MINUTES FOR THE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MEETING

October 11, 2021

I. CALL TO ORDER – Chair Thomas Glover called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers, 200 East Main Street, Lexington, Kentucky.

II. ATTENDANCE – Members present were: Raquel Carter, Harry Clarke, Thomas Glover, Chad Needham, Chad Walker and Joan Whitman. Branden Gross was absent. Others present were: Tracy Jones, Department of Law; Stephen Parker, Division of Traffic Engineering and Josh Dezarn, Division of Engineering. Planning staff members present were Traci Wade, Autumn Goderwis, and Donna Lewis.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – Mr. Glover announced that the minutes from the August 9, 2021 and the September 13, 2021 meetings would be considered at this time.

Action – A motion was made by Ms. Carter, seconded by Ms. Whitman and carried 6-0 (Gross absent), to **approve** the minutes from the August 9, 2021 and the September 13, 2021 Board of Adjustment meetings.

IV. PUBLIC HEARING ON ZONING APPEALS

A. Swearing of Witnesses – Mr. Glover announced that any applicant or objector to any appeal before the Board who planned to speak, would be sworn in at this time.

Mr. Glover administered the oath to several members of the audience and staff members at this time.

B. Sounding the Agenda - In order to expedite completion of agenda items, Mr. Glover sounded the agenda with regard to any postponements, withdrawals, and items requiring no discussion.

Postponements

1. **PLN-BOA-21-00057: HILLS PROPERTIES** – requested a variance to increase the maximum number of parking spaces allowed from 230 spaces to 236 spaces for a multi-family residential development in a Commercial Center (B-6P) zone, on property located at 3151 Mapleleaf Drive. (Council District 7).

   Representation – Mr. Fred Eastridge, Thoroughbred Engineering, requested a one-month postponement of this application on behalf of the applicant, due to illness of the representing attorney.

   Action – A motion was made by Mr. Needham, seconded by Mr. Clarke and carried 6-0 (Gross absent), to **postpone PLN-BOA-21-00057: HILLS PROPERTIES** – request for a variance to increase the maximum number of parking spaces allowed from 230 spaces to 236 spaces for a multi-family residential development in a Commercial Center (B-6P) zone, on property located at 3151 Mapleleaf Drive, to the November 8, 2021 meeting, based on the applicant's request.

C. Abbreviated Hearing

1. **PLN-BOA-21-00053: CANDICE AND JON SETZER (AMD)** – an amended request for a variance to reduce the required side street side yard from 30' to 10' in order to construct an in-ground swimming pool in a Single Family Residential (R-1D) zone, on property located at 857 Sunny Slope Trace. (Council District 9)

   The Staff Recommended: **Approval,** for the following reasons:
   a. Granting the variance will not have an adverse effect on the public health, safety, or welfare. The pool will be located 10 feet from the street property line in accordance with the Kentucky Residential Building Code.
   b. Granting the variance will not have a negative impact on the character of the general vicinity. While a pool is considered to be a "structure," the visual impact of a pool is significantly less than that of a building. Therefore, a setback variance from, 30' to 10' is generally reasonable.
   c. The location of other structures and the location of the existing easements are special circumstances that limit the available land area for such a structure, which justify the need for a variance.
   d. Granting a variance will not result in an unreasonable circumvention of the Zoning Ordinance. The applicant is going through the appropriate processes to seek approval prior to commencing construction.

This recommendation of approval was made subject to the following conditions:

1. The pool shall be installed at a minimum setback of 10' from the property line along Hollyberry Lane, in accordance with the revised site plan.
2. All necessary encroachment agreements shall be secured prior to beginning construction.
3. All necessary permits shall be obtained from the Division of Building Inspection prior to beginning construction.

Representation – Mrs. Candice and Mr. Jon Setzer, applicants and property owners, were present on behalf of their amended request for a variance in order to construct an in-ground swimming pool.

Board questions – Mr. Clarke asked the applicants what modifications were made to their application in order for it to be recommended for approval by staff, given the fact that it was recommended for disapproval at last month's meeting. Mrs. Setzer stated they were unaware of the requirement of a 10' setback from the property line by the Building Code when they came to last month's meeting. She stated they amended their site plan from their original request of a 6' setback to a 10' setback.

