

**CITY OF DEADWOOD**

**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

July 5, 2007

JOINT MEETING

The Joint Meeting of the Deadwood Planning and Zoning Commission and Deadwood Board of Adjustment was called to order by Chairperson Marie Farrier on Thursday July 5, 2007 at 5:00 p.m. in the Deadwood City Hall Meeting Room located at 102 Sherman Street, Deadwood, SD 57732.

PRESENT PLANNING & ZONING: Marie Farrier, Sheree Green, Larry Ryan, Mel Allen & Jim Shedd.

ABSENT PLANNING & ZONING: None.

PRESENT BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT: Francis Toscana, Georgeann Silvernail, Mike Klamm & Nyla Griffith.

ABSENT BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT: Mark Speirs.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**Mr. Ryan moved to approve the minutes of the May 30, 2007 Special Joint Meeting, as mailed. Mr. Shedd seconded and the motion carried.**

All in favor - 5  
Opposed - 0

**NEW BUSINESS:**

**REQUEST FOR CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR LARGE DAYCARE FACILITY**

Ms. William referred to the following Staff Report:

**STAFF REPORT  
PLANNING AND ZONING  
REQUEST FOR CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT  
FOR A LARGE DAYCARE USE**

---

**APPLICANT:** Sandra Grosek

**PURPOSE:** Request for Large Day Care for 10-12 children.

**GENERAL LOCATION:** 732 Main Street

**ZONING:** PU - Public Use District

**LEGAL DESCRIPTION:** Lots 3-10, Block 1, Kennedy & Cameron Addition, City of Deadwood, Lawrence County, South Dakota.

**FILE STATUS:** All legal obligations have been completed.

---

**CITIZENS RESPONSE:** FOR: AGAINST:

**STAFF FINDINGS:**

Surrounding Zoning:

Surrounding Land Uses

North:  
South:  
East:  
West:

School/residential  
Church/some commercial  
Fire Hall/commercial  
Limited residential/Williams Street

## SUMMARY OF REQUEST

The petitioner has submitted a request for a Conditional Use Permit to allow a Large Day Care Use. Large Day Care facilities are defined as **“Day care, large” means a facility that provides care for six or more children that are primarily present during daytime hours, and do not regularly stay overnight. Basic requirements for a large day care facility are: 1) Operator must comply with the standards of the state Fire Marshal relating to the subject of fire and life safety in large day care facilities; 2) The applicant shall be licensed by the State of South Dakota as a day care facility; 3) Applicant shall develop and distribute information to the day care clients stating the need not to disrupt the neighborhood when dropping off and picking up children; 4) Off-street parking shall be provided for employees of the day care facility; 5) Drop-off and pick-up areas are designated for clients.**

## FACTUAL INFORMATION

1. The property is currently zoned PU - Public Use District.
2. The property used for the daycare is comprised of 0.40 acres or 17,424 square feet, more or less.
3. The structure was formerly the Benedictine Convent and the property has adequate off-street parking in the rear and in the front where a double garage is located. Clients park approximately 3-5 minutes at each visit.
4. The property has access from Main Street.
5. The properties are located within an area close to the school and fire station. There is limited commercial use in the vicinity. The land is located in a mixed use neighborhood and is classified as low density residential on the adopted Land Use Map in the Deadwood Comprehensive Plan.
6. The land is located in Flood Zone X – Area’s of 500 year flood; areas of 100-year flood with average depths of less than 1 foot or with drainage areas less than 1 square mile; and areas protected by levees from 100-year flood.
7. Adequate public facilities are available to serve the use.
8. The area is characterized by mixed commercial, public, residential uses and vacant lands.

## STAFF DISCUSSION

The Conditional Use for a Large Day Care facility will be located at 732 Main Street. Ms. Grosek has been in the daycare profession for 14 years --- 3 years at the Lead YMCA and 11 years as sole proprietor of Sandy's Sandbox Daycare in Lead. The hours will be 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Monday through Friday. The daycare will be registered with the State of South Dakota and Capital Insurance has been her insurance company for 11 years. If the request is approved, Ms. Grosek will start her daycare business on July 9, 2007.

Ms. Grosek is not able to attend the meeting on July 5th since she had made a commitment to baby-sit her new born granddaughter in Florida from June 23rd until July 7th.

