

**CITY OF ANDOVER**  
**SITE PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE**  
**March 7, 2017**  
**MINUTES**

The Site Plan Review Committee met for a regular meeting on Tuesday, March 7, 2017 at Andover City Hall located at 1609 E. Central Ave., Andover, Kansas. Dennis Bush called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m. as Chairman Allison was unable to speak due to laryngitis. Members present were Chairman Allison, Dennis Bush, Don Kimble, Clark Nelson, Brandon Wilson, Nate Hinson and Todd Woolsoncroft.

Staff in attendance: Les Mangus, Director of Public Works and Community Development; Mark Detter, City Administrator, Steve Anderson, City Engineer and Daynna DuFriend, Administrative Assistant.

**Review the minutes of the February 7, 2017 meeting.**

*Nate Hinson made a motion, seconded by Chairman Allison, to approve the minutes of the February 7, 2017 meeting as presented. Motion carried 7/0.*

**SP-2017-03- Review for approval of the site plan for The Mapleton Assisted Living Center, located at 1503 W. Central Ave., Andover, Kansas.**

Dennis Bush recused himself due to a potential conflict of interest.

Don Kimble recused himself due to business relations.

Jerry Dieker, North American Buildings Inc., agent to the applicant was present to represent the application.

Mr. Dieker explained that this assisted living complex will consist of two buildings. One building will have 20 units and the other will have 17 units. His client has a goal to make the buildings resemble residential homes with different designs and colors for the two separate buildings. One building will have brick exterior detailing and the other will have stone exterior detailing. Samples of each were provided. Located at the front of the property the monument sign will be low-profile, brick detailing and will have low lighting. Trim colors selected are burgundy for one of the buildings and blue for the other. A white siding material will be used on both buildings. The front entry doors will each be a residential style six-panel double door.

Being in a residential area the lighting on the property will be concentrated to the front of the lot to average it out towards the back of the lot. The parking area will be in the front with most of the lighting. Two LED lights will be on the sides directed downward to ground. All lighting under the canopies will be LED can lights in the ceiling projecting down. Landscaping will be placed

around the two trash dumpsters at each building, around the sign and around the front of the parking area. Trees will be added along the property line at the rear where it is close to the residential areas. A fence will be placed on the west and south sides as screening on the residential sides. The neighboring business to the west has an existing fence. Access will be provided between the buildings for deliveries to kitchen area and for the fire department vehicles. A front sidewalk allows handicap access to the buildings. The parking lot is approximately three foot above the flood line, so drainage should not be hindered along the west edge of the property. Inlets will be constructed on both sides of the project for storm water run-off. Buffalo grass will be used for the grassed areas. There are several existing trees in the water way and they are unsure who is responsible for maintaining this area. Tamko weathered wood shingles will be used.

Clark Nelson asked where emergency vehicles would enter and who is responsible for the trees in the water way.

Mr. Dieker said they would enter at the front entrance.

Les Mangus stated that the trees are on private property.

Mr. Dieker noted that some of those trees would be affected in the connection to the sewer line that is along 159<sup>th</sup> Street.

Todd Woolsoncroft asked if the trash enclosures would be constructed of the same material as the back fencing.

Mr. Dieker answered that they would be cedar like the fencing.

Les Mangus asked Mr. Dieker if they have talked to the trash company about the route and width as designed. Concerns for this were noted by both the City Engineer and Fire Marshall. He suggested moving them forward and setting at an angle.

Don Kimble noted that the drainage issues causing concerns by neighbors is probably occurring on the property located between the Chateauroux neighborhood and this property. He asked what responsibility the applicant and their engineer Baughman Company would have to satisfy the concern of flooding to the residential neighbors that appear to be on this other property. He suggested that a civil engineer be consulted.

Matt Cartwright, representing the property owner of 450 N. 159<sup>th</sup> St. E., was present and stated that they do have drainage concerns. The building on their property is now under the floodplain. He asked if a swale could be created to help direct water run-off to the west so as not to increase the impact on their property.

Steve Anderson expressed concern with the sheet flow on to the tower (west) site. He was told by Trevor Wooten that this could be accommodated at the time of building plan submittal and if a swale is needed they are amenable to that and the concerns regarding the corner will be examined.

Les Mangus commented that there was discussion about the set back from the City Service pipeline. The civil engineer has clarified that it is a 66-foot easement and that the building is outside of that 66-foot easement.