Action – A motion was made by Mr. Clarke, seconded by Ms. Whitman and carried 6-0 (Gross absent), to **approve** **PLN-BOA-21-00053: CANDICE AND JON SETZER (AMD)** – an amended request for a variance to reduce the required side street side yard from 30' to 10' in order to construct an in-ground swimming pool in a Single Family Residential (R-1D) zone, on property located at 857 Sunny Slope Trace, based on staff's recommendation and subject to the three conditions as listed.

2. **PLN-BOA-21-00054: SOUTHERN & JONES PROPERTIES LLC** – requested a variance to reduce the required side yard setback from 6' to 3' in order to construct a duplex within the defined Infill & Redevelopment Area in a High Density Apartment (R-4) zone, on property located at 530 Merino Street (Council District 3).

The Staff Recommended: **Approval**, for the following reasons:

a. The special circumstance that justifies the need for the variance is the 15' sewer easement on the eastern side of the property, which renders 30% of the property unbuildable.
b. Granting the variance should not have an adverse effect on the character of the general vicinity, as there is not a well-defined streetscape, due to a number of the surrounding properties being vacant/undeveloped. Where there are houses nearby, on the same side of Merino Street, they have rather narrow side yards.
c. Granting the variance will not allow an unreasonable circumvention of the Zoning Ordinance. The applicant is going through the appropriate process and has applied for the variance prior to commencing construction.

This recommendation of approval was made subject to the following conditions:

1. The duplex shall be constructed in accordance with the submitted application materials and site plan.
2. All necessary permits and/or approvals shall be obtained from the Divisions of Planning, Building Inspection, and Traffic Engineering prior to construction and occupancy.

Representation – Mr. David Jones, applicant and property owner was present on behalf of this application for a variance to reduce the required side yard setback in order to construct a duplex.

Board questions – Mr. Clarke asked Mr. Jones what he planned to do with the trees on the subject property. Mr. Jones responded that there were a few nearly dead trees on the subject property. He also stated that the lots on Merino St. are very narrow and ninety-nine percent of the tree canopy that can be seen when driving by are on the property adjoining the subject property; therefore, he will not be removing those trees. Mr. Clarke thanked the applicant for his response.

Action – A motion was made by Ms. Carter, seconded by Mr. Clarke and carried 6-0 (Gross absent), to **approve** **PLN-BOA-21-00054: SOUTHERN & JONES PROPERTIES LLC** – request for a variance to reduce the required side yard setback from 6' to 3' in order to construct a duplex within the defined Infill & Redevelopment Area in a High Density Apartment (R-4) zone, on property located at 530 Merino St., based on staff's recommendation and subject to the two conditions as listed.

3. **PLN-BOA-21-00055: DBSP, LLC** – requested an administrative appeal to allow the applicant to forego the allowable wall sign on the rear wall of a building in order to allow two wall signs on the side wall of that building in a Commercial Center (B-6P) zone, on property located at 240 Canary Rd. (Council District 4).

The Staff Recommended: **Approval**, for the following reasons:

a. Granting the requested appeal will not adversely affect the public health, safety or welfare; will not alter the character of the general vicinity; and will not cause a hazard or nuisance to the public. The subject property has significant street frontage, but is only accessible by an access easement. Additionally, this shopping center sits at a lower elevation than the streets from which it is visible. These circumstances justify the need for a second sign on the façade facing New Circle Road.
b. The requested appeal will not result in an increase in the number of permitted signs, allow a design feature or type of sign not specifically permitted in the subject zone, nor will it increase the maximum total permitted sign area on a single lot or building. The applicant will forgo a sign on the rear façade of the building and the total allowable area of signage for the wall sign on the New Circle Road façade will be less than 15% of the total wall area, which is the established maximum for each façade or wall face.

This recommendation of approval was made subject to the following conditions:
1. All wall signs shall be installed in accordance with the submitted application materials and site plan.
2. No wall sign shall be permitted on the rear façade.
3. All necessary permits shall be obtained from the Division of Building Inspection, prior to installation of the signs.
4. Board of Adjustment action shall be noted on the corollary Final Development Plan for the site.

Representation – Ms. Angel Robinson, Main Event Entertainment, was present on behalf of the applicant and explained the applicant's request for this administrative appeal.

