

**ANDOVER CITY PLANNING COMMISSION /
BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
Tuesday, October 20, 2015
Minutes**

1. Call to order. 00:05:48

Chairman Lynn Heath called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

2. Roll call. 00:06:01

Planning Commission members present were Chairman Heath, Mike Warrington, Stephanie Gillespie, Brian Lindebak, William Schnauber, Lee Butler and Tyson Bean. Lee Butler arrived at 7:08 p.m.

Staff in attendance: Director of Public Works Les Mangus, City Administrator Mark Detter, Administrative Assistant Daynna DuFriend and City Council Liaison Sheri Geisler.

Legal Council: Andrew Kovar, Triplett, Woolf & Garretson

A/V: Cindy Barrett and Craig Brown

3. Approval of the minutes of the September 15, 2015 meetings. 00:06:23

A motion was made by Mike Warrington, seconded by William Schnauber to approve minutes of the September 15, 2015 meeting. Motion carried 6/0.

4. Communications 00:07:23

- A. Committee and Staff Report.
- B. Potential Residential Development Report.

5. Z-2015-02- Public hearing on proposed amendment to the Amended Terradyne Preliminary General Planned Unit Development Plan. 00:07:44

Chairman Heath explained that due to a tie vote of the City Council this case was returned to the Planning Commission for a summarization of the 17 Factors and Findings for the records. If any changes would occur a new vote would have to be made.

Andrew Kovar, reminded the Planning Commission that this case was recommended for approval to the City Council at a previous meeting. The City Council moved to return this case to the Planning Commission for reconsideration of the 17 Factors and Findings.

Bob Kaplan, attorney for the applicant, was present to represent the application.

Mr. Kaplan suggested that for the record the remand the Planning Commission received from the City Council was a very limited remand to expand on the 17 Factors and to submit such additional information in support of the decision as you wish to submit and to look at the factors again. This motion negates holding a re-hearing and a re-vote. The case has already been heard with the recommended approval and criteria submitted to the City Council. To quote the motion made by Mr. Nelson, he stated "to return the zoning case Z-2015-02 to the October 20, 2015 Planning Commission meeting for specific information on each of the 17 Factors and Findings used to determine the recommendation to the Council and return them to the Council for the October 27, 2015 meeting." The motion carried 6/0 and was supported by opposing Council members. Nothing was stated by the Council for a re-hearing or a re-vote.

Mr. Kaplan continued by reviewing the 17 Factors.

Factor #1, What are the existing uses and their character and condition on the subject property and in the surrounding neighborhood? and Factor #2, What is the current zoning of the subject property and that of the surrounding neighborhood in relationship to the requested change?, both consist of residential zoned properties surrounding the subject property to the North, East and South. The Terradyne golf course is West of the subject property.

Factor #3, Is the length of time that the subject property has remained undeveloped or vacant as zoned a factor in the consideration? This property has never been developed. Any property owner has a right to develop their property in trying to earn a return on investment. However, this is not without restrictions and the public has a right to be heard.

Factor #4, Would the request correct an error in the application of these regulations? This is non-applicable and has been answered by the Planning Commission as no.

Factor #5, Is the request caused by changed or changing conditions in the area of the subject property and, if so, what is the nature and significance of such changed or changing conditions? This is non-applicable as the subject property will remain residential.

Factor #6, Do adequate sewage disposal and water supply and all other necessary public facilities including street access exist or can they be provided to serve the uses that would be permitted on the subject property? The necessary infrastructure is already in place.

Factor #7, Would the subject property need to be platted or re-platted in lieu of dedications made for rights-of-way, easements access control or building setback lines? Two residential lots are being proposed and the engineers would replat the property during a separate, distinct hearing.

Factor #8, Would a screening plan be necessary for existing and/or potential uses of the subject property? Screening is not required single-family residential properties.

Factor #9, Are suitable vacant lands or buildings available or not available for development that currently has the same zoning as is requested? This is not applicable as the subject property is an infill in an area not being used by the Golf Course.

Factor #11, Is the subject property suitable for the current zoning to which it has been restricted? The property is already zoned as single-family and that is the use it will be used as.

Factor #12, To what extent would removal of the restrictions, i.e., the approval of the zoning request detrimentally affect other property in the neighborhood? This property is already zoned as single-family and consists of only 1 ½ acres.

