

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES November 5, 2013

ROLL CALL

The Planning Commission of the City of Prairie Village met in regular session on Tuesday, November 5, 2013, in the fellowship hall of Village Presbyterian Church at 6641 Mission Road. Chairman Ken Vaughn called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. with the following members present: Bob Lindeblad, Randy Kronblad, Nancy Wallerstein, Gregory Wolf and Nancy Vennard.

The following persons were present in their advisory capacity to the Planning Commission: Ron Williamson, City Planning Consultant; Danielle Dulin, Assistant to the City Administrator; Keith Bredehoeft, Public Works Director, Jim Brown, Building Official and Joyce Hagen Mundy, City Clerk/Planning Commission Secretary. Also present was Andrew Wang Council liaison and David Waters, representing the City Attorney.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The following corrections were made to the September 10, 2013 minutes:

- Page 2 - Bob Royer's address should be **7805** not 7005 Mission Road
- Page 4 - 3rd paragraph RP-1 Districts should be "**RP-1b Districts**"
- Page 20 - 2nd paragraph Paul Warbe should be "**Paul Wrablica**"

Randy Kronblad moved the approval of the Planning Commission minutes of September 10, 2013 with the corrections noted above. The motion was seconded by Nancy Vennard and passed 5 to 0 with Greg Wolf abstaining due to his absence at that meeting.

PUBLIC HEARING

Ron Williamson stated that the Governing Body has returned PC2013-08 - Request for Rezoning of the property at 3101 West 75th Street from R-1a to RP-1b for reconsideration specifically of the two requested deviations that were denied by the Planning Commission. The two deviations that were denied by the Planning Commission were a reduction in the rear yard setback from 25 feet to 20 feet and an increase in the lot coverage from 30% to 35%. Mr. Royer made a presentation to the Governing Body stating that in order to market the lots to builders they have been negotiating with, a larger footprint is needed. A motion was made by the Governing Body to approve the rezoning with all of the requested deviations; however, it failed to meet the two-thirds vote requirement to override the Planning Commission recommendation. The Governing Body then moved to return the item for reconsideration to the Planning Commission on the basis that there was no neighborhood opposition and Village Vision encourages higher density and intensity infill development.

Mr. Williamson noted the applicant has revised the preliminary development plan increasing the size of Lots 1 and 4 from 7,821 square feet to 8,811 square feet; increasing the size of Lots 2 and 5 from 7,821 square feet to 8,119 square feet; and decreasing the size of Lots 3 and 6 from 9,753 square feet to 9,405 square feet. The

primary reason for adjusting the lot sizes is to be able to provide three-car garages on Lots 1, 3, 4, and 6. The modification of the lot lines increases the area of Lots 1, 2, 4, and 5 which is positive regardless of whether the Commission approves the 35% lot coverage and the 20-foot rear yard setback.

Mr. Williamson stated after reconsidering the application, the Commission may resubmit its original application or submit a new or amended recommendation.

Robert Royer, 7805 Mission Road, stated the revised plans submitted to the Commission have incorporated the additional 10' right-of-way and show the proposed size and floor plan of houses on those lots. All six lots have the same floor plan with the four corner lots having three-car garages, instead of two-car garages. He has contacted two builders who are interested in building the homes if they are allowed to have the increased lot coverage of 35%. The builders do not feel the homes would be marketable under the required 30% maximum lot coverage.

Mr. Royer referenced Chapter 19.24 of the Prairie Village Code entitled "Planned Zoning Districts" which states the intention of planned zoning procedures is to encourage efficient development and redevelopment of small tracts, innovative and imaginative site planning, and conservation of natural resources and minimum waste of land." The code (Section 19.24.010C) goes on to say "Deviations in yard requirements, setbacks and relationship between buildings . . . may be approved by the Planning Commission and City Council . . ." It further states (Section 19.24.010F), "The developer will be given latitude in using innovative techniques in the development of land not feasible under the application of standard zoning requirements. . ." Mr. Royer stated the width of the Mogren property is 224 feet making it unfeasible to incorporate the standard zoning requirements.

