

**GAINESVILLE PLANNING AND APPEALS BOARD
MINUTES OF MEETING
JUNE 14, 2016**

CALL TO ORDER Chairman Carter at 5:30 p.m.

Members Present: Chairman Doug Carter, Vice-Chair Jane Fleming, and Board Members Connie Rucker, Eddie Martin, Sr., Carmen Delgado and Lemuel Betancourt

Members Absent: Board Member George Hokayem

Staff Present: Community Development Director Rusty Ligon, Planning Manager Matt Tate and Recording Secretary Judy Foster

Others Present: Council Members Zack Thompson and George Wangemann

MINUTES OF MAY 10, 2016

There was a motion to approve the minutes as presented.

Motion made by Vice-Chair Fleming
Motion seconded by Board Member Martin
Vote – 6 favor, 1 absent (Hokayem)

OLD BUSINESS

A. Variance Request

- 1) Request from **Aneesh Patel** to vary the stream buffer requirement on a 1.84± acres tract located on the south side of Browns Bridge Road, east of Delta Drive (a/k/a **1745 Browns Bridge Road SW**), having a zoning classification of General Business (G-B).
Ward Number: Five
Tax Parcel Number(s): 01-127-001-070
Request: Hotel

There was a motion to remove the request from the table and allow for public comments.

Motion made by Vice-Chair Fleming
Motion seconded by Board Member Delgado
Vote – 6 favor, 1 absent (Hokayem)

Staff Presentation: Planning Manager Matt Tate stated he would not give a full summary of the request since it was old business. However, he stated that staff had two separate meetings with the applicant regarding changes to the site plan to better protect Flat Creek and he would let the applicant share those details.

Applicant Presentation: **Brian Kimsey**, 1170 Manor Ridge Drive, Bishop, Georgia, stated he was with Carter Engineering Consultants and filling in for the Project Manager Mark Campbell who was on vacation. The proposed hotel never encroached into the State 25-foot buffer; however, after modifications, the proposed

hotel is now positioned completely out of the City 25-foot buffer but remains within the City 25-foot impervious buffer. Due to the site configuration, it was difficult to fit the project into the site but the revision was a compromise in which the applicant could agree. Mr. Kimsey stated the footprint of the proposed hotel was reduced in size from 14,000 sq. ft. to 12,000 sq. ft. While the State 25-foot buffer would not be impacted, he stated there would be some impact to the City 25-foot buffer merely from a construction standpoint such as the mitigation concept to install a rain garden which would run the full length of the hotel and provide pollution control and stormwater runoff control. The northern back corner of the proposed hotel would be fully within the City 25-foot impervious buffer, but would taper off to 5-feet at the southern end of the hotel because of its positioning. Mr. Kimsey pointed out the dotted areas on the revised site plan where pervious pavement would be used, including within the City 25-foot impervious buffer. There is also a bioretention area within the parking lot. The water, as much as possible, would be directed toward the existing master stormwater pond which would be upgraded and maintained to meet current standards as a part of the project. He stated they do not have a landscape plan at this time; however, within the rain garden, all plants would be native species and would include flowering plants, shrubs and trees within the area. Mr. Kimsey distributed a rendering which showed the side elevation of the proposed hotel and rain garden. During all phases of construction, Best Management Practices would be followed to meet all state and local requirements. He requested approval of the variance and stated the property owner lived in the community and wanted the site to be as well maintained as possible.

FAVOR: None

OPPOSE: Chairman Carter stated the Board received an email today from Wilton Rooks in opposition to the request.

Tom Vivelo, 5985 Nachoochee Trail, Flowery Branch, stated he was on the Lake Lanier Association Board of Directors and shared information as provided by Wilton Rooks. The Lake Lanier Association has been advocating for over 40 years keeping the lake clean, full and safe. They have worked on Flat Creek for several years and have spent a lot of money cleaning it up, as has the City, and felt it was in the best shape it has been in years. Their position on this issue was that stream buffers were put into place after a lot of research and study and the buffers are best for all streams that feed into the lake, but especially this one since it has had so many problems in the past. He feared the approval of the request would harm the good that has been done over the past few years to clean up Flat Creek, and could even damage Lake Lanier since it was under a lot of stress from the growth and developments along its shores. He stated there were always issues with pollution and siltation during construction even with the best of intentions. Mr. Vivelo stated Lake Lanier was an irreplaceable resource, noting it was the source of our water and provided a lot of revenue, so any risks of impacts to the lake should be well thought out. He stated the "highest and best use" of the property should be more than just getting the highest land value for taxation because it was more than a piece of dirt, and having a development of this nature so close to Flat Creek, which has had a history of problems, should be taken into consideration. He feared approval of the request could set a precedent for other developments along Flat Creek and other tributaries which would all be to the detriment of Lake Lanier.