## COMPLIANCE:

1. **The Zoning Officer provided notice identifying the applicant, describing the project and its location and giving the scheduled date of the public hearing in accordance with Chapter 17.76.**
2. **A sign was posted on the property for which the request was filed in accordance with Chapter 17.76.**
3. **Notice of the time and place was published in the designated newspaper of the City of Deadwood in accordance with Chapter 17.76.**

## CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT

### GENERAL USE STANDARDS FOR CONDITIONAL USE PERMITS:

In reviewing any application under the authority of this chapter and as a further guide to its decision upon the facts of the case, the Commission(s) shall consider, among other things, the following facts:

- A. The proposed use shall be in harmony with the general purposes, goals, objectives, and standards to the City Policy Plan, the ordinance, the district in which it is located, or any other plan, program, map, or ordinance adopted, or under consideration pursuant to official notice by the City of Deadwood.

*The use, as proposed, provides a daycare service that is a needed service in the Deadwood area. The projected use is not listed under Conditional Uses in the PU - Public Use District; however, it was determined to be a comparable use to a school for two (2) other daycare facilities in the past for this approximate location, under the same ownership. Conditional uses are those uses which have some special impact or uniqueness since their effect on the surrounding environment cannot be determined in advance of the use being proposed for a particular location.*

- B. Whether or not a community need exists for the proposed use at the proposed location in light of existing and proposed uses of a similar nature in the area and of the need to provide or maintain a proper mix of uses both within the city and also within the immediate area of the proposed use: (a) the proposed use in the proposed location shall not result in either a detrimental over concentration of a particular use from previously permitted uses within the city or within the immediate area of the proposed use.

*Ms. Grosek currently operates a daycare, but felt that she needed a different location. A review of the location, configuration and impact has been conducted and compared to uses by right. The school, church and fire station are all located in the vicinity.*

*The review determines whether the proposed use should be permitted by weighing public need for, and benefit to be derived from the use, against the local impact which it may cause. Recently, we had two other requests for daycare in Deadwood; however, only one of those daycares remains. The daycare approved on Charles Street did not materialize.*

*The subject area is zoned PU - Public Use District and it is intended to provide locations for areas worthy of preservation due to their natural beauty and open character or otherwise to provide for public uses which will serve the public good.*

- C. The proposed use at the projected location shall not result in a substantial or undue adverse effect on adjacent property, the character of the neighborhood, traffic conditions, parking, public improvements, public sites or rights-of-way.

*The planned use would not result in a substantial or undue adverse effect on adjacent property or the character of the neighborhood and the use will not alter the character of the neighborhood. To support a denial of a conditional use permit on the grounds that it will cause increased traffic problems, there must be a high degree of probability that the increase would pose a substantial threat to the health and safety of the community. The structure will remain the same size and the appearance of the structures does not change.*

- D. Whether or not the proposed use increases the proliferation of non-conforming uses as well as previously approved Conditional Use Permits which are still in use, when influenced by matters pertaining to the public health, safety, and general welfare, either as they now exist or as they may in the future be developed as a result of the implementation of provisions and policies of the Policy Plan, this ordinance, or any other plan, program, map or ordinance adopted, or under consideration pursuant to official notice, by the city or other governmental agency having jurisdiction to guide growth and development.

For any Conditional Use, lot and performance standards shall be the same as similar type uses located in specific districts. The character and use of buildings and structures adjoining or near the property mentioned in the application shall be considered in their entirety.

*The daycare use will not increase the proliferation of non-conforming uses. The use is intended to be a service to the community. The subject area is comprised of high density residential, public uses and limited commercial uses. St. Ambrose has 3 additional structures in the immediate vicinity and the public school is located on the northeastern side. Across the street are located, Norwest Bank, Real Estate Office, Fire Hall, KDSY and US West Communications.*

- E. Whether or not the proposed use in the proposed area will be adequately served by and will not impose an undue burden on any of the improvements, facilities, utilities, and services specified in this section.