Factor #14, Is the request in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan and does it further enhance the implementation of the Plan? The Comprehensive Plan is for single-family residential.

Factor #15, What is the nature of the support or opposition to the request? Both have spoken. No legal basis was stated for any opposition. The applicant plans to further enhance the neighborhood, raising the property values.

Factor #17, By comparison, does the relative gain to the public health, safety and general welfare outweigh the loss in property value or the hardship imposed upon the applicant by not approving the request? This would be a loss of a sale with no loss to the neighborhood. 108 dwelling units were originally planned for this Planned Unit Development.

Bill Fox, Poe & Associates, and David Foster, Rice, Foster & Associates were both present on behalf of the applicant.

Mr. Fox explained that the only change that has been made since reviewing in July is the addition of Reserve C located along the southern edge of the property. It will be 25 feet wide and used for irrigation, landscaping, entry monument and fence and will be left in its current natural state.

Mr. Foster described in detail the entry monument and single entry driveway. A few of the existing juniper trees on either side of the existing monument will need to be removed. The addition of Reserve C will contain natural landscape enhancements. Existing utility boxes will be hidden. One single drive entry will be used for both lots.

Brian Lindebak asked if there would be a separate drive entry for each property.

Chairman Heath opened the public hearing.

Joanne Barclay, 1117 W. Terradyne Ct., is opposed and submitted a 106 signature petition against the new development to the City Council prior to this meeting.

Factor #1, What are the existing uses and their character and condition of the subject property and in the surrounding neighborhood? This property was platted to be a golf course 30 years ago and the integrity of the golf course includes this area.

Factor #2, What is the current zoning of the subject property and that of the surrounding neighborhood in relationship to the requested change? This development would be taking the golf course designation to that of residential.

Factor #3, Is the length of time that the subject property has remained undeveloped or vacant as zoned a factor in the consideration? The time is significant.

Factor #5, Is the request caused by changed or changing conditions in the area of the subject property and, if so what is the nature and significance of such changed or changing conditions? There is no change.

Factor #9, Are suitable vacant lands or buildings available or not available for development that currently has the same zoning as is requested? Terradyne currently has, to the west of the club an area zoned for residential development.

Factor #14, Is the request in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan and does it further enhance the implementation of the Plan? Housing does fit as does open space.

Factor #15, What is the nature of the support or opposition to the request? The development of two additional lots in Parcel 1 of the Terradyne PUD is not supported. What is to stop future development of other areas of the golf course.

LaRoux Gillespie, 1123 Terradyne Ct., agrees with the summary of Mr. Kaplan regarding the request from the City Council. Mr. Gillespie disagreed with Mr. Kaplan regarding surrounding uses and potential uses of the property.

Chairman Heath closed the public hearing.

Mr. Kaplan noted that there will be no change to the use of this property. This property is zoned residential and is not part of the golf course.

Chairman Heath asked if the common areas in other additions are deeded to the City.

Les Mangus stated that typically the common areas are reserves and are owned by the Homeowners Association with a specific set of uses assigned to them by the developer. These uses most commonly being landscaping, screening, fencing, playgrounds, etc. When Terradyne was platted the golf course was platted as two lots.

Mike Warrington asked for the number of lot owners on the petition list.

Andrew Kovar, explained that the petition referred to was filed with the City on August 25th after the 15 day submission period from the last public hearing by the Planning Commission. A determination of who has signed the petition versus who was in the notification area or the actual affected area has not been done by the City. The statute for reconsideration calls for specific guidelines about the options. If there is no change of the 17 Factors, a recommendation can be submitted as done the first time. If you can make a new recommendation also to approve but

with some kind of change or clarified findings of fact on the 17 Factors. If something in those findings has changed to the extent that a recommendation to decline is made that can also be done. The final option is to do nothing. The Council can consider that a resubmission of the original recommendation.

Lee Butler asked what the legal standing was for returning this case to the Planning Commission and noted that some members of the Commission are new since the last hearing. What is the history of PUD's making amendments after they have been completed? Is this phase of Terradyne done and closed?