Pat Horgan, 1004 Lakemont Drive, reiterated his opposition to any variance on any stream that enters into Lake Lanier. He felt the location of the proposed hotel was the last place to depart from the 75-foot buffer since Flat Creek flows directly into Lake Lanier and was probably one of the most polluted streams in all of Georgia already. He asked where to draw the line if not here. Mr. Horgan stated that if the proposed hotel could not be built without the stream buffer variance, then it is not suited for the property. He suggested reconfiguring the parking lot and moving the hotel 45-feet to the northwest which would solve both the environmental problem as well as the applicant's problem in positioning the hotel.

Planning and Appeals Board Comments: None

There was a motion for approval to vary the stream buffer requirement from 75-feet to 25-feet with one condition as proposed by staff.

Motion made by Board Member Martin.

Motion seconded by Vice-Chair Fleming; however, she asked that a condition be added to include the standards as shown on the revised site plan.

Board Member Martin agreed with Vice-Chair Fleming and amended his motion to include the additional condition:

Conditions

1. Prior to a development permit being issued for the proposed development, the property owner/developer of the property shall provide a detailed landscape mitigation plan for the disturbed area within the 75-foot stream buffer. At minimum, the plan shall include pre, intermediate and post erosion and sedimentation control measures; as well as a landscape plan consisting of native trees and vegetation acceptable to the Gainesville Community Development Department and the Gainesville Water Resources Department.
2. The development standards within the applicant's revised site plan, dated June 3, 2016, shall be enforced and subject to the Community Development Director approval.

Vote – 6 favor, 1 absent (Hokayem)

NEW BUSINESS

A. Variance Request

- 1) Request from **Bryan Day** to vary the front yard setback requirement and the number of parking spaces required on a 0.69± acre tract located on the northwest side of the intersection of Browns Bridge Road and Pearl Nix Parkway (a/k/a **1500 Browns Bridge Road SW**), having a zoning classification of General Business (G-B).
Ward Number: Five
Tax Parcel Number(s): 00-119C-001-025A
Request: Restaurant

Staff Presentation: Planning Manager Matt Tate gave the following staff presentation:

The applicant is proposing to vary the front yard setback and parking standards for a new 11,000 square foot Golden Corral restaurant. The subject property is 0.69± acre in size and contains a 5,219 square foot Folks restaurant that is to be demolished. The property is located on the northwest side of the intersection of Browns Bridge Road and Pearl Nix Parkway and is located within the Gateway Corridor Overlay Zone. Specifically, the applicant is requesting to vary the front yard setback from Pearl Nix Parkway and Browns Bridge Road from 40-feet to 16-feet and to vary the number of required parking spaces from 88 spaces to 19 spaces. The applicant states the remaining spaces will be shared parking spaces within the adjacent shopping center. The front entrance of the proposed building will be oriented towards the existing shopping center opposite of Pearl Nix Parkway. The applicant is basing the hardship on the shape and size of the lot and its corner lot configuration. The applicant states that shared parking is necessary to meet the parking requirements for any size building.

The Planning Division staff recommended **conditional approval** of the request based on the size of the lot and its corner lot configuration with one condition.

Applicant Presentation: Bryan Day, 4371 Watley Place, Hoschton, stated he was requesting a variance of the front setback, noting the building would not encroach any further than where the current Folks restaurant is located. He stated they have a warranty deed that allows a non-exclusive easement for access, ingress and egress, and shared parking so they have permission from the property owner to share parking within the adjacent shopping center. Mr. Day stated they revised the site plan which includes six additional parking spaces for a total of 25 spaces.

Chairman Carter asked the applicant if he had any issues with changing the exterior rear facade of the building which would face Pearl Nix Parkway so as to have the appearance of a front facade. Mr. Day stated the owner was agreeable to that condition.