Chadwick Court meets the spirit and intent of the Code and of Village Vision which encourages neighborhoods with unique character, strong property values and quality housing options for families and individuals of a variety of ages and incomes". Village Vision goes on to provide the following direction - "Improve the Development/Redevelopment Process"

- Encourage Appropriate Redevelopment
- Permit higher residential densities

Mr. Royer noted that once completed Chadwick Court would bring in approximately \$65,000 per year in tax revenue to the City with no additional cost to the city for road construction or maintenance.

Nancy Wallerstein questioned if the existing out building would be remaining and how many trees would be lost. Mr. Royer responded the plan was to remove the brush and small trees and retain, but trim back the larger trees.

Bob Mogren, owner of the property, noted he uses the shed/out building to store his lawn mower equipment and could be removed if that is the desire of the Commission.

Bob Lindeblad noted on the site plan lots 3 and 6 have the curb from the street clipping the corners of the garage. It doesn't work. Mr. Royer stated the intent of the site plan was to show the layout. This is a preliminary plan. They will make the necessary changes for the garages on the final plans. Mr. Lindeblad responded that he was more comfortable with the open space on the plan, but still feels the units are too big. Mr. Williamson stated it could be approved subject to having the necessary setback from the street or continue the item and require revised plans to be submitted..

Nancy Vennard stated that the previous plan only had two three-car garages. She doesn't see a need for three-car garages, especially when he has been asked to reduce the footprint. Smaller homes at a lower cost would have a much larger sales market. Mr. Royer responded their builders state that even empty nesters want three-car garages. He noted the need to have all the primary amenities on the first floor to accommodate the desires of empty nesters. He stated he would like to be able to offer homes at a lower cost; however, the cost to create the necessary infrastructure for the development alone is over \$100,000. Mrs. Vennard responded the people wanting three-car garages are moving south, they recognize for the convenience of the location and amenities Prairie Village offers, they will need to give up three-car garages. Very well designed homes with two car garages could be constructed within the guidelines of the Commission.

Nancy Wallerstein asked if they would be trimming the trees on the fence line and if the fence would be set back 20 feet as she felt this would interfere with the existing hedgerow which covers approximately 10 feet in width. She asked if the hedgerow was the property line and how far from the hedgerow would the fence be located. Mr. Royer responded - three feet.

Bob Lindeblad confirmed that the property had been surveyed and the trees are on their property. Bob Mogren responded that approximately 20% of the hedgerow will be removed as it consists of brush and dead trees.

Nancy Vennard asked if there was currently a fence on the property. Mr. Royer responded there is a four foot chain link fence on the property line that will be replaced with a six foot cedar fence.

Nancy Wallerstein asked if the trees on 75th Street would be preserved. Mr. Mogren responded those that are not dead will be preserved.

Bob Lindeblad asked if there would be any outdoor patio area that would extend into the 20 foot rear yard setback. Mr. Royer responded that it would be more of a courtyard space than a rear yard.

Bob Lindeblad asked if the neighbors were told there would be a five-foot reduction in the rear yard setback. Mr. Royer responded they were shown plans reflecting the 20 foot rear yard setback.

Chairman Ken Vaughn asked if there was anyone present to speak on this application. Being none, he closed the public hearing at 7:35 p.m.

Bob Lindeblad stated he is satisfied with the lot coverage being increased from 30% to 35%, but feels a better effort should have been made to look at plans that would accommodate the 25 foot rear yard setback. He would have liked to see more creativity and imagination in the development than the straight-line layout of six identical homes. Mr. Royer responded with the limitations of this site including a lot depth of 99 feet. The floor plans are to simply show what can be done. He, too, would like to see six unique customized homes.

Ron Williamson noted the final plans will need to be approved by the Planning Commission and more detailed drawings and facades can be addressed at that time.

Nancy Vennard stated she has a problem with the 20 foot rear yard setback especially on the east side. She does not feel 20 feet is sufficient for a rear yard. Mr. Royer stated these are not rear yards; they are courtyards of a low maintenance development. Ken Vaughn noted the development has the advantage of having the hedgerow screening the properties from the adjacent properties.

Nancy Wallerstein asked if the recommendation was changed if it would still require a two-thirds vote to override the Planning Commission recommendation. Mr. Williamson when an item is returned to the Governing Body only a simple majority is required to override the Planning Commission recommendation.

Randy Kronblad does not feel the proposed fence will be able to be located on the hedgerow and thus the 20 foot rear yard setback is not sufficient.