Les Mangus explained that those new members not present for the first hearing can either choose not to vote or they can tell us that they have educated or rehabilitated themselves to a point that they feel they have enough information to vote. The original PUD had 108 dwelling units on this parcel. In 2006 there was an amendment of the PUD to change the number of dwelling units and the uses of a parcel of land west of the clubhouse. This created new sub-parcels from that original parcel and placed a limitation of 101 dwelling units in the remainder of the golf course and the first subdivision. The Terradyne development is not finished. There is a townhouse development currently under construction with another parcel adjacent to that yet to be developed. This area was part of the golf course, identified with the same lot and block.

Brian Lindebak remarked that it is not unheard of to amend CUP's or PUD's to make revisions as needed and as the market demands. The addition of 2 parcels on a PUD would be less than a 1% change.

Mike Warrington asked what the original intent was how this area and was it labeled on the original plat. It is not labeled at green space or open space.

Lynn Heath questioned how many owners have been involved with changes for this property.

Les Mangus answered that there have been approximately 4-5 owners of the golf course and vacant lands.

Planning Commission discussed the following Factors and Findings.

1. What are the existing uses and their character and condition on the subject property and in the surrounding neighborhood?

Chairman Heath noted that a residential neighborhood surrounds the property.

2. What is the current zoning of the subject property and that of the surrounding neighborhood in relationship to the requested change?

Chairman Heath noted that zoning is as such: North - R-2 Single Family Residential District – Terradyne Golf Course, South – R-1 Single Family Residential District, East – R-2 Single Family Residential District, West – R-2 Single Family Residential District – Terradyne Golf Course.

3. Is the length of time that the subject property has remained undeveloped or vacant as zoned a factor in the consideration?

July 21, 2015 determination was NO.

Lee Butler said there has been testimony saying that it has been setting and they want to make money with it.

Chairman Heath said there has also been testimony saying that it has been setting that way and they would like it to stay that way. The residents perceived that it would remain that way.

Brian Lindebak suggested that the market demand is more of a key factor with this and feels no is still appropriate.

Mike Warrington asked if there was anything in writing stating that the area would be left as open or green space.

Brian Lindebak asked if there was any title work or covenants stating this information.

Les Mangus replied that the City is not aware of any covenant.

The answer remains NO.

4. Would the request correct an error in the application of these regulations?

July 21, 2015 determination was NO.

No further discussion.

The answer remains NO.

5. Is the request caused by changed or changing conditions in the area of the subject property and, if so, what is the nature and significance of such changed or changing conditions?

July 21, 2015 determination was NO.

Chairman Heath said this is a result of current market demands.

Brian Lindebak noted that this is an unused area of the course.

The answer is changed to YES.

6. Do adequate sewage disposal and water supply and all other necessary public facilities including street access exist or can they be provided to serve the uses that would be permitted on the subject property?

July 21, 2015 determination was YES.

No further discussion.

The answer remains YES.

7. Would the subject property need to be platted or replatted in lieu of dedications made for rights-of-way, easements access control or building setback lines?

July 21, 2015 determination was YES.

No further discussion.

The answer remains YES.

8. Would a screening plan be necessary for existing and/or potential uses of the subject property?

July 21, 2015 determination was NO.

Chairman Heath stated that screening is not required in residential zoned areas.

The answer remains NO.

9. Are suitable vacant lands or buildings available or not available for development that currently has the same zoning as is requested?

July 21, 2015 determination was N/A.

Chairman Heath stated as discussed there are no other suitable lands available on a golf course for this development.

The answer is changed to NO.

10. If the request is for business or industrial uses, are such uses needed to provide more services or employment opportunities?

July 21, 2015 determination was N/A.

No further discussion

The answer remains N/A.

11. Is the subject property suitable for the current zoning to which it has been restricted?

July 21, 2015 determination was YES.

Chairman Heath said that the zoning remains the same.

The answer remains YES.

12. To what extent would removal of the restrictions, i.e., the approval of the zoning request detrimentally affect other property in the neighborhood?

July 21, 2015 determination AGREED WITH STAFF – NO DETRIMENT OT THE NEIGHBORHOOD IS PERCEIVED.

William Schnauber said that the letters of protest are for visual.

Chairman Heath added that values of neighboring homes will not be lowered.

Tyson Bean also added the number of homes be changed from 101 to 103.

Brian Lindebak stated that this could potentially improve home values.

The answer remains AGREE WITH STAFF – NO DETRIMENT OT THE NEIGHBORHOOD IS PERCEIVED.