Vice-Chair Fleming asked about the dumpster location. Mr. Day stated the dumpster orientation would be turned in, enclosed and bricked so it would not be noticeable. Planning Manager Matt Tate added that the Code required all dumpsters to be enclosed and architecturally compatible.

Mr. Tate stated he did not have the revised site plan in which Mr. Day referred; however, the number of parking spaces changing from 19 to 25 spaces should be considered by the Board.

FAVOR: None

OPPOSE: Scott Hunter, 885 Mountclaire Drive, Cumming, stated he represented SC Gainesville Georgia, LLC, who owns the shopping center with the shared access agreement. He stated they were opposed to the variance simply because there was not enough parking to support this type of use. He stated the easement agreement Mr. Day spoke of was from the 1970's. The current restaurant is 5,200 sq. ft. and the applicant is proposing to double the size of the building which would not provide sufficient parking for all the shopping center tenants, especially with the use

changing to a buffet style restaurant. His strongest opposition was the intent of the access agreement was not to allow as much parking as they wanted for the corner lot, but to support the current structure they were proposing to build at that time. He stated it would also create hardships for tenants and adversely affect property values. Mr. Hunter stated they had spent money to keep tenants in the shopping center since Office Depot left. Harbor Freight has now located in the shopping center and expects full parking and included in their lease, they also have the right to hold tent sales which they have often. Big Lots is expanding into an existing 10,000 sq. ft. space and are expecting full parking. He stated as of the last survey, the shopping center currently has 586 parking spaces and 13 handicap parking spaces. Mr. Hunter stated during due diligence for the refinancing of their mortgage, they were informed they are currently 46 parking spaces below current regulations. He stated that approval of the variance would cause problems for their tenants and make it difficult to keep tenants in the shopping center.

Vice-Chair Fleming asked if the parking requirement in which Mr. Hunter referred was from the State, City or the shopping center. Mr. Hunter reiterated it came out during due diligence for the refinancing of their mortgage.

Chairman Carter asked for clarification if that would have been a City requirement. Community Development Director Rusty Ligon stated the shopping center was constructed prior to current parking standards and he could not calculate what it would be now without the square footage. Planning Manager Matt Tate stated parking requirements are determined by use and square footage and when the current regulations were adopted in 2005, it was written to be more flexible with maximum and minimum parking and encouraged shared parking because you usually see an excess of parking at older shopping centers, except during the holidays. Mr. Tate agreed with the addition of Harbor Freight, there has been more parking spaces used in the center, but he could not quote what the parking requirement should be without the square footage.

Board Member Martin asked if Mr. Hunter did not think a Golden Corral restaurant would enhance the other businesses in the shopping center. Mr. Hunter stated he understood people having that opinion, but they currently have two long standing tenants within the shopping center that are buffet style restaurants which actually draw customers in because they are located within the shopping center. However, if Golden Corral was located on the corner, their customers would not likely drive back into the shopping center to see what other tenants have to offer. He stated some tenants may like the proposal, but it would also hurt others.

Michael Foy, 1612 Sweet Branch Trail, Grayson, stated he had been the owner of Stevie B's located in the shopping center since 2009. His son, Michael Foy, Jr. joined him at the podium. He shared concerns that the proposal would put pressure on his current customer base if they had to park farther away. He has been in the restaurant business all his life and he experienced a similar situation before when a third buffet restaurant opened up near his and it cut his sales by half. He believed the same thing would happen here and he would have to declare bankruptcy even though he had never done it before. He apologized for being emotional but his business provided for his and his son's family. Mr. Foy asked the Board to see the request from his perspective.

Chairman Carter asked if Mr. Foy's concern was the buffet style of the proposed restaurant as opposed to the existing style restaurant being more of a competitor for his business. **Michael Foy, Jr.** stated there were two issues: 1) the proposed restaurant would take 150 to 200 parking spaces within the shopping center parking lot, not just the 25 spaces as proposed in the request because Golden Corral would seat 300 to 400 customers. This would limit the parking for the shopping center especially when tent events are ongoing; and 2) the buffet segment is very limited, meaning people who go to buffets usually always go to buffets. He stated his customers would go next door to the Hibachi Buffet the day after visiting Stevie B's so you get a lot of overlap and the same area cannot handle three buffets. He noted Golden Corral offers pizza and Asian food so it would hurt both the other buffets business. If it hurts all the restaurants by having three buffets in the same area, the shopping center could stand to lose three tenants. He stated Stevie B's have 30 employees from ranging from part-time to full-time who could lose their jobs.

