

City of Rochester Zoning Board of Adjustment

Wednesday July 12, 2023

31 Wakefield Street, Rochester, NH 03867

(These minutes were approved on August 9, 2023)

Members Present

Larry Spector, *Chair*

Lance Powers, *Vice Chair*

James Connor – arrived at 7:02pm

Michael King

Members Absent

Matthew Winders, excused

Alternate Members Present

Brylye Collins

Stephen Foster

Laura Zimmerman

Staff: Shanna B. Saunders, *Director of Planning & Development*

Crystal Galloway, *Planner I*

These minutes serve as the legal record of the meeting and are in the format of an overview of the Zoning Board of Adjustment meeting. It is neither intended nor is it represented that this is a full transcription. A recording of the meeting is on file online at www.rochesternh.net for a limited time for reference purposes.

Chair Larry Spector called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

The recording secretary, Crystal Galloway, conducted roll call.

3. Seating of Alternates:

Mr. Spector seated Ms. Collins to vote in place of Mr. Winders.

4. Approval of Minutes:

A motion was made by Mr. King and seconded by Mr. Powers to approve the minutes from the June 14, 2023 meeting. The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Mr. Spector said the voting members for case Z-23-04 and Z-23-18 would be Mr. Powers, Mr. King, Mr. Foster, Ms. Collins, and himself.

5. Continued Cases:

Z-23-04 Aranosian Oil Company, Inc. & Aranco Realty, Inc. Seeks a *Variance* from Section 30.3 to permit the expansion of a non-conforming use (a gas station) and seeks a *Variance* from Table 19-A, lot coverage where 35% is allowed and they are proposing 70.7%

Location: 160 & 162 Charles Street, Map 128 Lots 214 & 215 in the Residential-2 and Neighborhood Mixed Use Zone.

Attorney FX Bruton of Bruton and Berube said the Board had asked the Planning Department to obtain a third-party review for traffic. He said there was also discussion regarding property value for the surrounding area. Mr. Bruton said they submitted a report from Brian White, Master Appraiser which speaks to the property values.

Mr. Bruton explained if they are granted the variance they will then have to go before the Planning Board for Site Plan review which will include traffic review and buffering for neighboring properties.

Mr. Bruton read an excerpt from the traffic report which says the result of the capacity shows the traffic generated by the proposed development would not have a significant impact on the signalized intersection of Columbus Avenue at Charles Street, or either of the development entrances.

Mr. Bruton said the site is unique because it is a triangle which would maintain the shape even when the two lots are merged. He said because lot 214 is in a residential zone the maximum lot coverage is 35%, even though it is adjacent to lot 215 where the maximum lot coverage is 90%. He said they are very close to a zone that allows the 68.4% coverage they are proposing.

Mr. Bruton went on to say the property is unique because of the location as well because zone is mixed use with a heavy commercial presence in the area where the existing gas station is located. He said the proposed plan is consistent with the character of the area.

Mr. Bruton said the goal is to bring the property into the 21st century because the gas station is old, it is a tight lot, and the convenience store is close to the gas pumps.

Mr. Bruton said the proposal will be consistent with the character of the area. He said the ordinance encourages an orderly pattern of development which he believes they have achieved. They are very close to the zone which would allow 90% lot coverage which makes the property unique.

Brian White of White Appraisal in Dover, New Hampshire explained the applicant hired him to conduct an unbiased study to determine that if the variance were granted if there would be a negative impact on the surrounding properties.

Mr. White explained what impacts value when there is a change in use are noise, view, and the use of the property. He said the noise from the existing gas station will extend onto the new lot, however they will be installing vinyl fencing and other screening that will help satisfy some of the noise issues. He said he searched the area for data regarding any diminished value study to compare it to the subject property. He explained this is a unique situation because it's an existing use that is being expanded and he was unable to find any data points that were truly comparable. Mr. White said his determination came down to years of experience, evaluation of property, and how he views the data. He said there are factors that affect value such as view, use, and noise. After weighing those factors he has determined property values will not be diminished.

Mr. Spector opened the public hearing.

Rebecca Bannon of 155 Charles Street said her family has lived in their home for nine years. She went on to answer the five variance criteria questions from the perspective of someone who will be affected by the change.

Ms. Bannon said granting the variance is contrary to the public interest because the small size of the current gas station makes it safer for pedestrians and limits the number of vehicles entering and existing the site at the same time. The proposed new gas station would alter the quality of life for the surrounding home owners who live nearby and will result in reduced public safety. The spirit of residential zoning for lot 214 is not observed by expanding an admitted non-conforming use into the residential parcel. Granting the variance would not do substantial justice because razing and replacing the home on lot 214 increases light pollution, delivery truck

traffic, pedestrians, car traffic, and the removal of a classic single-family home. If the variance is granted the values of the surrounding properties would be diminished.

Christopher Bannon of 155 Charles Street discussed the number of gas pumps. He said the largest gas station in Rochester has 10 pumps handles, they are proposing 18. He said a gas station that size is going to affect the residential nature of area.

Ms. Saunders read the following two emails sent in from abutters:

My Husband Paul and I live at 161 Charles Street, the house with the big Rhododendron in front. We were at the meeting tonight and just would like to make clear our thoughts on the gas station expansion. It is true we stated lights as one of the reasons for our hesitation. We value our privacy just like anyone else. We have drapes, blinds, but we also have lights down our driveway. We think it is great that he got over 200 signatures from all the customers that come in. How many of those people actually live in this end of Charles ST. We worry about property values. If the values go down our taxes won't go down. If the values go up the taxes will go up. I don't see an benefit from either one. We also asked about the hours. We were told they don't have a plan to expand the hours but it wasn't mentioned in the meeting. That would make a big issue if they decide to open late at night. We have to sleep. Thank you for taking the time for the property value study. We appreciate your attention to detail.

