

**ANDOVER CITY PLANNING COMMISSION /  
BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS  
Tuesday, November 20, 2018  
Minutes**

- 1. Call to order. 00:00:00**

Chairman Lindebak called the meeting to order at 7:02pm.

- 2. Roll call. 00:00:15**

Planning Commission members in attendance: Brian Lindebak, William Schnauber, Lynn Heath, Alex Zarchan and Erik Pedersen. Member Stephanie Gillespie was absent. Member Gary Israel arrived at 7:11pm.

Staff in attendance: Les Mangus, Director of Community Development & Public Works; Lance Onstott, Stormwater/GIS/Planning Technician.

A/V: WAV Services

- 3. Approval of the minutes of the October 16, 2018 meeting. 00:00:24**

*A motion was made by Lynn Heath, seconded by William Schnauber, to approve the minutes of the October 16, 2018 meeting. Motion carried 5/0.*

- 4. Communications 00:01:08**

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

None.

- Recess the Planning Commission and Convene the Board of Zoning Appeals 00:06:31**

*A motion was made by Erik Pedersen, seconded by William Schnauber, to recess the Planning Commission and convene the Board of Zoning Appeals. Motion carried 5/0.*

5. **BZA-V-2018-05- Public hearing on an application filed by Greg Reeves, 635 S. Verna Ave., Andover, Kansas, pursuant to Article 10.107 of the City Zoning Regulations, a variance of 3,556 square feet from the required 500 square foot maximum floor area of a structure used exclusively for storage permitted by Article 6.100B3 and a variance of 3,056 square feet from the required 1,000 square foot maximum aggregate total floor area of all accessory structures permitted by Article 6.100C4 for the purpose of constructing a 2,400 square foot residential storage structure, in addition to the existing legal non-conforming 1,656 square foot accessory storage structure, on property zoned as the R-1 Single-Family Residential District and generally located at 635 S. Verna Ave., Andover, Kansas.**

00:01:38

Greg Reeves, 635 S. Verna was in attendance to represent the application.

Les Mangus stated that the request is for a large storage shed on a lot that is considerably larger than what is required by the zoning district. The proposed building is 2,400 sq. ft. on a lot that is just over one acre. The request is similar to several others in the neighborhood.

Erik Pedersen asked where the proposed building will be located on the lot.

Les Mangus stated a rough sketch has been submitted, but the question may best be asked of the applicant.

Chairman Lindebak commented that the square footages of the existing buildings according to Butler County do not match what is indicated on the application and requested staff to verify.

Mr. Reeves stated that the proposed building will be utilized for storage.

Lynn Heath asked what the current shed on the property is used for.

Mr. Reeves stated that it is a detached garage; the principal structure has no attached garage.

Erik Pedersen asked if the physical appearance of the proposed structure will match the existing.

Mr. Reeves confirmed the exterior will match.

Chairman Lindebak asked for the heights of the existing and proposed structures.

Mr. Reeves did not have a number, but stated all will be similar. The proposed structure will more than likely be shorter than the existing in order to preserve trees in the vicinity.

Alex Zarchan asked what will be stored in the building.

Mr. Reeves stated a camper will be stored, among other things.

Alex Zarchan asked if there is a gravel access way that will lead to the proposed building.

Mr. Reeves confirmed a gravel access will be used.

Chairman Lindebak asked the applicant if he would be opposed to additional setbacks being imposed on the proposed building.

Mr. Reeves stated the large size of the lot allows for some placement flexibility. There are some trees he would like to save and would like to ensure there is enough room at the rear of the property to easily park equipment in the building.

Chairman Lindebak suggested a 100-foot rear yard setback and 15-foot side yard setback.

Lynn Heath suggested a 50-foot rear yard setback.

Alex Zarchan agreed with the 100-foot rear yard setback.

Les Mangus stated the adjoining property to the west is zoned R-2 Single Family Residential District and a preliminary plat for the Cottonwood Point Subdivision is on file.

Gary Israel agreed that the 100-foot rear yard setback is too much.

Chairman Lindebak stated that an accessory structure on a neighboring property is approximately 72 feet from the rear property line, so a 70-foot rear yard setback would be okay.

Mr. Reeves agreed he could make 70 feet work.

Alex Zarchan stated that the aerial photograph shows many large detached structures in the neighborhood and also agrees with the additional setback requirements.