Randy Kronblad moved the Planning Commission return application PC2013-08 to the Governing Body recommending that the rezoning be granted subject to the revised replatting and with the following three deviations from ordinance requirements granted:

- 1) Reduce the front yard setback from 30 feet to 15 feet.
- 2) Increase the lot coverage from 30% to 35%.
- 3) Reduce the lot depth from 100 feet to 99 feet and that the required rear yard setback of 25 feet be retained.

The motion was seconded by Nancy Wallerstein and passed unanimously.

**PC2013-120 Request for Preliminary Plat Approval - Chadwick Court
3101 West 75th Street**

Ron Williamson stated the plat is dependent upon the approval of the Preliminary Development Plan that is a part of the Zoning Change Request from R-1A to RP-1B. It was continued at the last meeting to this meeting pending approval by the Governing Body on the requested rezoning. It will need to be continued again.

Randy Kronblad moved the Planning Commission continue PC2013-120 until such time as the rezoning is resolved. The motion was seconded by Nancy Vennard and passed unanimously.

Chairman Ken Vaughn noted there was one routine non-public hearing application on the Commission's agenda and asked permission of the Commission to move that item up on the agenda for consideration prior to PC2013-11. The Commission agreed with the change in the agenda.

**PC2013-125 Request for Approval of Sign Standards
3520 West 75th Street**

Steve Chellgren, representing Big Industrial noted that a few years ago a monument sign was approved 3500 West 75th Street and would now like to place a similar sign at their building at 3520 West 75th Street. Before a monument sign can be constructed for a multi-tenant office building sign standards must be approved. They have submitted sign standards very similar to those approved for 3500 West 75th Street and after their approval will return to the Planning Commission for approval of a monument sign.

Danielle Dulin stated Windsor-Continental Investors, LLC owns both the office buildings at 3520 West 75th Street and 3500 West 75th Street and the proposed sign standards are very similar. However, Section II.G of the proposed sign standards do not allow roof mounted signs, but the building currently has a roof mounted sign on the awning above the entrance that will need to be removed to comply with the sign standards. Additionally, the proposed sign standards include standards for signs that will be included on the monument wall, but the application for this will be submitted under a separate later application that will reflect location of the sign as well as sign materials and design.

Bob Lindeblad moved the Planning Commission approve the proposed sign standards for 3520 West 75th Street (The Continental Building) subject to the following conditions:

- 1) That the roof mounted sign on the awning above the entrance be removed prior to the installation of any other signage.
- 2) That the applicant returns to the Planning Commission for approval of the design and location of the monument wall and this condition is added as item #6 to Section I of the sign standards.
- 3) That the applicant submit the revised sign standards to the City prior to obtaining any sign permit.

The motion was seconded by Nancy Wallerstein and passed unanimously.

**PC2013-11 Request for Special Use Permit for Adult Senior Dwellings
8500 Mission Road**

Chairman Ken Vaughn reviewed the procedure for the public hearing noting that each presenter will be given 30 minutes followed by public comment limited to three minutes per individual followed by a 15 minute rebuttal period for each the applicant and a representative of Mission Valley Neighborhood Association

John Petersen with Polsinelli, 6201 College Blvd., Suite 500, addressed the Commission on behalf of MVS, LLC stating that although only he and Joe Tuteru would be addressing the Commission, Randy Bloom and other members of the development team are present and available to answer any questions. Mr. Petersen stated they had a lot of supporters wanting to attend this hearing; however, he advised them their support would be presented and they didn't need to attend. To that point, Mr. Petersen stated they have 494 e-mails and 249 letters in support of the project being presented this evening.

Joe Tuteru, 7611 State Line Road, Suite 301, stated they have preserved the design elements while combining the skilled nursing facility and memory care facility into one building. The memory care facility has been relocated from a separate building to underneath the skilled nursing unit opening up more open green space. At the request of the neighbors who stated they did not want rental villas as the transitional element between their property and the main complex, they have created nine single family lots of more than 10,000 square feet each that generally line up with the property lines to the south. They will be owner occupied and will be custom built homes.

The Assisted Living and Independent Living structures have the same design elements as previously submitted. The streetscape along Mission Road was retained and they have been able to preserve the height of the structures, which for the most part are lower than the existing school on the property.