13. Would the request be consistent with the purpose of the zoning district classification and the intent and purpose of these regulations?

July 21, 2015 determination was YES.

No further discussion.

The answer remains YES.

14. Is the request in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan and does it further enhance the implementation of the Plan?

July 21, 2015 determination was YES.

No further discussion.

The answer remains YES.

15. What is the nature of the support or opposition to the request?

July 21, 2015 determination was OPPOSITION IS DUE TO OBSTRUCTION OF AESTHETICS.

Chairman Heath added that the opposition is due to obstruction of the view/aesthetics, not a lowering of values.

Lee Butler asked to add for the record that it was 101 houses when properties were purchased depending on dates of their purchase.

The answer remains OPPOSITION IS DUE TO OBSTRUCTION OF AESTHETICS.

16. Are there any informational materials or recommendations available from knowledgeable persons or experts which would be helpful in its evaluation?

July 21, 2015 determination was NO.

Chairman Heath stated that the commission has heard a lot of information and the change from 101 homes to 103 homes can be argued both ways.

Brian Lindebak said he did not feel there has been any more substantive material that previously seen.

The answer remains NO.

17. By comparison, does the relative gain to the public health, safety and general welfare outweigh the loss in property value or the hardship imposed upon the applicant by not approving the request?

July 21, 2015 determination was NO.

No further discussion

The answer remains NO.

Having considered the evidence at the hearing and the factors to evaluate the zoning application, I Brian Lindebak, move that we recommend to the Governing Body that Case No. (Z-2015-02) be approved for the proposed amendments to the Amended Terradyne Preliminary General Planned Unit Development Plan

Existing Parcel 1

1. *Reconfigure the boundaries of Parcel 1 to create a new Parcel 1-B.*
2. *Increase the maximum number of single-family detached dwelling units to reflect an increase from 101 to 103 existing single-family dwelling units.*

Parcel 1-B

1. *To allow not more than 2 single-family dwelling units in the R-2 Single-Family Residential District.*

based on the findings of #5 – current market demands, #9 – no other suitable sites, and #14 – infill of unused land with high quality homes, in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan, by the Planning Commission as recorded in the summary of this hearing. Motion seconded by William Schnauber. Motion carried 6/1. Lee Butler opposed.

This case will be heard by the City Council October 27, 2015.

The Planning Commission requested a 10 minute recess.

01:40:52

7. Z-2015-03- A public hearing on proposed amendment to the Green Valley Greens Planned Unit Development Plan. 01:50:00

Les Mangus explained that the applicant is asking to develop single-family and two-family residential units and is requesting a change in the zoning district classification of Parcel 15 from the B-4 Central Business District to the R-3 Multiple Family Residential District. A revision to the bulk regulations includes a request for the minimum lot size to be 5,000 square feet and a 6 foot side yard setback.

Phil Meyer, Baughman Co., agent for the applicant was present.

Mr. Meyer presented a sketch plan of the proposed final PUD, subject to change, that will be submitted upon approval of the zoning request. Two-family homes are planned on this last piece of property owned by the developers J. Russell and Clifford Nies as this property has been on the market since 1998. In regards to the 17 Factors and Findings he highlighted the following.

#1. What are the existing uses and their character and condition on the subject property and in the surrounding neighborhood? The residential use is appropriate and would be a buffer to the patio homes immediately north of the property. Green Valley Greens is a residential development. East adjacent property is owned by a church and is zoned commercial.

#3. Is the length of time that the subject property has remained undeveloped or vacant as zoned a factor in the consideration? As mentioned the developers have been unable to develop this property commercially since purchase in 1998.

#5. Is the request caused by changed or changing conditions in the area of the subject property and, if so, what is the nature and significance of such changed or changing conditions? The length of time property has been for sale.

#6. Do adequate sewage disposal and water supply and all other necessary public facilities including street access exist or can they be provided to serve the uses that would be permitted on the subject property? All utilities are available.

#9. Are suitable vacant lands or buildings available or not available for development that currently has the same zoning as is requested? There is no two-family or duplex zoning available in this area.

#12. To what extent would removal of the restrictions, i.e., the approval of the zoning request detrimentally affect other property in the neighborhood? Change in down zoning is consistent with the Green Valley Greens Development.

Chairman Heath asked what the price range would be of the homes.