**ANDOVER BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS**

**Agenda Item No. 5**

**November 20, 2018**

**VARIANCE REPORT \***

**CASE NUMBER: BZA-V-2018-05**

APPLICANT/AGENT: Greg Reeves

REQUEST: Greg Reeves, 635 S. Verna Ave., Andover, Kansas, pursuant to Section 10-107 of the City Zoning Regulations, a variance of 3,556 square feet from the required 500 square foot maximum aggregate total floor area of all accessory structures used exclusively for storage permitted by Section 6-100b3 and a variance of 3,056 square feet from the required 1,000 square foot maximum aggregate total floor area of all accessory structures permitted by Section 6-100c4 for the purpose of constructing a 2,400 square foot residential storage

structure, in addition to the existing legal non-conforming 1,656 square foot accessory storage structure, on property zoned as the R-1 Single-Family Residential District.

CASE HISTORY: The subject property has an existing 1520 sq. ft. detached garage. The variance applied for considers both the proposed 2400 sq. ft. storage building, which exceeds the 500 sq. ft. maximum allowed, and the aggregate total of the proposed 2400 sq. ft. storage building and the existing 1520 sq. ft. detached garage, which when combined exceed the 1000 sq. ft. maximum aggregate floor area for all accessory structures.

LOCATION: Lot 35, Revised Plat No. 2 of Mecca Acres a Subdivision in the East Half of the Northwest Quarter of Section 30, T27S, R3E, Butler County, Kansas.

General location: 635 S. Verna Ave., Andover, Kansas.

SITE SIZE: ±1.0 acres

**ADJACENT ZONING AND EXISTING LAND USE:**

North: R-1 Single Family Residential District – Mecca Acres Subdivision single family home

South: R-1 Single Family Residential District - Mecca Acres Subdivision single family home

East: R-1 Single Family Residential District - Mecca Acres Subdivision single family home

West: R-2 Single Family Residential District – Cottonwood Point Subdivision undeveloped land

\*NOTE: This report has been prepared by the Zoning Administrator to assist the Board of Zoning Appeals to determine their findings from the evidence presented at the hearing so as to base their decision for a variance on the required five findings found in Section 10-107 D 1 of the Zoning Regulations. The Board may grant a request upon specific written findings of fact when all five conditions, as required by state statutes, are found to exist. The responses provided need to be evaluated with the evidence and reworded as necessary to reflect the Board of Zoning Appeals considered opinion. Conditions attached to the motion, if any, should be carefully worded to provide instructions to the applicant and facilitate enforcement by the Zoning Administrator.

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION:**

**DOES THE EVIDENCE DEMONSTRATE THAT:**

1. The particular physical surroundings, shape or topographical condition of the specific property involved would result in a practical difficulty or unnecessary hardship upon or for the owner, lessee or occupant, as distinguished from a mere inconvenience, if the provisions of these regulations were literally enforced, **because the subject property is more than twice the minimum lot area for the zoning district and adequate space for building setbacks and open space are available.**
2. The request for a variance is not based exclusively upon a desire of the owner, lessee, occupant or applicant to make more money out of the property, **because the applicant desires more indoor storage space.**
3. 3. The granting of the variance will not be materially detrimental or injurious to other property or improvements in the neighborhood in which the subject property is located, **because the subject property is more than twice the minimum lot area for the zoning district and adequate space for building setbacks and open space are available.**
4. 4. The proposed variance will not impair an adequate supply of light or air to adjacent property, substantially increase congestion on public streets or roads, increase the danger of fire, endanger the public safety or substantially diminish or impair property values within the neighborhood, **because the subject property is more than twice the minimum lot area for the zoning district and adequate space for building setbacks and open space are available.**

**SPECIFIED CONDITIONS TO BE MET:**

The Board may grant a variance upon specific written findings of fact based upon the particular evidence presented at the hearing so that all five of the conditions required by K.S.A 12-759(e) have been met which are listed below. If any of the conditions cannot be met, the condition(s) needs to be reworded from a positive to a negative statement and the variance not granted.