*There will be no significant adverse impacts on water supply, fire protection, waste disposal, schools, traffic and circulation or other services. Existing services are available onsite. The area can accommodate drop-off and pick-up for the clients in the front and the rear. .*

#### CONDITIONS GOVERNING APPLICATIONS AND PROVISIONS:

- A. Following the issuance of a conditional use permit pursuant to the provisions of this ordinance, such permit may be amended, varied, or altered only pursuant to the standards and procedures established by this section for its original approval.
- B. The Board of Adjustment can revoke conditional use permits, once granted, for cause after a hearing is held before them. Complaints seeking the revocation of such permit shall be filed with the Zoning Administrator and may be initiated by the Planning and Zoning Commission OR any three (3) residents

within three hundred (300) feet of the property lines of which the application has been filed. All such revocation hearings shall be conducted in the same manner as for the Conditional Use Permit application hearings.

- C. The Planning and Zoning Commission shall have the authority to review Conditional Use Permits at any time and/or on an annual basis and place additional stipulations to mitigate a problem.
- D. If the use permitted under the terms of a Conditional Use Permit has not been started within six (6) months of the date of issuance thereof, said permit shall expire and be canceled by the City Planning Department. Written notice thereof, shall be given to the person(s) affected, together with notice that further use or work as described in the canceled permit shall not proceed, unless and until a new conditional use permit has been obtained.
- E. If the use permitted under the terms of a Conditional Use Permit, ceases, for whatever reason, for a period of twelve (12) months, said permit shall expire and be canceled by the City Planning Department. Written notice thereof, shall be given to the person(s) affected, together with notice that further use or work as described in the canceled permit shall not proceed, unless and until a new conditional use permit has been obtained.

Ms. Williams noted the Planning and Zoning Commission had determined the use as comparable to a school in the past for a daycare at the Catholic School. She noted the fee had been paid. The Planning & Zoning Commission corrected the address of 372 on the staff report; the correct address was 732 Main Street.

Mr. Shedd questioned if the building would be placed on the tax roll. Ms. Williams stated she had contacted them and they were looking into it. Ms. Williams stated she did not receive any comments from adjacent landowners.

**Mr. Ryan moved to approve the Conditional Use Permit for Sandra Grosek for a Large Daycare at 732 Main Street. Mr. Shedd seconded and the motion carried.**

**All in favor - 5**  
**Opposed - 0**

Chairperson Farrier adjourned the Planning and Zoning meeting and turned the meeting over to the Board of Adjustment.

**DEADWOOD BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT**

Mayor Toscana called the Board of Adjustment to order.

Mayor Toscana stated he was recusing himself from discussion and voting because of a conflict of interest and turned the meeting over to Ms. Silvernail.

**Ms. Griffith moved to approve the recommendation from Planning & Zoning for the Conditional Use Permit for Sandra Grosek for a Large Daycare at 732 Main Street. Mr. Klamm seconded and the motion carried.**

**All in favor - 3**  
**Opposed - 0**  
**Abstain - 1 (Toscana)**

Ms. Silvernail adjourned the Board of Adjustment and turned the meeting back over to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Chairperson Farrier called the Planning and Zoning meeting back to order.

**REQUEST FOR 10' VARIANCE - Lou & Linda Stojack/Elizabeth Holmes**

Ms. William referred to the following Staff Report:

**STAFF REPORT  
REQUEST FOR VARIANCE  
FROM CHAPTER 17.24  
SECTION 17.24.040.B**

**APPLICANTS:** Lou and Linda Stojack/Elizabeth Holmes

**SIZE AND LOCATION:** The approximate 0.46 acre property is located on the Northern side of Denver Street

**ADDRESS:** 60 Denver Street

**LEGAL DESCRIPTION:** Tract 1 of Lots 12 and 13, Block N, O.T., City of Deadwood, Lawrence County, South Dakota.

**EXISTING ZONING AND LAND USE:** The property is currently zoned R1 – Residential District and the site is vacant.

**ADJACENT ZONING AND LAND USES:**

The property to the north is zoned PF - Park Forest District and is vacant land. The land to the east is zoned R1 – Residential District and homes lining Denver Street. The land to the south and west is zoned R1 - Residential District with single-family dwellings.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

Attached for review is a location map.

