said it's unique because the structure was built before the existence of any code, and its presentation to the street is much closer than what would be built today. He noted that he provided some documentation on front porches in support of the porch he has proposed, and due to the setback requirements he would not be able to build a front porch that is functional or ADA compliant.

Weik clarified that the 6 feet fence height is covered in the fence requirements for dwelling purposes.

No public comment.

ACTION TAKEN

Motioned by Wilbur, seconded by Wisner, to close public comment for the item.

Unanimously approved 5-0.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Clark asked for thoughts regarding uniqueness. He felt that the first three variance requests were no-brainers as far as maintaining what is existing. He asked for thoughts on uniqueness.

Harrod said factors such as the age of house and the home's total nonconformity create a need for variances for its existing conditions.

Clark added that there's also a convincing argument that the proposed porch was similar to one that existed historically. He felt that was unique.

Wilbur said this would not adversely affect property owners, there's hardship because the porch is not functional, and it appears his requests are beneficial to neighbors.

Shipley added that the applicant doesn't have to construct a new porch.

Clark did not feel the requests were adverse to the public health, safety, and welfare, and the uniqueness is a factor when meeting the spirit and intent of the code.

Shipley asked if there's a sidewalk in front.

Gascon said yes, and he encouraged the Board to read the written responses in his application.

Clark asked for thoughts regarding the variance request for fence height.

Shipley said the retaining wall seems necessary but the privacy fence does not.

Clark explained that the severe grade change and yard configuration is unique, where privacy is desirable and height has been artificially adjusted.

Harrod said that granting the variances will only help adjacent the property owner.

Clark said the privacy factor goes both ways as well.

Wilbur said it's likely that if the neighbor had issues with the requests they would have expressed them.

Clark asked about the hardship.

Wilbur said the grade issue wasn't caused by the property owner and there is some expectation of privacy.

Wisner felt the 6 feet height requirement was a hardship.

Clark said he didn't believe the height of the fence would affect health, safety, or morals and that it's not opposed to the general spirit or intent of the chapter.

The Board agreed.

ACTION TAKEN

Motioned by Wilbur, seconded by Harrod, to approve the variances as recommended in the staff report.

Unanimously approved 5-0.

Gascon rejoined the Board.

ITEM NO. 7 MISCELLANEOUS

A. There was no other business to come before the Board.

Motioned by Clark, seconded by Wisner, to adjourn the meeting.

MEETING ADJOURNED 9:44 PM