1. That the variance requested arises from such condition which is unique to the property in question and which is not ordinarily found in the same zoning district, and is not created by an action or actions of the property owner or the applicant, **because the subject property is more than twice the minimum lot area for the zoning district and adequate space for building setbacks and open space are available.**

2. That granting of the variance will not adversely affect the rights of adjacent property owners or residents, **because the subject property is more than twice the minimum lot area for the zoning district and adequate space for building setbacks and open space are available.**
  
3. That strict application of the provisions of these regulations from which a variance is requested will **not** constitute **an unnecessary hardship** upon the property owner represented in the application, **because the subject property is more than twice the minimum lot area for the zoning district and adequate space for building setbacks and open space are available.**
  
4. That the variance desired will not adversely affect the public health, safety, morals, order, convenience, prosperity or general welfare, **because the subject property is more than twice the minimum lot area for the zoning district and adequate space for building setbacks and open space are available.**
  
5. That granting the variance desired will not be opposed to the general spirit and intent of these regulations, **because the subject property is more than twice the minimum lot area for the zoning district and adequate space for building setbacks and open space are available.**

Date Granted: \_\_\_\_\_

Valid Until (date): \_\_\_\_\_

(180 days Sec. 10-107G)

\_\_\_\_\_

Brian Lindebak, Chairman

\_\_\_\_\_

Gary Israel, Secretary

Certified to the Zoning Administrator on this date of: \_\_\_\_\_

Chairman Lindebak agreed with the findings included in the Variance Report as long as provisions for additional setbacks were included.

*Having considered the evidence at the hearing and determined that the findings of fact in the Variance Report have been found to exist that support all the five conditions set out in Section 10-107D1 of the Zoning Regulations and K.S.A. 12-759(e) of the state statutes which are necessary for granting of a variance, I, Alex Zarchan, move that the Chairperson be authorized to sign a Resolution granting the variance for Case No. BZA-V-2018-05 as requested, subject to the following conditions: 1) minimum 70-foot rear yard setback, and 2) minimum 15-foot side yard setback. Motion seconded by Gary Israel. Motion carried 6/0.*

- 6. BZA-V-2018-06- Public hearing on an application filed by Sidney and Ruth Cain, 125 W. Pine View Dr., Andover, Kansas, pursuant to Article 10.107 of the City Zoning Regulations, requests a variance of 2 feet from the required 6-foot maximum height of fencing in rear yards permitted by Article 3.104B1 for the purpose of constructing up to an 8-foot privacy fence on property zoned as the R-2 Single-Family Residential District and generally located at 125 W. Pine View Dr., Andover, Kansas.**

**00:28:26**

Sidney and Ruth Cain, 125 W. Pine View Dr., were in attendance to represent the application.

Les Mangus stated the school property south of the applicant property has experienced significant construction activity as of late. Also evident from the site photos is the slope of the applicant's rear yard. It has a significant slope that reduces the effectiveness of the existing 6-foot privacy fence.

Alex Zarchan asked the applicant if he planned on replacing the entire fence or just the rear portion.

Mr. Cain stated they are requesting up to 8-feet for the entire fence. The sides will be up to 8 feet as it follows the slope, and the rear will be 8 foot.

**ANDOVER BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS**

**Agenda Item No. 6**

**November 20, 2018**

**VARIANCE REPORT \***

**CASE NUMBER: BZA-V-2018-06**

APPLICANT/AGENT: Sidney & Ruth Cain

REQUEST: Sidney and Ruth Cain, 125 W. Pine View Dr., Andover, Kansas, pursuant to Article 10.107 of the City Zoning Regulations, requests a variance of 2 feet from the required 6-foot maximum height of fencing in rear yards permitted by Article 3.104B1 for the purpose of constructing up to an 8-foot privacy fence on property zoned as the R-2 Single-Family Residential District.

CASE HISTORY: The rear yard of the subject property abuts the Andover District Stadium/Cottonwood Elementary School property. Recent additions to the elementary school and the construction of a loop road around the stadium have increased traffic and activity near the subject property.

LOCATION: Lot 14, Block 2, Andover Heights 4th Addition.

General location: 125 W. Pine View Dr., Andover, Kansas

SITE SIZE: ±10,878 sq. ft.

**ADJACENT ZONING AND EXISTING LAND USE:**

North: R-3 Multi Family Residential District – Andover Heights 4<sup>th</sup> Addition vacant lot

South: B-1 Office Business District – Andover District Stadium/Cottonwood Elementary School

East: R-3 Multi Family Residential District – Andover Heights 4<sup>th</sup> Addition two-family dwelling

West: R-2 Single Family Residential District - Andover Heights 4<sup>th</sup> Addition single family dwelling

\*NOTE: This report has been prepared by the Zoning Administrator to assist the Board of Zoning Appeals to determine their findings from the evidence presented at the hearing so as to base their decision for a variance on the required five findings found in Section 10-107 D 1 of the Zoning Regulations. The Board may grant a request upon specific written findings of fact when all five conditions, as required by state statutes, are found to exist. The responses provided need to be evaluated with the evidence and reworded as necessary to reflect the Board of Zoning Appeals considered opinion. Conditions attached to the motion, if any, should be carefully worded to provide instructions to the applicant and facilitate enforcement by the Zoning Administrator.