Jack Yang, 4165 Deer Spring Way, stated Hao Yang, Lindi Yang and himself were owners of the Hibachi Buffet and were opposed to the request as well. He agreed having three restaurants in one shopping center was too many and they would either have to close down or lose half of their business. He stated if Golden Corral came into the shopping center, they would lose 40 to 50 potential employees.

Li Jing, 1500 Browns Bridge Road, Suite 117, stated she was the manager of the Hibachi Buffet and spoke on behalf of the employees. She stated they have over 20 employees and their income supports, either fully or partially, their entire family and if they were to lose their income, they would not be able to pay their rent or feed their children.

REBUTTAL: **Bryan Day** stated that unfortunately, he was not made aware of the opposition of the shopping center owners in regards to the validity of the deed and Golden Corral has not had enough time to consult with their attorneys and review it. Mr. Day stated he was not an attorney; however, the deed grants a non-exclusive easement which was not restricted to a certain size building but simply grants shared access. He stated that the aerial photo of the shopping center showed all occupied parking spaces were around the mall area instead of where Golden Corral customers would park, noting he did not know when the photo was taken. He stated he could not make any calculations about the parking lot, but he had been there several times and had never seen it full.

Chairman Carter stated the Board would render a decision based on the variance request solely. Any legal disputes regarding ingress and egress, perpetual easements, etc. was a civil matter and not within the purview of this Board to render a legal decision in that regard.

Planning and Appeals Board Comments: Vice-Chair Fleming hoped the diverse food services would actually complement each other.

There was a motion to approve the request to vary the front yard setback requirement from 40-feet to 16-feet and to vary the number of required parking spaces from 88 spaces to 25 spaces with the following condition:

Condition

The size, scale and exterior materials of the proposed building shall be consistent with the architectural renderings submitted with the variance application, except that the rear (east) side of the building facing Pearl Nix Parkway shall have an architectural appearance of a front exterior facade.

Motion made by Vice-Chair Fleming

Motion seconded by Board Member Martin

Vote – 6 favor, 1 absent (Hokayem)

B. Annexation Requests

- 1) Request from **David Pierce Family, LP** to annex a 0.68± acre tract located on the north side of West Side Drive, east of its intersection with West Carter Street (a/k/a **0 and 1510 West Side Drive**), and to establish zoning as Residential-II (R-II).

Ward Number: Five

Tax Parcel Number(s): 00-126-011-008 and 009

Request: Sewer for two existing single-family homes

Staff Presentation: Planning Manager Matt Tate gave the following staff presentation:

The applicant is proposing to annex the subject property with a zoning of Residential-II (R-II) for the purpose of connecting to sanitary sewer. The subject property is contiguous to the City limits of Gainesville to the north and south and is currently zoned Residential-II (R-II) within unincorporated Hall County. The subject area includes two parcels, each containing a single-family rental home that previously had failed septic systems. According to the Department of Water Resources, the two homes were recently provided sewer due to the environmental impacts, and the properties need to be annexed. The existing homes are older and in need of improvement. There are no other changes proposed at this time.

The Gainesville 2030 Future Development Map for the City of Gainesville places the subject property within the *Mixed Use General* land use category. This category includes areas containing or planned for a mixture of land uses including office, neighborhood retail, and residential. According to the Character Area map for the City of Gainesville, the subject property is located within the *Browns Bridge Corridor* character area. This character area encourages long-term activity center nodes at the Memorial Park Drive and Pearl Nix Parkway intersections. Targeted redevelopment of outdated strip commercial is encouraged. Browns Bridge Road could be a future Community Improvement District for the corridor businesses. The addition of multi-family, mixed-income housing may be a redevelopment option for the areas adjacent to the commercial hubs. Areas of blighted neighborhoods should be revitalized. Land uses allowed in the Browns Bridge Corridor are medium-density residential, multi-family residential, mixed-use, commercial, light industrial, and parks / recreation / conservation.

The Planning Division staff recommended **conditional approval** of this request based on the Comprehensive Plan and the adjacent single-family uses with three conditions.