Mr. Tuteru reviewed a slide showing the location of the facilities and a comparison of heights of their facilities with the existing adjacent properties. The heights were very similar and the transition is from highest on the north end adjacent to the apartment projects to lower on the south end adjacent to the single-family dwellings.

The same level of stormwater retention and same parking ratios are reflected in this plan as in the previous plan. Mr. Tuteru presented the proposed site plan with an overlay of the existing school to provide a more clear comparison. They are proposing to use the same brick/stucco/stone design elements with a lowered roof line and the tops of the windows will be consistent with two story structures.

John Petersen noted this project is to be reviewed objectively following the criteria established by the City. He then presented a review of the project per the special use permit and code requirements. He believes the first criteria that the special use complies with all applicable provisions of these regulations including intensity of use regulations, yard regulations and use limitations is fundamental. He noted that standard measurement for residential development is that of units per acre. The square foot per acre measurement desired by the opponent is a commercial development measurement. The total land area required for the proposed use by ordinance is 237,400 square feet. The site area is 557,632 square feet (2.3 times greater than the proposed use). The setbacks are at least 3.5 times greater than what is required by code with the side yard setback on the north property line being 32 times greater. The maximum height allowed is 45' and the maximum height of the proposed development is

40'. Maximum not coverage allowed is 30% and the proposed lot coverage is 21.4%. Off-street Parking setbacks are more than twice that required by code.

In his presentation, Mr. Petersen referenced the staff report prepared by Ron Williamson, the City's Planning Consultant for his review of the special use permit requirements agreeing with the staff findings. In reference to the impact on neighboring properties, the Todd Appraisal which was submitted by the applicant and it was noted that in Johnson County almost all senior communities are located adjacent to single family residences and they work well together. He agrees with Mr. Williamson that through design, landscaping and setbacks the dominance of this project can be mitigated and will not hinder the development or use of adjacent properties.

The proposed plan has 316 parking spaces on site which exceeds the code requirements by 61 spaces. Mr. Petersen noted the screening elements in place to screen the view of parking from adjacent properties. There will also be a plan in place to address parking during special events. Staff and vendors will be prohibited from parking in the adjacent neighborhoods under condition #11 of the staff recommendation.

The storm drainage and traffic studies have been completed and submitted to city staff for review and approval. The city's professional staff has stated that in general the overall design is compatible with the area with the details of the design addressed during site plan review.

In addressing the Golden Factors, Mr. Petersen referenced the first factor - "The character of the neighborhood" is the defining factor. He stated neighborhood does not just include the one component of adjacent property owners. He quoted the staff report stating "the properties in the neighborhood around the proposed project range from high density apartments to high-end large lot single-family dwellings plus the office and business uses in Corinth South Center. The Mission Valley School site has served as a buffer between the high density and low density residential uses.

Chairman Vaughn advised Mr. Petersen that his time period was up.

Mr. Petersen closed stating this plan is consistent with the city's comprehensive plan "Village Vision". He noted that although the applicant is in agreement with the 14 conditions for approval recommended by staff for the special use permit and the 18 conditions for approval recommended on the site plan, they would like to have the opportunity to specifically address #2 on the special use permit and #17 on the site plan.

Gregory Wolf asked how the applicant envisioned the single family lots to be developed. Mr. Petersen responded they will be platted and open for sale to builders for development. He noted they have had builders already express interest in the lots.

Ron Williamson questioned why the size of the Memory Care/Skilled Nursing facility increased in size. Mr. Petersen responded the footprint of the Memory Care Unit will slide under the building design of the Skilled Nursing Unit and in doing so they need to add stairwells and open hallways and this change adds approximately 6,000 more

square feet that will have a minimal impact on the exterior but a significant impact on the interior. Joe Tutera added that approximately 2,500 to 3,000 of the additional square feet will be for the stairwells. They will continue to refine the actual dimensions through the final site plan approval process.

Chairman Ken Vaughn opened the public hearing for comment in support of the application. No one wished to address the Commission. Chairman Vaughn called upon John Duggan with the Mission Valley Neighborhood Association for his presentation.

John Duggan, Duggan Shadwick Doer & Kurlbaum, LLC, 11040 Oakmont, urged the Commission to protect his property owners' due process rights. He stated this application is an attempt to remove from his clients the ability to file a protest petition.