**BACKGROUND INFORMATION:**

The rear yard of the subject property abuts the Andover District Stadium/Cottonwood Elementary School property. Recent additions to the elementary school and the construction of a loop road around the stadium have increased traffic and activity near the subject property.

**DOES THE EVIDENCE DEMONSTRATE THAT:**

5. The particular physical surroundings, shape or topographical condition of the specific property involved would result in a practical difficulty or unnecessary hardship upon or for the owner, lessee or occupant, as distinguished from a mere inconvenience, if the provisions of these regulations were literally enforced, **because the rear yard of the subject property abuts the Andover District Stadium/Cottonwood Elementary School property. Recent additions to the elementary school and the construction of a loop road around the stadium have increased traffic and activity near the subject property.**
6. The request for a variance is not based exclusively upon a desire of the owner, lessee, occupant or applicant to make more money out of the property, **because the rear yard of the subject property abuts the Andover District Stadium/Cottonwood Elementary School property. Recent additions to the elementary school and the construction of a loop road around the stadium have increased traffic and activity near the subject property.**
3. The granting of the variance will not be materially detrimental or injurious to other property or improvements in the neighborhood in which the subject property is located, **the proposed rear yard of the subject property abuts the Andover District Stadium/Cottonwood Elementary School property. Recent additions to the elementary school and the construction of a loop road around the stadium have increased traffic and activity near the subject property.**
4. The proposed variance will not impair an adequate supply of light or air to adjacent property, substantially increase congestion on public streets or roads, increase the danger of fire, endanger the public safety or substantially diminish or impair property values within the neighborhood, **because the rear yard of the subject property slopes toward the Andover District Stadium/Cottonwood Elementary School property, which reduces the effectiveness of the permitted 6 ft. privacy fence.**

**SPECIFIED CONDITIONS TO BE MET:**

The Board may grant a variance upon specific written findings of fact based upon the particular evidence presented at the hearing so that all five of the conditions required by K.S.A 12-759(e) have been met which are listed

below. If any of the conditions cannot be met, the condition(s) needs to be reworded from a positive to a negative statement and the variance not granted.

1. That the variance requested arises from such condition which is unique to the property in question and which is not ordinarily found in the same zoning district, and is not created by an action or actions of the property owner or the applicant, because the rear yard of the subject property abuts the Andover District Stadium/Cottonwood Elementary School property. Recent additions to the elementary school and the construction of a loop road around the stadium have increased traffic and activity near the subject property.
2. That granting of the variance will not adversely affect the rights of adjacent property owners or residents, because the rear yard of the subject property slopes toward the Andover District Stadium/Cottonwood Elementary School property, which reduces the effectiveness of the permitted 6 ft. privacy fence.
1. That strict application of the provisions of these regulations from which a variance is requested will not constitute an unnecessary hardship upon the property owner represented in the application, because the rear yard of the subject property slopes toward the Andover District Stadium/Cottonwood Elementary School property, which reduces the effectiveness of the permitted 6 ft. privacy fence.
4. That the variance desired will not adversely affect the public health, safety, morals, order, convenience, prosperity or general welfare, because the rear yard of the subject property slopes toward the Andover District Stadium/Cottonwood Elementary School property, which reduces the effectiveness of the permitted 6 ft. privacy fence.
5. That granting the variance desired will not be opposed to the general spirit and intent of these regulations, because the rear yard of the subject property abuts the Andover District Stadium/Cottonwood Elementary School property. Recent additions to the elementary school and the construction of a loop road around the stadium have increased traffic and activity near the subject property, and the rear yard of the subject property slopes toward the Andover District Stadium/Cottonwood Elementary School property, which reduces the effectiveness of the permitted 6 ft. privacy fence.