Board questions – Mr. Needham asked if the two signs proposed to face New Circle Rd. are less in size than one larger sign. Ms. Robinson confirmed that to be true and added there is no sign proposed for the rear side of the building, which would face the multi-family residential area. Mr. Needham stated that he did not notice two signs in the most recent signage elevation documents, which the Board received earlier that day. Ms. Robinson confirmed there are two signs; one that says "The Main Event" and closer to the front façade, and on the corner of the side façade there is a sign depicted that says "Eat, Bowl Play". She continued, saying on the front façade there is an "Eat, Bowl Play" sign that is recessed three and one-half feet inside the building and structurally supported from the ceiling.

Mr. Glover asked if there were going to be signs on two walls. Ms. Robinson stated there would be signage on three sides of the building with no signs on the rear facade.

Ms. Goderwis directed the Board's attention to the overhead screen, on which the elevations of the proposed project were displayed. Ms. Robinson further clarified the images to the Board members.

Action – A motion was made by Mr. Needham, seconded by Ms. Carter and carried 6-0 (Gross absent), to **approve** **PLN-BOA-21-00055: DBSP, LLC** – request for an administrative appeal to allow the applicant to forego the allowable wall sign on the rear wall of a building in order to allow two wall signs on the side wall of that building in an Commercial Center (B-6P) zone, on property located at 240 Canary Rd., based on staff's recommendation and subject to the four conditions as listed.

D. Discussion Items

1. **PLN-BOA-21-00039: THE ARCADIA COMPANY LLC** – requested conditional uses to establish a school for academic instruction and an accessory nursery school in an Agricultural Rural (A-R) zone, on property located at 5768 Tates Creek Rd. (Council District 12)

The Staff Recommended: **Approval**, for the following reasons:
a. The proposed use should not have an adverse influence on the subject property or the surrounding neighborhood. Traffic impacts should be relatively minor and the school will operate during normal business hours throughout the week.
b. All necessary public services and facilities are or will be available and adequate for the proposed use.

This recommendation of approval was made subject to the following conditions:
1. The school and accessory nursery school shall be established and operated in accordance with the submitted application materials and a revised site plan, demonstrating that the parking lot will be provided behind the proposed school, unless such a configuration will conflict with the septic system.
2. All parking areas shall be designed in accordance with the recommendations of the Division of Traffic Engineering.
3. The septic system shall be reviewed and approved, as necessary, by the Fayette County Board of Health.
4. All necessary permits and/or approvals shall be obtained from the Division of Building Inspection prior to occupancy.

Representation – Mr. Jon Woodall, attorney for the applicants, was present and offered to answer any questions from the Board concerning the applicants' request for conditional uses to establish a school for academic instruction and an accessory nursery school.

Board questions – Mr. Needham asked Mr. Woodall if a final decision on the location of the proposed parking lot had been made. Mr. Woodall commented that staff had indicated that the preferred location was at the rear of the building, if it was possible to do so in conjunction with the septic system. He mentioned that the septic system had been approved by the Health Department. Mr. Woodall stated that he had not discussed the location of the parking lot with the applicants since the septic system was approved, but he felt it could be located at the rear of the building.

Mr. Clarke mentioned that the majority of the schools in Fayette County have parking in the front of the school. He stated the reasoning for that was ready access to the offices. Mr. Clarke said that he did not believe a requirement for parking in the rear was necessary. There was further discussion.

Mr. Woodall introduced the applicants, Mr. Gus LaFontaine and Mrs. Kristin LaFontaine, and gave a brief overview of their backgrounds and of the proposed project.

Mr. LaFontaine explained the principles behind the school he and his wife Kristin currently operate in Madison County, Kentucky on twelve acres of land, and how it is similar to the proposed project.

Mrs. LaFontaine addressed the Board and elaborated on several of the issues that concerned members of the opposition.

Opposition – Mr. Tom Miller, attorney for the opposition, Overbrook Farm, was present on behalf of his client. He directed the Board's attention to the overhead screen, which displayed a video recording of traffic on Tates Creek Road, near the proposed project. Mr. Miller shared concerns of some of the patrons of Overbrook Farm, who board horses at the farm.

Mr. Al Gross, EA Partners, was called as a witness to speak about traffic in the area of the proposed project. Mr. Gross said he visited the site and personally watched the traffic movements and speeds along Tates Creek Road. He expressed concern over the excessive speed of the cars traveling in both directions on Tates Creek Road in the area near the proposed school.