Steve Anderson added that this easement is ambiguous. One paragraph of the legal description defines it by a survey of map and another by center line of pipeline. If there needs to be an adjustment to safely maintain that 33-feet, it would be prudent to require or allow in a motion of approval. This may require a technical shift of a few feet to the building.

Mr. Dieker said that they could move the buildings six feet to the north.

Ryan Zink, 1406 Chaumont Cir., Chateauroux, asked if both buildings would be moved.

Mr. Dieker replied that both buildings would be moved to create a swale based on what is determined by Baughman Company.

Pat Voth Blankenship, 351 N. Chaumont Ct., Chateauroux, explained that the main input that the neighborhood is making for the Site Plan Review Committee is that approximately 25% have submitted requests asking the committee to give the neighbors additional time to review this. This was dropped on the neighbors with only 48 hours to review the plans. In August when the neighbors first met with the developer they asked this developer if he would be willing to work with them in order to absolve any neighborhood concerns. Unfortunately, this was not how this was handled. She contacted the developer and received the information from the developer Sunday night by email. This information was then forwarded to the homeowners of Chateauroux and told them to identify if any of them needed more than 48 hours to have an opportunity to review them or if they were fine with them as presented with the time allowed to review, or if any could put together review comments. They are concerned about the effect of this permanent improvement on the neighborhood and their homes. A key issue is the drainage concern. These private properties are very connected with how drainage impacts. She feels it is extremely reasonable that if homeowners would like additional information from Baughman Company to make sure that they are comfortable about how the proposed plan or any proposed adjustments could affect the amount of run off that could come to the homeowners.

Mr. Zink expressed concern for the impact that this is going to have on an already challenging situation they have in maintaining adequate drainage on the property on behalf of the neighbors located along the northern edge of Chateauroux.

Gary Dunnegan, 1502 Chaumont Cir., Chateauroux, asked if drainage could be moved towards Central where there is better drainage already built in. He is also concerned about the fence along the south of the subject property and if asked they would consider installing an eight-foot fence or something more permanent than a wood fence. He asked if they would be able to add a few tall trees along the back to screen the rear lighting directly affecting them.

Mr. Dieker pointed out to him the landscape and lighting plans for the project. All lighting is directed to the ground. There are LED can-lights in the canopies along the sides of the buildings that shine directly down. More trees will be installed.

Brandon Wilson commented that architecturally this design lacks. This style of design looks like modular housing and does not compare to the three neighboring developments. The windows, masonry and colors are not proportionate. Central is a gateway to Andover and this design is a huge disservice to the community.

Clark Nelson inquired as to what the time frame is for the developer and asked the committee if they had any objections to honoring the neighbors request to defer a decision for 30 days.

Don Kimble explained that this process really needs to take place in two weeks to allow for the developer to submit any changes and notices to be published prior to the next meeting.

Mr. Dieker answered that they want to proceed as soon as they could get a building permit. Upon permit approval they would be able to mobilize within two to three weeks. In approximately 90 days they plan to have the smaller unit completed. All plans are complete and ready to submit.

Todd Woolsoncroft said he felt that this should be continued.

Les Mangus told the committee that they will need to give the applicant instructions so that he knows what is expected to be seen in 30 days.

*Todd Woolsoncroft made a motion, seconded by Clark Nelson, to continue SP-2017-03 with the following items to be addressed by the applicant; 1. Moving the buildings six-feet to the north to avoid any conflict with the Cities Service Gas Company easement to the south if necessary, 2. Have Baughman Company further study the drainage onsite with potential impact to neighboring sites with consideration to a swale to the west, 3. Consideration of comments from Chateauroux neighborhood expected to be submitted to applicant within one week, 4. Consideration of exterior details of the project in relation to existing neighboring architecture. Motion carried 5/0.*

Following are emails received from Chateauroux property owners:

Received March 6, 2017, 9:43am

Daynna,

My name is David Rains. My family and I live at 1435 Chaumont Circle, Andover, KS 67002. We are residents of the Chateauroux neighborhood. For the reason I set forth below, I am writing this email to ask that you please delay the hearing that is currently scheduled for tomorrow, March 7, on the plans for the assisted living center (the "Facility") that is being planned for a site between Central Ave. and Chateauroux.