Mr. Meyer replied that the developers plan to own the homes and lease them, a rate is unknown. Duplexes and apartments are very active residential developments in this area right now. The 10 foot utility easement along Onewood on Lot 1 and Lot 11 could become a reserve.

Mike Warrington asked if there is an economic need for additional duplexes.

Brian Lindebak suggested converting the 20 foot building setbacks into landscape reserves.

Les Mangus stated that any land platted as a reserve would be considered a side lot or rear yard setback for the home and would determine where the house would set on the lot. The highway requirement is noted on the plan.

Lynn Heath asked if this plan meets the Corridor Plan.

Chairman Heath opened the public hearing.

Rusty Hatch, 216 S. Onewood Dr. neither opposes nor supports the zoning request but feels that this plan is compressed and could become a possible eyesore if not maintained.

Chairman Heath closed the public hearing.

ANDOVER CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Agenda Item No. 6

REZONING REPORT *

CASE NUMBER: Z-2015-03

APPLICANT/AGENT:

Green Valley Commercial Development/Baughman Company, P.A.

REQUEST: Proposed amendments to the Amended Final General Planned Unit Development (P.U.D.) of Green Valley Greens, to change the zoning district classification of Parcel 15 from the B-4 Central Business District to the R-3 Multiple Family Residential District.

CASE HISTORY:

LOCATION: Northwest corner of Onewood Drive and US 54 Highway

SITE SIZE: 3.98 acres

PROPOSED USE: Single-Family Detached Residential Units, Two-Family Detached Residential Units, Patio Homes, Zero Lot Line Units, Playgrounds, Ponds, and Open Space.

ADJACENT ZONING AND EXISTING LAND USE:

North: R-4 Multi-Family Residential District – Single family residences

South: B-2 Neighborhood Business District / B-5 Highway Business District – multiple family residences

East: B-4 Central Business District – undeveloped church site

West: R-2 Single Family Residential District – Andover Municipal Golf Course

Background Information: A final PUD Plan was submitted for this parcel for businesses uses a few months ago, but the developer has abandoned that plan and desires to construct duplexes instead.

* Note: This report is to assist the Planning Commission to determine their findings from the evidence presented at the hearing so as to base their rezoning recommendation on the required 17 factors found in Section 11-100 H of the Zoning Regulations. The responses provided need to be evaluated with the evidence and reworded as necessary to reflect the Planning Commission's considered opinion. Sample motions are provided to ensure the accuracy of the motion and facilitate the summary of the hearing for the minutes. Conditions attached to the motion, if any, should be carefully worded to provide instructions to the applicant and facilitate enforcement by the Zoning Administrator.

(As per Article 11, Section 100 of the City of Andover Zoning Regulation – 1993)

H. Amendments to Change Zoning Districts. When a proposed amendment would result in a change of the zoning district classification of any specific property, the report of the Planning Commission, accompanied by a summary of the hearing, shall contain statements as to (1) the present and proposed district classifications, (2) the applicant's reasons for seeking such reclassification, and (3) a statement of the factors where relevant upon which the recommendation of the Commission is based using the following factors as guidelines:

FACTORS AND FINDINGS:

YES NO 1. What are the existing uses and their character and condition on the subject property and in the surrounding neighborhood? (See Adjacent Existing Land Uses on page 1 of 4)

STAFF:

PLANNING: Residential and Business Districts.

COUNCIL:

YES NO 2. What is the current zoning of the subject property and that of the surrounding neighborhood in relationship to the requested change? (See Adjacent Zoning on page 1 of 4)

STAFF:

PLANNING: R-2, R-4, B-2 & B-4.

COUNCIL:

YES NO 3. Is the length of time that the subject property has remained undeveloped or vacant as zoned a factor in the consideration?

X STAFF: The applicant has had the property for sale for business uses for many years without success.

X PLANNING:
COUNCIL:

YES NO 4. Would the request correct an error in the application of these regulations?

X STAFF:
X PLANNING:
COUNCIL:

YES NO 5. Is the request caused by changed or changing conditions in the area of the subject property and, if so, what is the nature and significance of such changed or changing conditions?

X STAFF: The Comprehensive Plan market study indicates that there is an overabundance of commercial property for sale along the highway corridor.
X PLANNING:
COUNCIL:

YES NO 6. Do adequate sewage disposal and water supply and all other necessary public facilities including street access exist or can they be provided to serve the uses that would be permitted on the subject property?