**BACKGROUND:**

The proposed project will consist of a two (2) single-family homes. The applicants had requested approval of 1' variances on three of the side lot lines (on 2 lots); however, that request has been dropped since they felt the one foot on each side could be accommodated by building smaller houses. Therefore, the only request for variance is for a 10' variance from the front yard setback requirement of twenty (20) feet. The lots will be square in shape; however, the rear yards retain steep slopes. Placement of the structures are limited by the slopes and sizes of the lots.

The intention of the proposed project is to provide two (2) single-family dwellings and off-street parking.

The Comprehensive Plan designates this land as Low Density Residential. The low density category is intended for predominately single family detached residential development, similar to that found in many existing city neighborhoods. The Comprehensive Plan also encourages infill development within an area that already has existing services.

The property is located within Zone X – Areas of 500 year flood, areas of 100 year flood with average depths of less than 1 foot or with drainage areas less than 1 square mile; and areas protected by levees from 100 year flood.

**COMPLIANCE:**

1. **The Zoning Officer provided notice identifying the applicant, describing the project and its location and giving the scheduled date and time of the public hearing in accordance with Section 17.80.010.B. This notice was mailed to property owners within 300 feet of the subject property.**
2. **A sign was posted on the property for which the request was filed as required by Section 17.80.010.B.**
3. **Notice of the time and place for the public hearing was published ten (10) days in advance of the hearing in the designated newspaper of the City of Deadwood as required by Section 17.80.010.B.**

**VARIANCE:**

The purpose of a variance is to modify the strict application of the specific requirements of this Ordinance in the case of exceptionally irregular, narrow, shallow or steep lots, or other exceptional conditions, whereby, such strict application would result in practical difficulty or unnecessary hardship which would deprive an owner of the reasonable use of his or her land. The variance shall be used only where necessary to overcome some obstacle which is preventing an owner from using his or her lot as the Zoning Ordinance intended.

The Board shall consider and decide all applications for variances within 30 days of such public hearing and in accordance with the standards provided below.

**STANDARDS FOR VARIANCES:**

In granting a variance, the Board shall ascertain that the following criteria are met, and presented at the public hearing or otherwise included in the record.

1. **A variance may be appropriate where, by reason of exceptional narrowness, shallowness, or shape or by reason of other exceptional topographic conditions or other extraordinary conditions on a piece of property, the strict application of any regulation enacted under this Ordinance**

would result in peculiar, exceptional, and undue hardship on the owner of the property. The previously mentioned circumstances or conditions shall be set forth in the Findings of the Board.

*There are special circumstances unique to this property. These special circumstances involve the size and topography, of the property -- in short, a physical constraint which is unique to this site. Lot sizes in Deadwood tend to be historically small in size. Special circumstances are not interpreted to be something intangible, such as lack of knowledge of the Code or misinformation given at the time that the land was purchased. The term undue hardship encompasses virtually any problem and the hardship only needs to be practical. Because of the particular physical surroundings of the specific property involved, a particular hardship to the owner would result, as distinguished from a mere inconvenience, if the strict letter of regulations were carried out. Approving the variance request would enable the reasonable use of the property.*

2. Variances shall not be granted to allow a use otherwise excluded from the particular district in which requested.

*The zoning ordinance does not preclude the construction of single family dwellings. The Comprehensive Plan recommends a mixture of uses in this area, when located properly. This property is located on Denver Street where homes are located near to each other. Also, garages set right on the street and they have zero setbacks.*

3. Any variance granted under the provisions of this section shall be the minimum adjustment necessary for the reasonable use of the land.

*That within the intent and purposes of this application for variance, if granted, is the minimum adjustment necessary to afford relief or the reasonable use of the land without significantly disturbing the rear hillside.*

4. The granting of any variance is in harmony with the general purposes and intent of this Ordinance and will not be injurious to the neighborhood, and/or detrimental to the public welfare, or in conflict with the established policies of the City of Deadwood.

*The granting of the variance would not be detrimental to public health, safety or general welfare. A variance cannot be granted if it would pose any threat to the public health or safety.*

*The granting of the variances in the subject area would not be injurious to the area in general. Again, single family dwellings are allowed in the R1 - Residential District. There would be off-street parking. The variance would not alter the essential character of the neighborhood in which the property is located; substantially or permanently impair the appropriate use or development of adjacent property.*

5. There must be proof of practical difficulty, which may be based upon sufficiently documented economic factors but such proof shall not be based solely upon or limited to such economic factors. Furthermore, the hardship complained of cannot be self-created; nor can it be established on this basis by one who purchases with or without the knowledge of the restrictions; it must result from the application of this Ordinance; it must be suffered directly by the property in question; and evidence of variance granted under similar circumstances shall not be considered.