Board questions – Mr. Glover asked Mr. Gross if the proposed school was on the same side of the road as Overbrook Farm, and whether there was an entrance to the farm from Tates Creek Road. Mr. Gross stated that he believed there to be an entrance to Overbrook Farm from Tates Creek Road. Mr. Glover asked how far that entrance was from the proposed school. Mr. Gross replied that he did not know for sure.

Opposition - Mr. Terry Judd, Overbrook Farm Operations Manager, was called as a witness to speak. He stated that the distance between the entrance to Overbrook Farm and the entrance to the proposed project is approximately 100' to 150'. Mr. Judd stated that two farm employees have had automobile accidents within the past two years while waiting to turn into the entrance to the farm. He stated that in his opinion, traffic is going to be a real issue.

Mr. Miller asked Mr. Judd to explain his concerns over 72 children being in fields next to horses. Mr. Judd explained that an individual leases a portion of Overbrook Farm, which is contiguous to the subject property. That individual boards mares and their foals until the foals are yearlings, at which time the foals are taken to the horse sales, where they will hopefully bring a significant sum of money. Mr. Judd explained that if an animal, such as a young horse, is placed in an area that is chaotic, that animal will most likely flee, and in some instances injure itself or worse. He added that fences do not always stop horses; they try to run through them or jump over them.

Board question – Mr. Needham asked for clarification regarding the leasing of Overbrook Farm, and whether the lessee was present in the audience. Mr. Judd stated that individual was not present but she did submit a letter for the Board to review.

Opposition – Mr. Kenneth C. Schlich, II, 5650 Tates Creek Road, was called upon to speak. He explained that he and his mother live on a 40-acre farm adjacent to the subject property. Mr. Schlich expressed his concerns over the current traffic and a presumed increase in traffic should the proposed project be approved, as well as his concerns over small children being near horses. He also shared his concerns with a septic system on the subject property. Mr. Schlich mentioned a need for a stop sign at the intersection of E. Brannon and Tates Creek Road.

Mr. William T. (Bill) Young, Jr., President of Overbook Farm, was called on to speak. He explained the proximity of Overbrook Farm to two large subdivisions and a church. Mr. Young commented that Overbrook Farm had considered putting horses in the pastures near the church, but given the fact there would be children on that property at times, they reconsidered due to the risks. He also expressed his concerns about traffic.

Rebuttal – Mr. Woodall addressed the comments and concerns that the opposition had raised and asked the Board to support staff's recommendation of approval of the proposed project.

Board question – Mr. Glover asked staff if the Division of Traffic Engineering had looked at traffic ingress and egress on Tates Creek Road. Ms. Goderwis replied that the Division of Traffic Engineering was part of the conversation in the staff review process. She added that Mr. Stephen Parker was present if the Board had additional questions. Ms. Goderwis stated that the Division of Traffic Engineering did not express any concerns with the number of students proposed for the school location.

Ms. Carter asked the applicant if there were any plans for signage for the purpose of safety, given that several remarks were made. Mr. LaFontaine responded that, as with the Richmond, KY location, they did not plan for any roadside signage that would interfere with the nature in the area unless the signage was required. Ms. Carter replied that she felt signage would help with people slowing down. Mr. LaFontaine responded that he did not realize Ms. Carter was referring to safety signs. He added that they did include safety signs at the school in Richmond and they will incorporate signage at the proposed location to keep everyone safe.

Mr. Needham asked what the Division of Traffic Engineering required regarding signage for a school such as the proposed one. Mr. Stephen Parker, Division of Traffic Engineering, stated that signage for the subject property would be addressed by the Kentucky Department of Transportation at the time of construction, as Tates Creek Road is a state road. There was further discussion.

Mr. Needham asked Mr. Parker if it was his opinion that the proposed project would add a lot of traffic. Mr. Parker replied he did not think it would add a lot of traffic. There was further discussion.

Action – A motion was made by Ms. Carter, seconded by Mr. Needham and carried 6-0 (Gross absent), to **approve PLN-BOA-21-00039: THE ARCADIA COMPANY LLC** – request for conditional uses to establish a school for academic instruction and an accessory nursery school in an Agricultural Rural (A-R) zone, on property located at 5768 Tates Creek Rd., based on staff's recommendation and subject to the four conditions as listed.