Last night I was forwarded an email by Trish Voth, a member of the Chateauroux HOA, that contained site plans for the Facility. On behalf of the HOA, she has been in contact with the developer of the Facility over the past several months. Last year, the HOA was assured by the developer that it would be kept in the loop in this process and that its concerns, if any, would be heard prior to submission of plans to Andover for official review so as to be able to collaborate and avoid unnecessary discussions in public hearings. However, contrary to the developer's assurances, he did not send her any updates until last night at 7:30 (less than 48 hours before the hearing) and only because she requested them after independently finding out about the upcoming hearing. That is not the type of openness and collaboration that I expected from him.

The sole reason my family and I have not submitted any previous comments or been involved until now is that the HOA was assured that it (and my family as a result) would be kept abreast of any plans. I certainly am not accusing the developer of avoiding involvement with our HOA nefariously since it may have legitimately been an honest oversight. However, his actions in not keeping us informed of their progress and plans, contrary to assurances that we had received, are not merely a violation of a technicality or a simple request from us. If these types of oversights are common with this developer, this may not be the type of developer I would like to see working in Andover. More importantly for me, my family and I live a stone's throw away from the planned site of the Facility and it will be visible from our property. We desire and deserve the opportunity to properly review these plans and to have any concerns heard. That opportunity has not fully been granted us as a result of the developer's actions since there is little chance that I can review these plans as they should be reviewed before the hearing tomorrow night. For this reason I am respectfully requesting that the hearing on plans for the Facility be delayed at least until the April meeting of the Site Plan Review Committee so as to allow me time to properly review the plans provided and assess their impact on my home and my community.

I appreciate your time in reviewing this email and thank you for your attention to this matter.

If you have any questions, please feel free to call or email me.

Thanks,

David Rains  
(316)828-4840 – office  
(316)708-2109 - cell

---

Received March 5, 2017, 5:47pm

Good evening  
we are Rana Antonios and Georges Elhomsy

we live in the Chateauroux neighborhood, and we are submit this email as our input to Site Plan Review Committee (SPRC) SP-2017-03: we have reviewed and concur with the SPRC input provided via email from Trish Voth on 3.5.17.

Thank you  
Georges Ehomsy  
Rana Antonios

---

Received March 6, 2017, 3:06pm

Dear Ms. DuFriend,

We are writing as residents of the Chateauroux neighborhood (1414 Chaumont Circle). We have reviewed emails from Trish and persons involved in the assisted living facility proposal for the lot just north of the Chateauroux neighborhood. The developers just forwarded their proposal to the HOA yesterday. There is a SPRC meeting tomorrow, in part, to discuss the proposal. However, we would greatly appreciate having more time to review the proposal in its present form. We have reviewed a prior version of the proposal but believe that the proposal has underwent significant changes, some or many of which have the potential to affect the Chateauroux neighborhood. We hope to have an opportunity to review the present proposal in detail, but will be unable to do so prior to tomorrow's meeting because of time constraints. We agree with the SPRC input that Trish provided on 3/5/17. We appreciate your consideration of my email.

Thank you,

Jarrod and Aimee Steffan

---

Received March 5, 2017, 9:36pm

Good evening, Daynna. My husband and two boys live in the Chateauroux neighborhood, and we wish to provide input to the Site Plan Review Committee (SPRC) SP-2017-03:

We have received some information today from our HOA regarding the issue as outlined in the March 5 email from Trish Voth. We have only recently moved into this neighborhood and are trying our best to get up to speed on this issue. However, given the significant, potential implications for our recently purchased property, we will need more than 48 hours to review the information provided and submit input. **I therefore urge the SPRC to delay any decisions until Chateauroux homeowners have had a chance to review and comment.**

**Jodie Stutzman**

INVISTA | Director, Public Affairs | +1.316.828.1786

---

Received March 6, 2017, 5:33pm

**We live in the Chateauroux neighborhood, and submit this email as our input to Site Plan Review Committee (SPRC) SP-2017-03: We have reviewed and concur with the SPRC input provided via email from Trish Voth on 3.5.17.**

**Joel and Gaylene Alderson**

**1332 Chaumont Circle**

---

Received March 6, 2017, 4:49am

**I live in the Chateauroux neighborhood, and submit this email as our input to Site Plan Review Committee (SPRC) SP-2017-03: I have reviewed and concur with the SPRC input provided via email from Trish Voth on 3.5.17.”**

**Thank you.**

**kendal nelson**

---

March 5, 2017, 12:20pm

Hi, Daynna – hope things are well!