*Once more, the natural hillside in the rear poses practical difficulties and a literal enforcement of the provisions of the zoning ordinance would involve either substantial hardship, financial or otherwise to the petitioners. The granting of the variance would not constitute a special privilege.*

6. That the proposed variance will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent properties, substantially increase the congestion in the public streets, increase the danger of fire, endanger the public safety, or substantially diminish or impair property values within the adjacent neighborhood.

*The use and value of the area adjacent to the property included in the variance request will not be affected in a substantially adverse manner. There will be no significant adverse impacts on water supply, fire protection, schools, or other services. The granting of the variance would not be detrimental to public health, safety or general welfare.*

7. **The fee, as adopted by resolution, was paid to the Zoning Administrator as agent for the Board to cover the costs of notices and other expenses incidental to the hearing.**
8. **The applicant has proven that he or she is the owner of the property, or is his or her officially designated agent and has presented proof thereof.**

**Requirements for the Granting of a Variance:**

**Before the Board shall have the authority to grant a variance, the person claiming the variances has the burden of showing:**

1. **That the granting of the permit will not be contrary to the public interest;**
2. **That the literal enforcement of the Ordinance will result in unnecessary hardship; and,**
3. **That by granting the permit, substantial justice will be done.**

**A variance shall be null and void two (2) years from the date it is granted unless completion or substantial construction has taken place. The Board of Adjustment may extend the variance for an additional period not to exceed one (1) year upon the receipt of a written request from the applicant demonstrating good cause for the delay.**

**If upon review by the Zoning Administrator, a violation of any condition, imposed in approval of a variance is found, the Administrator shall inform the applicant by registered mail of the violation and shall require compliance within sixty (60) days, or the Administrator will take action to revoke the permit. The Administrator's letter, constituting Notice of Intent to Revoke Variance may be appealed to the Board of Adjustment within thirty (30) days of its mailing. The Board of Adjustment shall consider the appeal and may affirm, reverse, or modify the Administrator's Notice of Intent to Revoke. The applicant must comply with the Board of Adjustment's Order on Appeal of Notice of Intent to Revoke Variance within thirty (30) days of the Board's decision.**

Ms. Williams noted that the Stojack's had provided sample designs for the two homes; however, any new construction would require approval from the Historic Preservation Commission.

Chairperson Farrier questioned when the Planning & Zoning Commission would require platting. Ms. Williams stated that platting would be the next step in this process. Ms. Green questioned the size of the lots being only 47 feet. Ms. Williams stated that the applicant would be required to have the lot subdivided into two (2) lots and she pointed out they may be short of the 5,000 square feet requirement for each lot. She noted that issue would be addressed at the platting stage and the subdivision ordinance had a variance process of its own.

Ms. Farrier questioned the ownership of the lot located above the lots. Ms. Williams stated they are researching the issue of ownership; however, the GIS did not identify an owner. She noted that the land could possibly be owned by a governmental entity (state, county, city or school) since ownership did not show up. Ms. Green questioned how many feet were required for the side setbacks. Ms. Williams stated that the lots were considered interior lot lines; therefore, five (5') setbacks were required. Ms. Green pointed out the homes would need to be 37' wide.

Ms. Barbara Larson of 93 Denver voiced her concern with having two new dwellings on Denver Street. She stated that it was a very narrow street and very congested in that area and she felt one dwelling would probably be better for the site.

Mr. Walt Iverson, of Englewood, Colorado, represented his mother who lived at 52 Denver, and he questioned if the applicant had submitted plans. Ms. Williams stated that they had submitted a sample of the proposed dwellings, but it was not a plan. Mr. Iverson questioned if they would have garages and where would the 10' begin. Ms. Williams stated they would have garages under the homes and the ten foot (10') setback would start at the property line.

Mr. Mike Klamm, 57 Denver, stated he had applied and was granted the same variance request when he built his garage.