* Note – At this time, Ms. Whitman recused herself from hearing the next case, based on a conflict of interest and Mr. Needham excused himself from the remainder of the meeting.

2. PLN-BOA-21-00058: LFUC HOUSING AUTHORITY - requested 1) a conditional use to establish a childcare center; 2) a variance to reduce the required front yard from 20' to 10' along Shropshire Avenue; 3) a variance to reduce the through lot front yard from 20' to 5' along a new proposed Street "A"; 4) a variance to reduce the required side street side yard from 20' to 10' along E. Fifth Street; and 5) a variance to reduce the required side street side yard from 20' to 10' along E. Sixth Street in order to develop 11 proposed lots within the defined Infill and Redevelopment Area in a Planned Neighborhood Residential (R-3) zone, on property located at 551 Shropshire Ave. (Council District 1).

The Staff Recommended: **Approval of the conditional use and variances,** for the following reasons:

a. Approval of the proposed conditional use should not adversely affect the subject or adjoining/nearby properties. The property can accommodate a child care facility along with its associated parking and outdoor play areas. This use will provide a convenient and beneficial service for the surrounding neighbors and broader community.
b. All necessary public services and facilities are or will be available and adequate for the proposed use.
c. Granting the variances should not adversely affect the public health, safety, or welfare, nor alter the character of the general vicinity. Much of the vicinity is characterized by similar small lots and the requested setbacks will be similar to other setbacks in the area.
d. The unique design of the right-of-way along Shropshire Avenue is a special circumstance that justifies the need for the variances. Granting the variances will allow the applicant to utilize a currently vacant lot within the Infill & Redevelopment Area for needed housing and a childcare center.
e. The variance requests do not attempt to circumvent the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance. The Zoning Ordinance specifically states that BOA action may sometimes be required in order to facilitate appropriate development without creating an unusual hardship or development that is incompatible with the existing pattern of the neighborhood within the defined Infill and Redevelopment Area. Additionally, the applicant has applied for the variances as soon as it was determined that they were needed during the permit process, and prior to beginning construction.

This recommendation of approval was made subject to the following conditions:

1. The property shall be developed and operated in accordance with the submitted application materials and site plan.
2. All necessary permits and/or approvals shall be obtained from the Divisions of Planning and Building Inspection prior to construction and occupancy.
3. The days and hours of operation of the childcare facility may be expanded to operate 7 days per week from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. without a new application to the Board of Adjustment.
4. Maximum enrollment for the childcare facility shall be based on the capacity allowed by the Cabinet for Health and Family Services Division of Regulated Childcare, so long as local parking and outdoor play area requirements are met.
5. The final design of "Street A" and the childcare center parking lot shall be subject to approval by the Division of Traffic Engineering and shall be designed for one-way traffic moving north from East Fifth Street toward East Sixth Street.
6. Variance shall be noted on the face of the Final Record Plat.

Representation – Mr. Darby Turner, attorney for the applicant, indicated to the Board that he and his client had read staff's report with recommendations and were in complete agreement with the recommendations and conditions imposed.

Audience comments – Ms. Billie Mallory, East End Community Development Corporation, was present to speak on concerns of her own and on behalf of the EECDC. She stated they were not in opposition to the proposed development, but they had questions they would like to have answered. Ms. Mallory stated their number one concern was for public safety and personal security. She commented on the level of criminal activity in the neighborhood near the proposed project and expressed concern over the traffic flow in the area, near the William Wells Brown Elementary School. Another concern Ms. Mallory addressed was that of the tree canopy. She stated the first District has the lowest tree canopy in the city and some of the trees on the subject property are over one hundred years old. Ms. Mallory stressed her desire for engagement between the developer and the community in the future.

Ms. Amy Clark, 628 Kastle Rd., was sworn in by Mr. Glover prior to speaking, as she arrived late to the meeting. She distributed copies of the proposed development plan of the subject property and other renderings for the Board to review, and displayed them on the screen overhead. Ms. Clark spoke in support of the proposed project, but suggested a continuance to allow more information to be known about the request for the variances. She expressed her concern over what might happen to the trees in the area should this project be approved.