Would you please pass this email on to the Site Plan Review Committee members? Thanks! Apologies, but I do not find an email address online for me to email SPRC direct, so I figured I would just need to get this to you to forward. If instead you have email(s) for SPRC and you prefer I contact them directly, happy to do so. Please feel free to let me know of any questions-

**Input to Site Plan Review Committee (SPRC) SP-2017-03:**

Our Chateauroux neighborhood HOA just learned this past Thursday night, that this next Tuesday night the proposed assisted living facility at 1503 W Central is on the agenda for SPRC. Shelly with our HOA left a phone message Friday morning requesting a full copy of the file so that our homeowners would have sufficient time to review and provide input by the meeting. But, we have not received copies as of today (Sunday). We are “in the dark” on this proposal. Site design was a CRITICAL component to the site’s zoning change last fall, due to proximity to residential property.

On behalf of the HOA, please consider the following:

1. **Seven HOA Site Design Criteria Requests:** At a minimum, implementing all seven site design items described in the HOA’s 8.16.16 email (copy attached for easy reference). Note that when Planning Commission approved this site’s zoning change last fall (8.16.16), the approval terms included providing these seven site design items to SPRC (copy of PC approval minutes attached for easy reference).
2. **Copies to HOA:** Providing the HOA a full copy of all that has been submitted to the City regarding this proposed development, along with copies of all correspondence between any City representatives and applicant representatives, so that the HOA can be aware of the full proposal regarding this development.
3. **Final Decision Deferral:** Deferring SPRC final decision on this item past 3/7/17, to allowing HOA members additional time to review what has been submitted, against what HOA was provided last fall from the applicant. If helpful to SPRC, attached are elevations that the applicant provided the HOA last fall as how the applicant “sold” the quality of the proposed development to the HOA and the Planning Commission. I do not know how these compare to what has been submitted to SPRC. Additionally, last fall the applicant said the use would most likely be a Bee Hive franchised location, or else of the same design and quality. If helpful to SPRC, here is the Bee Hive website: [www.beehivehomes.com](http://www.beehivehomes.com)
4. **Drainage:** I do not know if Matt Cartwright or Brian Lindebak are aware of the proposed development plans. Both during the 8.16.16 Planning Commission meeting provided detailed input on drainage issues (see attached PC 8.16.16 minutes), so SPRC may want to interview both of them as part of the SPRC’s work. Additionally: all 10 HOA lots abutting the HOA North boundary are affected by this overall drainage pattern, and many of the HOA lot owners have incurred material cost to design, grade and even install drainage infrastructure, to alleviate

drainage issues. The HOA needs sufficient information and time to evaluate any drainage impact.

5. **Applicant Neighborly Cooperation with HOA:** Since this is not our “day job,” it is difficult for our homeowners to review and respond to information on only a few days’ notice. Particularly if a homeowner needs to receive any professional advice (eg, drainage impact on yards & basements). To put it mildly, we are dismayed that this new community partner/business attempted to avoid HOA input completely on the SPRC submittal. It does not bode well for how he plans to handle and manage other aspects of doing business in our community. SPRC should factor this applicant’s approach into SPRC’s approach and decision on this application. For example, when the use change proposal came up last fall, thanks really to the efforts by the land seller’s broker (Kris Wessel), the HOA met with the applicant rep (Aaron Thornock). So in addition to the HOA’s 8.16.16 email, the HOA provided Aaron face-to-face input. We made it clear to Aaron and Planning Commission that we wanted to be good neighbors and community partners. We in person on 8.16.16, and in follow up email 9.13.16 (attached), asked Aaron to work with the HOA BEFORE submitting to SPRC. So that what got submitted to SPRC would already have been vetted with the HOA. Unfortunately, we have not heard from Aaron at all.