Date Granted: \_\_\_\_\_

Valid Until (date): \_\_\_\_\_

(180 days Sec. 10-107G)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Brian Lindebak, Chairman

\_\_\_\_\_  
Gary Israel, Secretary

Certified to the Zoning Administrator on this date of: \_\_\_\_\_

*Having considered the evidence at the hearing and determined that the findings of fact in the Variance Report have been found to exist that support all the five conditions set out in Section 10-107D1 of the Zoning Regulations and K.S.A. 12-759(e) of the state statutes which are necessary for granting of a variance, I, Gary Israel, move that the Chairperson be authorized to sign a Resolution granting the variance for Case No. BZA-V-2018-06 as requested. Motion seconded by Lynn Heath. Motion carried 6/0.*

**Recess the Board of Zoning Appeals and Convene the Planning Commission 00:40:37**

*A motion was made by William Schnauber, seconded by Lynn Heath, to recess the Board of Zoning Appeals and convene the Planning Commission. Motion carried 6/0.*

**7. Review and accept the Amended Terradyne Estates 3rd Subdivision Final Planned Unit Development Plan. 00:40:53**

Chairman Lindebak asked staff if all comments from the Subdivision Committee have been addressed and all required documents received.

Les Mangus indicated the applicant’s agent has provided a map that depicts the location of the easement that showed up on the title work. The location of this easement is not within the boundaries of the final planned unit development plan. The covenant included on the title work that was questioned at the Subdivision Committee is for a project nearly one mile from this final planned unit development plan. A developer’s agreement, letter of credit for the installation of

sanitary sewer and a cashier’s check for the required 15% maintenance bond have been received as well.

*A motion was made by Lynn Heath to accept the Amended Terradyne Estates 3rd Subdivision Final Planned Unit Development Plan as presented. Motion seconded by William Schnauber. Motion carried 6/0.*

**8. Public hearing to consider the adoption of new Zoning Regulations, Subdivision Regulations and their Definitions, and new Floodplain Management Regulations, all to be incorporated in the City of Andover’s Unified Development Manual. 00:42:50**

David Foster and Debra Foster, Foster Design Associates LLC, were in attendance.

Mr. Foster congratulated staff and Commission members on their hard work up to this point. Mr. Foster covered what each phase of the Unified Development Manual accomplished and the significant changes to the existing zoning regulations.

Les Mangus stated all regulations regarding small cell wireless and distributed antennae systems located within the public right of way have been removed from the Unified Development Manual in order to further the development of those regulations based on the latest information from the FCC and advice from a lawyer who specializes in wireless regulations. Regulations involving the public right of way are expected to be included in a separate ordinance. Small cell and DAS located on private property remain in the UDM and have not been revised since last presented.

Chairman Lindebak asked if the Planning Commission would be presented the public right of way regulations once drafted.

Les Mangus confirmed the Planning Commission will have the opportunity to review.

Mr. Foster stated that regulations dealing with the aesthetics of facilities located in the public right of way must be enacted prior to January 15, 2019, so the timeline is tight.

Mr. Foster presented the significant changes to the site plan review process.

Ms. Foster gave a walk-through of the final format of the UDM. FlippingBook will host the finished UDM.

Gary Israel asked who will be the administrator of the UDM as accessed through FlippingBook.

Ms. Foster stated that the City will provide FlippingBook with a .pdf each time it is updated, and FlippingBook will ensure its updated on their end.

Mr. Foster asked the Planning Commission to make one recommendation for the Zoning Regulations, Subdivision Regulations and their Definitions. A separate recommendation will then be made for the Floodplain Management Regulations.

*I, William Schnauber, move that the proposed Unified Development Ordinance for the City of Andover, including new Zoning Regulations and revisions to the Official Zoning Map, new Subdivision Regulations, and new Definitions for use with the Zoning Regulations, Subdivision Regulations, and Site Plan Review & Approval Procedures & Standards be adopted as a Model Code dated November 20, 2018 and that it be recommended to the Governing Body for approval by incorporation into an effectuating ordinance for publication. Motion seconded by Lynn Heath. Motion carried 6/0.*

Mr. Foster stated that the floodplain management regulations have been removed from the zoning regulations and will be available through the appendix of the UDM. The proposed regulations are based on the most current model made available by the State.