Rebuttal – Mr. Turner commented that when the Housing Authority developed the Equestrian Estates neighborhood in 2008, they were able to save a great number of trees. He said the Housing Authority would plant trees to beautify the area and provide additional canopy. Mr. Turner said that the development plan is currently before the Planning Commission, at which time tree canopy requirement would be addressed. He also noted that there is an approved final development plan for this tract of land, which goes back to 2008 that reflects apartments to be built by the Housing Authority.

Board comments - Ms. Carter asked for clarification that several of the issues that are still open issues are issues for the Planning Commission and not before the Board of Adjustment today. Mr. Turner confirmed that to be correct.

Mr. Clarke asked what the impact would be for the Planning Commission, should the Board approve this application today. Mr. Turner responded that he thought it would be very little impact. There was further discussion.

Ms. Carter commented that she appreciates the desire to beautify the area but she also appreciated how this project is in alignment with the priorities of the city to provide affordable housing and she felt this project was needed.

Staff comments – Ms. Goderwis commented that Mr. Turner had previously indicated that the applicant might be interested in increasing the number of children to 100 from what was initially proposed. She said that staff considered that option with condition number four, regarding outdoor play areas and parking requirements. Ms. Goderwis directed the Board's attention to the overhead screen on which she displayed an alternative to the original condition number one in the staff report. She explained that the alternate version allows for modifications to the parking lot for the childcare center and its associated fenced play area with an amended final development plan approved by the Planning Commission.

Action - A motion was made by Ms. Carter, seconded by Mr. Walker and carried 4-0 (Gross and Needham absent; Whitman recused), to **approve PLN-BOA-21-00058: LFUC HOUSING AUTHORITY** – request for 1) a conditional use to establish a childcare center; 2) a variance to reduce the required front yard from 20' to 10' along Shropshire Avenue; 3) a variance to reduce the through lot front yard from 20' to 5' along a new proposed Street "A"; 4) a variance to reduce the required side street side yard from 20' to 10' along E. Fifth Street; and 5) a variance to reduce the required side street side yard from 20' to 10' along E. Sixth Street in order to develop 11 proposed lots within the defined Infill and Redevelopment Area in a Planned Neighborhood Residential (R-3) zone, on property located at 551 Shropshire Ave., based on staff's recommendation and subject to the six conditions, to include the alternate condition number one, which states:

1. The property shall be developed and operated in accordance with the submitted application materials and site plan, or as amended by an approved final development plan to allow for modifications to the childcare facility's parking lot and fenced play area.

V. BOARD ITEMS

A. Presentation of Resolution to former Board of Adjustment member, Janice Meyer.

Chair Glover recognized Ms. Meyer and asked that she come forward for the presentation of a Certificate of Service, and a personalized paperweight to commemorate her service of three terms with the Board of Adjustment. Mr. Glover thanked Ms. Meyer for her service.

B. Division of Planning staff presented an overview of the 2018 Comprehensive Plan, "Imagine Lexington".

*Note – Prior to the presentation, the Board took a brief recess at 3:35 p.m. and reconvened at 3:40 p.m. Ms. Whitman reassumed her position on the Board.

Mr. Chris Woodall, Long Range Planning Manager, presented an overview, of the 2018 Comprehensive Plan for the Board members.

Ms. Traci Wade, Planning Service Manager, gave a presentation of the Placebuilder process of the 2018 Comprehensive Plan. She also informed the Board members of new member orientation for Board and Planning Commission members on Friday, October 15, which will be available via video teleconference, and will count towards their training requirement.

C. Consideration of the 2022 Board of Adjustment Meeting and Filing Schedule

Staff distributed copies of the draft "2022 Official Meeting and Filing Schedule" for the Board to consider prior to the November 2021 public hearing. The Official Meeting and Filing schedule must be adopted each year by both the Board of Adjustment and the Planning Commission, and must be adopted no later than the end of November.

VI. STAFF ITEMS – Chair Glover announced that any items a Staff member wished to present would be heard at this time.

There were none.

VII. NEXT MEETING DATE - Chair Glover announced that the next meeting date will be November 8, 2021 at 1:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers at 200 E. Main Street.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT – Chair Glover declared the meeting adjourned at 4:12 p.m.

____

Thomas Glover, Chair

____

Joan Whitman, Secretary