Thanks for your time and consideration,  
Trish

**Patricia Voth Blankenship**  
Partner, **Foulston Siefkin LLP**  
[bio](#) | [vcard](#) | [www.foulston.com](#)

Phone: Direct (316) 291-9767; Firm (316) 267-6371  
Fax: (866) 347-3139  
1551 N. Waterfront Pkwy, Suite 100  
Wichita, KS 67206

---

Received March 5, 2017, 7:41pm

Dear Daynna-

I, along with my wife and two children, are residents of the Chateauroux neighborhood. I am writing to provide input on the proposed assisted living facility at 1503 W Central that is on the agenda for Site Plan Review Committee (SP-2017-03). I was present during the Planning Commission meeting on August 16, 2016 and personally met with the applicant rep (Aaron Thornock). As a member of this community, I found that the originally-proposed facility was of a nature that complemented our adjacent residential neighborhood and I expressed to him my desire to support the HOA’s collaborative work with the developer with the expectation that this collaboration would be reciprocated by the developer. I am concerned that we have not received any communication from the developer at this point in time and that development has already progressed to SPRC. Trish Voth has provided me a copy of the input she provided on March 5, 2017 via email. I have reviewed and I fully concur with her input on this situation.

My primary personal concern and reason for involvement is the preservation (and accretion) of my home’s property value, which is driven significantly by property values of other homes in the neighborhood. Despite being a smaller neighborhood with ~40 home sites, Chateauroux has an

aggregate appraised value in 2017 in excess of \$14 million with average appraised home value that exceeds \$400,000. Preservation of this value is beneficial not just to my family and my immediate neighbors, but also to all of Andover, including the impact of higher property values on tax revenues for the community.

Please consider Trish's input to this SPRC matter, in particular the request to defer final decision on this item past 3/7/17 to allow the HOA additional review time against what had been provided to the HOA last fall.

Thank you for your consideration of these matters.

Best regards,  
Ryan

Ryan M. Zink  
1406 Chaumont Circle  
Andover, KS 67002  
(316) 304-6476 (cell)

---

Received March 6, 2017, 12:38 pm

I am writing as a resident of Chateauroux HOA. I think the assisted living is a good use of the land. We appreciate the protective overlay that was placed on the property at the planning commission level. However, I was disappointed that the neighborhood had to find out about the site plan meeting being tomorrow night through a separate email that I think was maybe sent to the Rotary Club just a few days ago on 3/2/17.

My four main concerns are the following:

1. How bright/far will the lighting shine that is between the two buildings to the south?
2. The south fence is only 6' tall and of cedar. I'm sure that follows the City guidelines. However, I wish it were taller since our houses sit above that property and I hope there are guidelines that fences must be maintained. I think everyone is familiar with the way wood fences deteriorate after a few years. I wish the City required a concrete wall fence instead of wood.
3. I believe the developer said the colors in the plans are not set in stone. I hope they are more subtle than either of the choices in the plans.
4. Lastly, I am concerned with the drainage. Obviously I am not a civil engineer but we have a lot of water that runs along the north edge of our neighborhood and I don't want this development to cause more water to come our way. We are at 1502 Chaumont so we are directly south of the development and we have a river that runs along the north end of our property when it rains.

I had called and left a message Daynna on Friday requesting copies of all submitted materials but I think the neighborhood got copies from the developer Aaron as of last night.

Thanks,

*Shelly*

Shelly Dunnegan  
1502 Chaumont Cir  
Andover, KS 67002  
316-371-3070

Dennis Bush and Don Kimble both rejoined the committee.

**SP-2012-05- Sketch plan submitted for review and comments for Revelation Ministries Christian Church, NW corner of US 54 and Onewood Dr. (414 S. Onewood Dr.), Andover, Kansas.**

Chairman Allison recused himself due to business relations.

Les Mangus explained that in 2012 the Revelation Ministries Christian Church submitted a plan to the committee for a new church with approximately 3,000 seats. This was before the economy fell. The church is now considering doing the project in smaller phases. This revised plan would allow the church to add phases as their needs grow from what was designed in 2012. With this sketch plan they are looking for input on the revised design.

Bill Johnson, Evans Building Co., Inc. was present to represent the application.

Dennis Bush asked for Mr. Johnson to give a brief presentation of the original project for any committee members not familiar with the original presentation.

Mr. Johnson explained that in 2012 this property was rezoned from Highway Business to B-4 Central Business to allow for the church. The Site Plan Committee then approved the design that was submitted. Since that time the ground has been paid for and they are now in a position to begin construction. Their plan is to start Phase 1 and get it operational. Then they will put their property on East Harry up for sale. Once that property has been sold they would begin Phase 2. The revised design is not as large as the original approved design with 90 feet taken off of the design. The roof height has changed to have multiple heights rather than one large roof and the dormers have been removed.