Mr. Duggan began his presentation with quotes from City Council members in their defeat of the previous application. He went on to state that the application being presented meets the requirements for a Mixed Use District and should be processed as such. However, he believes the new MVS application fails to comply with Kansas Law as the applicant has not complied with the City's zoning ordinance with respect to notice, and therefore, approval of the application would be invalid.

The City's code notice by mail to all "owners of lands located within two hundred feet, except public streets and ways." 20 days prior to the public hearing. The applicant did not exclude Mission Road when determining the property owners entitled to notice, thus a number of property owners within the 200 foot radius to the east were excluded from the calculation and not provided notice as required.

The applicant's refusal to recognize the south and southwest adjoining landowners' property rights to receive notice and in turn file a protest petition is premised on the hope that the City will find that "the area to be altered with a change in land use should include only the Assisted/Independent Living and SNF facilities and not the outer boundaries of the entire proposed Mission Chateau development. Mr. Duggan noted that under its previous application, the applicant agreed that the villa-style residences to the south were within the area proposed to be altered and thus afforded the adjoining property owners their right to file a protest petition. Mr. Duggan stated this application takes the inconsistent and disingenuous position that only the Assisted/Independent Living and SNF facility should be considered "the area proposed to be altered" under K.S.A. 12-757.

John Duggan continued noting the Kansas Supreme Court has specifically recognized the validity of a protest petition which measured the requisite distance requirement from the outer boundary of the lot, despite that only a limited portion of the lot was subject to a special use permit and provided several case references.

Mr. Duggan stated the staff report requires the platting the entire 18 acre property. The city's subdivision regulations do not contemplate the ability to subdivide property for the purpose of defeating a special use permit. He believes the proposed development cannot be approved in piecemeal fashion; at base, the entire "Mission Chateau Senior

Living Community” constitutes a planned mixed use development which must be considered as one application under zoning regulation 19.23. Any consideration by the City of this piecemeal application scheme would constitute invalid haphazard zoning enacted without any reasonable basis but for the advancement of MVS/ private interest in evading the adjoining property owners’ right to file a protest petition.

Mr. Duggan stated the applicant is seeking the City’s approval for an application to change the land use on the subject property from what was exclusively a public school to what would contain several uses: (1) single-family dwellings; and (2) a special use permit for senior adult dwellings and (3) nursing care or continuous health care services . . . on the premises that it is a subordinate accessory use. Despite assuring its potential residents a variety of uses in its senior living “campus”, the applicant is claiming - solely for purposes of avoiding he adjoining landowners’ right to file a protest petition - that the City must consider its special use permit application separate from its eventual plat approval for the single-family dwellings to the south and southwest.

The applicant proposes a variety uses on one common lot. The intent of the City zoning ordinance demands that it be reviewed as a single application for rezoning as a “MXD” Planned Mixed Use District. Mr. Duggan stated this is backhanded spot zoning to submit what is really a mixed use district project as a single family residential district project.

John Duggan also noted that this application interferes with the MVS,LLC lawsuit and that he City should abstain from action on the renewed application because MVS has removed the case from the jurisdiction of the City to the jurisdiction of the District Court through its appeal and any action from the City on the matter would interfere with the District Court proceeding. He believes by appealing the City’s decision, MVS has terminated the City’s power to reconsider MVS application for a Special Use Permit. Since the District Court now possesses jurisdiction over the matter, the City should avoid potentially-conflicting parallel litigation and abstain from acting on the MVS’ application for a special use permit.

Mr. Duggan was advised his 30 minute time limit was approaching. He stated this is not a new application and noted the earlier application that was defeated by the City Council, due to its size and density, is now bigger - 325,890 square feet. Mr. Duggan made a comparison between the proposed project and the Santa Marta project in Olathe. He advised the Commission that it may recommend denial based on only the aesthetics of the project as demonstrated by case law references provided by Mr. Duggan.

This is a very disappointing development of the most promising piece of land within the City of Prairie Village. Mr. Duggan urged the Commission to protect the City’s character and the rights of its residents and property owners. This development is not compatible with the adjacent single family residential properties that surround it and does not meet the required Golden Factors. Mr. Duggan stated common sense will tell you that this is a commercial development. He advised the Commission to take one of the following three actions:

- 1) Stay the proceedings until the lawsuit filed in the District Court is resolved
- 2) Deny the application
- 3) Make the corrections to the public notice and notification for appropriate due process.