Mr. Iverson questioned if people would be allowed to park in front of the garages. Ms. Williams stated they would not be allowed to park in front of the garages on the street because of a City Ordinance that prohibits parking in front or across from garages. She pointed out the 10' setback would provide another parking space off of the street.

Ms. Larson stated Mr. & Mrs. Stojack owned 62 Denver, a rental property and at one time, they had three families living in the unit. She noted that had caused a lot of parking problems. Ms.

Williams stated she would like to be notified if this happened again since it is a violation of City Ordinance.

**Mr. Allen moved to approve the Request for a 10' Variance from Section 17.24.040.B - Front Yard setback of 20'.**

Ms. Green questioned if approval of the variance would bind the commission for approval of the plat. Ms. Williams stated it did not; it was only the first step of the process.

**Ms. Green seconded and the motion carried.**

<b><u>All in favor</u></b>	<b><u>-</u></b>	<b><u>5</u></b>
<b><u>Opposed</u></b>	<b><u>-</u></b>	<b><u>0</u></b>

Chairperson Farrier adjourned the Planning and Zoning meeting and turned the meeting over to the Board of Adjustment.

#### **DEADWOOD BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT**

Mayor Toscana called the Board of Adjustment to order.

**Ms. Griffith moved to approve the recommendation from Planning & Zoning for the Request for a 10' Variance from Section 17.24.040.B - Front Yard setback of 20'. Mr. Klamm seconded and the motion carried.**

<b><u>All in favor</u></b>	<b><u>-</u></b>	<b><u>3</u></b>
<b><u>Opposed</u></b>	<b><u>-</u></b>	<b><u>0</u></b>

Mayor Toscana adjourned the Board of Adjustment and turned the meeting back over to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Chairperson Farrier called the Planning and Zoning meeting back to order.

#### **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

- 1) **Deadwood Resort, LLC - Variances from height, side and rear lot line setback requirements and Change of Zoning from PF - Park Forest District to CH - Commercial Highway District.**

**Mr. Shedd moved to approve the Findings of Fact for Deadwood Resort, LLC - Variances from height, side and rear lot line setback requirements and Change of Zoning from PF - Park Forest District to CH - Commercial Highway District. Mr. Allen seconded and the motion carried.**

<b><u>All in Favor</u></b>	<b><u>-</u></b>	<b><u>5</u></b>
<b><u>Opposed</u></b>	<b><u>-</u></b>	<b><u>0</u></b>

Chairman Farrier adjourned the Planning and Zoning meeting and turned the meeting over to the Board of Adjustment.

#### **DEADWOOD BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT**

Mayor Toscana called the Board of Adjustment to order.

**Ms. Silvernail moved to approve the Findings of Fact for Variances from height, side and rear lot line setback requirements and Change of Zoning from PF - Park Forest District to CH - Commercial Highway District, as recommended by Planning and Zoning. Ms. Griffith seconded and the motion carried.**

<b><u>All in Favor</u></b>	<b><u>-</u></b>	<b><u>3</u></b>
<b><u>Opposed</u></b>	<b><u>-</u></b>	<b><u>0</u></b>

Mayor Toscana adjourned the Board of Adjustments and turned the meeting over to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Chairman Farrier called the Planning and Zoning meeting back to order.

**OPEN**

Ms. Williams introduced the new City Attorney, Jason Campbell to the Planning & Zoning Commission.

Ms. Williams gave an update on Janice Heffron, Fogle Conditional Use Permit stipulations. She stated Ms. Heffron-Fogle had paid for the building permit; however, she still needed approval from Historic Preservation on the rear stair issue.

Mr. Green questioned the status of the Mr. David Bosch's nightly rental issue. Ms. Williams stated she had turned her file over to Mr. Jason Campbell, Deadwood City Attorney, and he was to review the file and issues.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

**Mr. Ryan moved to adjourn the Special Joint Meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission. Mr. Shedd seconded and the motion carried.**

**All in favor - 5**  
**Opposed - 0**

There being no further business, Planning & Zoning Commission adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ms. Marie Farrier  
Chairman (Acting)  
Planning and Zoning

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ms. Sheree Green  
Secretary (Acting)  
Planning and Zoning