Brandon Wilson commented that this location is a gateway into Andover and this is a huge metal building with a red metal roof. His question to the committee is do they feel this is a good fit for the gateway to the city and the surrounding neighbors.

Les Mangus added that there was a lot of input from the Green Valley neighborhood adjacent to the north and from the neighborhood adjacent to the east. The main concerns were drainage and traffic. This is a 20-acre site with the opportunity for a lot of expansion. A school with several other accessory buildings was discussed at that time.

Clark Nelson asked about metal versus wood construction and if the Comprehensive Plan would affect what would go in this area.

Les Mangus replied that there was a lot of debate about the metal material five years ago. There are no words in either the Comprehensive Plan or the Corridor Plan about metal versus non-metal. These documents contain information pertaining to structure size and land-use matters.

Dennis Bush noted that the Treescapes building is an example that metal buildings can be built as long as they have appropriate landscaping and the other things necessary in order to compensate for the different materials.

Don Kimble said he would like to see the dormers put back into the building design and possibly replacing the upper metal with EIFS.

Brandon Wilson asked how they could be assured that Phase 2 would indeed happen. They want to avoid having another uncompleted project as was the case with a project several years ago along Andover Rd.

Nate Hinson asked where the mechanical equipment would be located.

Mr. Johnson said that it would be on the ground with screening built around it.

Dennis Bush asked about a trash enclosure.

Mr. Johnson replied that the same will be done for the trash enclosure.

Todd Woolsoncroft asked staff if the storm concerns were previously addressed.

Les Mangus answered that they were.

Don Kimble suggested increasing the roof pitch to make it more attractive.

Nate Hinson inquired as to how far away the houses were to the North and if the parking lot lighting could pose a problem.

Les Mangus said the houses are approximately 200 feet away with landscaped drainage way and platted street between them.

Dennis Bush asked if there was landscape required on that strip of land and if all landscaping would be done in Phase 1 and also if any members had issues with the phasing of this project.

Les Mangus said there is a substantial landscaping plan for that area. He would expect perimeter landscaping to be put in at this area during Phase 1.

Mr. Johnson said that they want to submit a plan taking care of this portion with additional landscaping being done with the following building phases.

Don Kimble suggested adding windows in the vestibule.

Brandon Wilson replied that he does not have problems with the phasing part of it but would like to see improvements to the aesthetics of this project. These are huge sidewalls with a huge red roof and doesn't feel this is appropriate.

Nate Hinson asked if the adjacent neighborhoods would have an opportunity to review the project.

Mr. Johnson said that Dr. Sanders wants to be a good neighbor and asked committee for color suggestions. The roof is more of a terra cotta color.

Dennis Bush said that improvements would have to be made and colors toned down.

Doug Allison said the dormers could be added if they are required.

Chairman Allison rejoined the committee.

**SP-2015-10- Review for approval of the parking lot expansion for Andover Family Medicine, 2117 N. Keystone, Andover, Kansas.**

Les Mangus explained that at the time this building was designed there were three doctors in house. They opened the business several months ago with eight doctors. They are so successful that the employees and doctors are having to park in the street because there are so many patients. They are anxious to get this approved so that work can begin within the next two weeks.

Don Kimble asked if this would be enough parking.

Les Mangus said this will be and added that the building is being fully utilized, there is no room for expansion. They are looking at possibly buying more land and building a second building.

Brandon Wilson commented that the sidewalk shown between the detention pond and the new parking lot appears to dead end into two parking stalls of the existing parking lot. It seems that it should turn east/right and end in the hatched area. And asked if any additional landscaping is required.

Todd Woolsoncroft added that it could be lined up with the existing sidewalk and possibly stripe the parking lot.

Les Mangus said there is a landscaped berm on the west side and an existing tree row along the east side. Vacant land is on the north side. He will discuss restriping the parking stalls for the sidewalk with the applicant.

*Brandon Wilson made a motion, seconded by Clark Nelson, to approve SP-2010-10 Andover Family Medicine parking lot expansion as presented. Motion carried 7/0.*

**Member items-**

There were no member items.

**Adjourn**

*Chairman Allison made a motion, seconded by Todd Woolsoncroft to adjourn. Motion carried 7/0.*

*Chairman Allison adjourned the meeting at 7:50 p.m.*

Respectfully Submitted by

Daynna DuFriend  
Administrative Assistant

Approved this 4<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2017 by the Site Plan Review Committee, City of Andover.