Applicant Presentation: Jacky Mathis, 1485 Montrose Drive, stated he represented the David Pierce Family, LP, and noted David Pierce was unable to attend the meeting due to a prior engagement. He asked the annexation request be granted.

Vice-Chair Fleming stated she rode by the subject property and asked if they were agreeable with the proposed conditions as measures would have to be taken to make improvements when coming into the City of Gainesville. Mr. Mathis stated yes, they were in agreement with the conditions, noting the David Pierce Family, LP owned several properties within the City already so they knew what it would entail and were willing to abide by City ordinances. Ms. Fleming asked if condition three could be changed to give the applicant 60 days instead of 120 days to address the issues. Chairman Carter stated that could be addressed in a motion by the Board. Ms. Fleming asked Mr. Mathis if the 60 days would be a problem with the applicant as the properties need to be cleaned up. Mr. Mathis stated it would not be a problem.

FAVOR: None

OPPOSE: None

Planning and Appeals Board Comments: Board Member Martin asked what would happen if the applicant did not comply with the conditions. Community Development Director Rusty Ligon stated that since the applicant was aware of the time period to become compliant and if he did not meet the requirements, a citation would be issued by the Code Enforcement Division within a week after the time period elapsed.

There was a motion to recommend approval of the request with the conditions as proposed by staff and to amend condition three to give the applicant 60 days instead of 120 days to address the issues:

Conditions

1. The exterior appearance of the subject properties shall be improved by the removal of all indoor furniture and appliances displayed outdoors, metal siding material used for screening, and debris.
2. There shall be no yard parking for any motor vehicles within the subject properties. All vehicles shall be parked on a hard surface which may include concrete, asphalt or an approved pervious surface material. All other areas shall be stabilized with new vegetation which may include the addition of grass, shrubs, mulch and other landscape materials acceptable to the Community Development Department Director.
3. The preceding zoning conditions shall be required to be addressed by the property owner within 60 days of the effective date of the annexation.

Motion made by Board Member Delgado

Motion seconded by Vice-Chair Fleming

Vote – 6 favor, 1 absent (Hokayem)

- 2) Request from **Oak Hall Companies, LLC** to annex a 26.2± acres tract located east of Dawsonville Highway and on the north side of the intersection of Strickland Drive and Sportsman Club Road, with road frontage on Karen Lane (a/k/a **0 and 2209 Karen Lane; 2106, 2234 and 2242 Sportsman Club Road; and 2049 Strickland Drive**), and to establish zoning as Planned Unit Development (P-U-D).
Ward Number: One
Tax Parcel Number(s): 00-109-003-001, 004, 005; 00-109B-000-001, 002A and 036
Request: Active adult community

Staff Presentation: Planning Manager Matt Tate stated the applicant withdrew the annexation request; however, since the legal ad was published and public notice letters mailed out, a motion was required to accept the withdrawal.

There was a motion to accept the withdrawal by the applicant.

Motion made by Board Member Martin
Motion seconded by Board Member Rucker
Vote – 6 favor, 1 absent (Hokayem)

- 3) Request from **Spring Road Group, LLC** to annex a 10.06± acres tract located on the northeast side of Spring Road, east of its intersection with McEver Road and having road frontage at the terminus of Pine Circle Drive (a/k/a **2360, 2370, 2374, 2376, 2380, 2400 and 2410 Spring Road**), and to establish zoning as Residential-II (R-II).
Ward Number: Five
Tax Parcel Number(s): 08-005-000-041, 042 and 045
Request: Active adult community

Staff Presentation: Planning Manager Matt Tate gave the following staff presentation:

The applicant is proposing to annex the subject property with a zoning of Residential-II (R-II) for a 110-unit active adult community. The property is 10.06± acres in size and is zoned Residential-II (R-II) within Hall County and is contiguous to the City limits to the north and west. The property consists of three tracts of land and contains 11 mobile homes, one site-built home and numerous accessory structures that are mostly occupied and are to be removed. The proposed development is for an active adult community and proposes a total of 110 residential units. Specifically, a total of 50-units are proposed within a three-story apartment style building and 60-units are to be attached two bedroom units with one-car garages. Amenities are to include club / community house, tennis court and swimming pool. Primary access is proposed from Spring Road and a secondary service / emergency access proposed from the Pine Circle Drive cul-de-sac.