Chairman Ken Vaughn called for a ten minute recess.

Chairman Vaughn reconvened the meeting at 9:10.

Bob Lindeblad asked that before the public hearing is continued for a response from the city's legal representative on whether the meeting was properly noticed.

David Waters, representing the City Attorney, stated the actual notice references the entire lot and the 12.8 acre site and generally complies with notice requirements with the legal description referenced. The standard practice of the City has been that the notice area is that immediately adjacent to the proposed "use change".

Bob Lindeblad asked if the legal description was on file at City Hall. Mr. Waters responded it was. Gregory Wolf confirmed it was Mr. Waters' opinion that proper notice was given. Mr. Wolf asked for a legal opinion on hearing this application while there was a pending lawsuit in District Court. Mr. Waters responded that this is a different application and the appeal of the previous application does not prohibit the applicant from pursuing other actions. He does not believe the city would be in violation to consider this application. Mr. Wolf asked what would happen if the District Court overturns the city's earlier decision. Mr. Waters responded it would be handed back to the City for action.

Nancy Vennard asked about the contention that this application should be filed as a rezoning for a mixed use district. Mr. Waters replied a mixed use district has totally different uses, i.e. residential, retail, restaurant, etc. not broader uses of a residential nature.

Randy Kronblad asked for clarification on the notification area. Ron Williamson responded that either the legal description or general application area can be used with the statement that plans are available for review. The statutes do not require publication of the legal description.

Bob Lindeblad confirmed it is the opinion of legal consul that the public hearing should be continued. Mr. Waters noted the case reference by Mr. Duggan was regarding an annexation and not applicable to this application.

Chairman Vaughn reopened the public hearing and called for public comment.

Steve Carman, 8521 Delmar, stated that he is within 200' of the 18 acre outer boundary and did not receive a notice. Mr. Carman reference the amendment to the City's comprehensive plan relative to this location and noted the numerous references in the plan to the input of the community. He noted he has attended all but one of the

community meetings and at all the meetings the common thread of the message was that this project was too large, too dense, and too tall and did not fit within the community. He noted at the end of the first meeting before the Planning Commission, Chairman Vaughn directed the applicant to work with the residents to find a plan that was acceptable to both parties. They have not.

David Waters stated he has re-examined the notice and recommends that the Commission continue this item to allow for legal staff to do further research on the issue.

Nancy Wallerstein moved the Planning Commission continue PC2013-11 to the December 3rd meeting to allow for legal staff to address the issues raised. The motion was seconded by Randy Kronblad. It was confirmed that if new notice is required, it can be done to allow for consideration by the Commission on December 3rd. It was recommended that both attorneys review the notice prior to its publication. Both attorneys agreed.

The motion to continue was voted on and passed unanimously.

NON-PUBLIC HEARINGS

**PC2013-126 Site Plan Approval - Mission Chateau
8500 Mission Road**

**PC2013-127 Preliminary Plat Approval - Mission Chateau
8500 Mission Road**

Bob Lindeblad moved the Planning Commission continue applications PC2013-126 Site Plan Approval and Preliminary Plat Approval for Mission Chateau at 8500 Mission Road to the December 3, 2013 Planning Commission meeting. The motion was seconded by Randy Kronblad and passed unanimously.

OTHER BUSINESS

Consider 2014 Planning Commission Meeting/Submittal Schedule

Joyce Hagen Mundy reviewed the proposed 2014 meeting and submittal schedule following the scheduled first Tuesday of the month meeting date. She noted, in the past, the Commission has stated they were prefer not to meet on election days and the 2014 calendar has meetings on April 1st and November 4th which are both election days. Mr. Lindeblad stated he would rather not meet on election days.

Nancy Wallerstein moved to approve the schedule as proposed. The motion was seconded by Gregory Wolf and passed unanimously.

NEXT MEETING

The Secretary noted that at this time the City has received four applications for special use permits for the before/after school programs at the elementary schools and one site plan approval for a wall. Danielle Dulin announced that there may also be a site plan submittal for Westlake Hardware. The December meeting will be held at the cafeteria of Shawnee Mission East.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to come before the Commission, Chairman Ken Vaughn adjourned the meeting at 9:35 p.m.

Ken Vaughn
Chairman