Les Mangus stated that the regulations come from FEMA and then the State creates model regulations. The proposed regulations are largely the same as current regulations but the format has been updated since the current 2003 regulations. There has been discussion regarding the vertical datum referenced in the proposed ordinance being based on a 1929 edition. The presumption is that once all flood maps are updated, the vertical datum referenced will also be updated. There was also discussion regarding the minimum elevation requirement to be set at 2 feet above base flood elevation instead of the drafted 1 foot. The impacts of this can be further researched by staff. The floodplain nonconforming use timeline was changed from the current 12-month allowance to 6-month. In other words, if a structure, use or utility service is discontinued for six months, any future use of the building must conform to the updated ordinance.

William Schnauber asked if increasing the minimum elevation above BFE would create conflicts between property owners and their insurance.

Lynn Heath asked if the minimum elevation would apply only to new construction.

Les Mangus replied that the minimum applies to new construction and improvements that meet the ordinance's definition of substantial.

William Schnauber stated that he was concerned regarding the potential ramifications of increasing the minimum elevation.

Mr. Foster commented that the ordinance can be revised at a later time.

Les Mangus stated that they can solicit comment from the state floodplain manager and potentially bring an amendment back at another time.

Chairman Lindebak asked if the ordinance could better define "lowest opening."

Les Mangus stated staff will ask this question along with the freeboard question.

*I, Lynn Heath, move that the proposed Floodplain Management Ordinance for the City of Andover be adopted as a Model Code dated November 20, 2018 and that, pending State approval, it be recommended to the Governing Body for approval by incorporation into an effectuating ordinance for publication. Motion seconded by William Schnauber. Motion carried 6/0.*

**9. Review and recommend the revised Site Plan Review Procedures and Standards to be incorporated in the City of Andover’s Unified Development Manual. 01:28:30**

David Foster and Debra Foster, Foster Design Associates LLC, were in attendance.

Mr. Foster stated that this item does not require a public hearing. The zoning regulations provide for the authorization of the site plan review standards and process. Keeping the actual standards out of the zoning regulations allows for some flexibility. The Planning Commission would approve and make a recommendation to the Governing Body to approve the standards by resolution.

*I, Lynn Heath, move that the proposed Site Plan Review Procedures and Standards be recommended for approval by the Governing Body. Motion seconded by William Schnauber. Motion carried 6/0.*

**10. Review and recommend the format of the City of Andover’s Unified Development Manual. 01:31:35**

David Foster and Debra Foster, Foster Design Associates LLC, were in attendance.

Mr. Foster stated that the goal is to maintain the organizational format of the UDM as presented as a policy recommendation to the Governing Body.

*I, William Schnauber, move that the Planning Commission recommend to the Governing Body the adoption of a resolution approving the UDM model format as presented with the four parts. Motion seconded by Lynn Heath. Motion carried 6/0.*

**11. Review and approve the 2019 meeting calendar of the City of Andover Planning Commission & Board of Zoning Appeals. 01:34:58**

Chairman Lindebak noted the application deadline changes to allow applicants, utility companies and staff more time to prepare applications and complete reviews.

*I, Alex Zarchan, move that 2019 meeting calendar be approved with the dates as listed. Motion seconded by Gary Israel. Motion carried 6/0.*

- 12. Review and approve the recommendation to reschedule the December 18, 2018 regular meeting of the City of Andover Planning Commission and Board of Zoning Appeals to December 19, 2018 at 7:00pm at City Hall. 01:39:16**

*I, Gary Israel, move that we reschedule the December 18<sup>th</sup> meeting to December 19, 2018. Motion seconded by William Schnauber. Motion carried 6/0.*

- 13. Member items. 01:40:46**

William Schnauber thanked the Fosters for their work on the UDM.

Gary Israel asked if the variance granted for the fence set a precedent for the neighbors to also build 8-foot fences.

Les Mangus said the granting of this particular variance would be taken into consideration if additional applications are received, but it does not automatically allow others to do the same without making application.

Gary Israel wished everyone a Happy Thanksgiving.

Alex Zarchan asked for clarification of the current Prairie Creek Rd. closure north of 13<sup>th</sup> St.

Les Mangus indicated the project at the northwest corner of Prairie Creek Rd. and 13<sup>th</sup> St. is currently in the paving phase and confirmed the road closure will be for 30 days.

- 14. Adjourn. 01:43:00**

*A motion was made by Gary Israel to adjourn the meeting at 8:45pm. Motion seconded by Lynn Heath. Motion carried 6/0.*

Respectfully Submitted by,



Lance A. Onstott  
Stormwater/GIS/Planning Technician

Approved this 19th day of December 2018 by the Andover City Planning Commission/Board of Zoning Appeals, City of Andover.