According to the Solid Waste Division of the Gainesville Public Works Department, the City of Gainesville will provide solid waste pickup for the sixty (60) units, 1-story dwellings. However, the proposed fifty (50) units, multi-story apartment building will require a private dumpster service according to Section 4-3-3(b) of the Solid Waste ordinance.

According to the Gainesville Police Department, the proposed annexation could have a slight increase in calls for service. The additional calls for service will soon require additional officers be added to the GPD to maintain the type of service the citizens of Gainesville expect.

The Gainesville 2030 Future Development Map for the City of Gainesville places the subject property within the *Low-Medium Density Residential* land use category which includes areas containing or planned for single-family detached or semi-detached housing at densities ranging from one to four dwelling units per acre. Limited light office uses such as a home occupation or other similar light office uses are acceptable as well. The proposed development proposes a density of 10.93 dwelling units per acre.

According to the Character Area map for the City of Gainesville, the subject property is located within the *Browns Bridge Corridor* character area. The addition of multi-family, mixed-income housing may be a redevelopment option for the areas adjacent to the commercial hubs. Areas of blighted neighborhoods should be revitalized. Land uses allowed in the Browns Bridge Corridor are medium-density residential, multi-family residential, mixed-use, commercial, light industrial, and parks / recreation / conservation.

The Planning Division staff recommended **conditional approval** of the request based on the Comprehensive Plan and the adjacent residential and non-residential land uses with nine conditions.

Applicant Presentation: Alan Travis, 3453 Holcomb Bridge Road, Peachtree Corners, stated the applicant was satisfied with the recommendation of staff and was agreeable with the proposed conditions. They were looking forward to the development and believed it would be a great asset and fill a need in the community.

Board Member Martin asked if the applicant had a problem with keeping the project an active adult community and not turning them into apartments. Mr. Travis stated, no, that was the recommendation of staff and the applicant was agreeable with keeping it an active adult community.

FAVOR: None

OPPOSE: None

Planning and Appeals Board Comments: None

There was a motion to recommend approval with the following conditions:

Conditions

- 1. The development standards within the narrative, site plan and architectural renderings submitted with the applicant's annexation application shall be made part of the zoning ordinance, and shall be subject to the Community Development Director approval.**

2. The approved use for the property shall be limited to an active adult community for seniors not to exceed 110 units as stated within the applicant's narrative. The residential units may include detached single-family homes, townhomes, condominiums, duplex and multi-family apartments.
3. All exterior walls of all buildings shall be constructed of a combination of stucco or fiber cement siding and a minimum of 50% brick and/or stone. No vinyl siding shall be allowed excluding soffit areas.
4. The front and rear of all buildings shall present an architectural front elevation finish as presented within the photographs and architectural rendering provided with the zoning application.
5. The owner / developer of the property shall provide a minimum 25-foot wide evergreen vegetated buffer along the property lines adjacent to the single-family properties. Additional evergreen buffer trees shall be planted within the perimeter buffer area where needed. The intent of the buffer is to supplement the existing vegetation with buffer trees to provide for an effective buffer. The spacing, size and type of trees planted shall be subject to Community Development Department Director approval.
6. Access points, interior roadways, sidewalks, decorative streetlights, storm sewers, and garbage pick-up for the development shall be provided and maintained by the property owner/developer.
7. Access point and design of Spring Road and Pine Circle Drive shall be reviewed and approved by the Gainesville Public Works Department and Hall County Public Works Department. All road improvements associated with access to the subject property and found to be within the scope of the proposed development shall be at the full expense of the owner/developer.
8. Any and all unoccupied nonconforming uses, structures and/or situations shall be removed and corrected within ninety (90) days of the effective date of the annexation ordinance in accordance with applicable provisions of the Unified Land Development Code.
9. An updated as-built boundary survey/plat of the subject property, indicating all improvements and conditions of zoning shall be made a part of any final plat and recorded prior to obtaining a Certificate of Occupancy.

Motion made by Vice-Chair Fleming
Motion seconded by Board Member Rucker
Vote – 6 favor, 1 absent (Hokayem)

ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Carter adjourned the meeting at 6:30 p.m.

Motion made by Board Member Delgado
Motion seconded by Board Member Martin
Vote – 6 favor, 1 absent (Hokayem)

Respectfully submitted,

Doug Carter, Chairman

Judy Foster, Recording Secretary