STAFF: Water and streets are in place and adequate. Sewer can be readily extended to the site.

PLANNING: Agree.
COUNCIL:

YES NO 7. Would the subject property need to be platted or replatted in lieu of dedications made for rights-of-way, easements access control or building setback lines?

X STAFF: A final PUD Plan will be required.
X PLANNING:
COUNCIL:

YES NO 8. Would a screening plan be necessary for existing and/or potential uses of the subject property?

X STAFF: No screening of the adjacent land uses is required.
X PLANNING:
COUNCIL:

YES NO 9. Are suitable vacant lands or buildings available or not available for development that currently has the same zoning as is requested?

STAFF: No properties with the appropriate zoning are available in the vicinity.
 PLANNING:
COUNCIL:

YES NO 10. If the request is for business or industrial uses, are such uses needed to provide more services or employment opportunities?

STAFF: NA
PLANNING: NA
COUNCIL:

YES NO 11. Is the subject property suitable for the current zoning to which it has been restricted?

STAFF:
 PLANNING:
COUNCIL:

YES NO 12. To what extent would removal of the restrictions, i.e., the approval of the zoning request detrimentally affect other property in the neighborhood?

STAFF: Staff perceives no detriment by the down zoning.
PLANNING: Agree.
COUNCIL:

YES NO 13. Would the request be consistent with the purpose of the zoning district classification and the intent and purpose of these regulations?

STAFF:
 PLANNING:
COUNCIL:

YES NO 14. Is the request in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan and does it further enhance the implementation of the Plan?

STAFF: The subject property is within the US-54/400 lifestyle corridor, which recognizes the need for a variety of housing types mixed with business & civic uses.
PLANNING: Agree.
COUNCIL:

YES NO 15. What is the nature of the support or opposition to the request?

STAFF: None at this time.

PLANNING: None at this time.

COUNCIL:

YES NO 16. Are there any informational materials or recommendations available from knowledgeable persons or experts, which would be helpful in its evaluation?

STAFF: Approval, conditioned upon satisfactory platting.

PLANNING: Agree.

COUNCIL:

YES NO 17. By comparison, does the relative gain to the public health, safety and general welfare outweigh the loss in property value or the hardship imposed upon the applicant by not approving the request?

STAFF:
 PLANNING:
 COUNCIL:

Having considered the evidence at the hearing and the factors to evaluate the zoning application, I Brian Lindebak, move that we recommend to the Governing Body that Case No. (Z-2015-03) be modified & approved, as reserve areas may substitute setbacks as listed for both rear yard and side yard when adjoining a street right of way for the proposed amendment to the Amended Final General Planned Unit Development (P.U.D.) of Green Valley Greens

An amendment to the zoning district classification of Parcel 15 eliminating the B-4 Central Business District and replace with the R-3 Multiple Family Residential District.

based on the findings of #3 – length of vacancy time, #9 – no suitable lands available, #11 – suitable as a highway buffer, #12 – compatible with land setbacks, by the Planning Commission as recorded in the summary of this hearing. Motion seconded by William Schnauber. Motion carried 7/0.

This case will be forwarded to the Governing Body with the Planning Commission's recommendation and a written summary of the hearing for consideration at their regular meeting of November 10, 2015 which begins at 7:00 p.m. in this same meeting room. The tape recording of this hearing will be retained for at least 60 days after the final determination is completed on this case.

Protest petitions against the change in zoning and/or special use, but not directed at the Commission's recommendations as such, may be received by the City Clerk for 14 days after tonight, i.e. November 3, 2015 at 4:30 p.m. If there are properly signed protest petitions with accurate legal descriptions from the owners of record of 20% or more of the total real property within the official area of notification both inside and outside the City not counting public street rights of way or specific statutorily excluded property, then such a change shall not be passed except by a three-fourths vote of all the members of the City Council. (See Section 11-103.)

8. Member Items. 02:34:40

There were no member items.

A motion was made by Tyson Bean, seconded by Brian Lindebak to adjourn at 9:32p.m. Motion carried 7/0.

Respectfully Submitted by

Daynna DuFriend
Administrative Assistant

Approved this 17th of November, 2015 by the Andover City Planning Commission/Board of Zoning Appeals, City of Andover.