Sincerely,

Melody and Paul Campbell

My name is Fay (Elliott)Rogers owner of 159 Charles St. I never received the letter for last week's meeting but was made aware of it from my neighbor. I watched the recording and first off I would like to say I feel Aranco is giving misinformation. I live directly across the street from the brick house they are looking to tear down. You will not find my name on their list of signatures and they did not come to speak to me. So for them to say all the neighbors agree is not true. I agree with Chris and the concerns he gave.. If my property is going to lose value,, I will not agree to this expansion!! They certainly blew that up making it look like everyone agrees. Where is the list of people who disagree. And the people who signed,, Like the woman on the board said, did they have all the details when they signed?? Doubt it because if Chris hadn't brought up the issues he did, I wouldn't have thought of them all. I am concerned about the fact a building is going to replace that cute little house across the street and the fact they are expanding a parking lot that is hardly ever full. The gas pumps on the back side hardly ever get used. They want to expand get rid of the pumps and expand the store that way. 2 issues I currently have with the store is I am constantly cleaning up trash that blows over from when the dumpster gets emptied. And just this past week there was a car with a drug over dose in the parking lot on the back side of the building. Bigger store with more parking is going to bring in more riff raff. I don't think it's a good idea. I am also concerned about the hours. They did not bring that up but right now they close at 9 and if they started staying open later my house will be flooded with lights. Those are my concerns and I hope all will be considered.

Thank you,

Fay Rogers, 159 Charles st

Mr. Bruton said the applicant is in front of the Board for permission to expand the use and they will have to go before the Planning Board for site review where all the issues that have been raised will be worked out.

Mr. Spector closed the public hearing.

The Board deliberated the variance criteria.

Mr. King said he supports the expansion of the gas station and the lot coverage as he thinks it meets the criteria including substantial justice and property values because it would improve the area and they have worked hard to bring the coverage down. And he believes the concerns raised by abutters are issues for the Planning Board, not the Zoning Board. In addition, it is in the spirit of the ordinance as it is improving the community by expanding the use only one lot. It is a hardship that both properties have unique characteristics, and the coverage has been adjusted to be more reasonable.

A motion was made by Mr. King and seconded by Mr. Foster to approve the expansion of a non-conforming use for case Z-23-04 citing all the criteria has been met. The motion carried unanimously by a roll call vote.

A motion was made by Mr. King and seconded by Mr. Powers to approve lot coverage of 68% for case Z-23-04 citing all the criteria has been met. The motion carried unanimously by a roll call vote.

6. New Cases:

Z-23-18 Tim and Sue Wilson Seek a *Variance* from Section 23.2.A(1)(k) to permit an 868 s.f. security apartment where 800 s.f. is allowed.

Location: 10 Chestnut Hill Road, Map 113 Lot 20 in the Highway Commercial Zone.

Mr. Wilson read through the criteria. He said granting the variance would not be contrary to public interest because it would provide security for the property and would also provide a security presence for surrounding commercial properties where one does not already exist. The spirit of the ordinance would be observed because it would support the principal use of the property and encourage the wellbeing of the business by having the owners on site 24 hours a day. The building footprint will not be altered. Substantial justice will be done because it will benefit the property owners and it will not cause harm or loss to the general public. Adding a security apartment will provide added security to the neighborhood businesses. The surrounding property values would not be diminished because the construction is interior, and no exterior modifications are being proposed. A hardship would result from the existing interior layout of the building when purchased. We would like to keep the same footprint without moving walls which would give an additional 68 square feet. The intent of the ordinance is still consistent. The business is already existing in the building and given the interior configuration it is a way to provide a secure housing solution within the existing footprint with the existing walls already in place before purchase.

Mr. Spector opened the public hearing.

TJ Jean of 51 Anderson Lane spoke in favor of the applicant's variance request. He said Potter's House Bakery has been recognized by the Chamber of Commerce as Business of the Year, they have been featured on New Hampshire Chronicle, and they have provided a service to the vulnerable autistic community. Mr. Jean said he is speaking on behalf of many, many supporters in the audience tonight and asked supporters to raise their hands. Nearly 40 people raised their hands.

Maxwell Horwitz said he has been an employee at Potter's House Bakery for five years. He said before he started working there, he didn't think he would ever work anywhere because of his autism. Mr. Horowitz said by granting them the variance would allow them more resources and space to work with, so they are able to help more kids like himself.

Mr. Spector closed the public hearing.

Ms. Saunders said a variance is granted, in part because of special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area. The fact that the applicant is trying to work within existing building footprint may be considered a hardship. However, it may be worth asking the applicant if there is an 8'x8' utility closet that may be cut out of the apartment and added to the bakery area to avoid this variance.

The Board deliberated the variance criteria. Mr. Powers said he supports the variance request because there's no contrary to the public interest, or spirit of the ordinance and the hardship has been met. He added that the applicant would have to renovate not just the apartment but now the bakery in order to remove the 8'x8' space which would result in a hardship. No diminution of property value.

A motion was made by Mr. Powers and seconded Mr. Foster to approve case Z-23-18 as presented citing all the criteria has been met. The motion carried unanimously by a roll call vote.

Mr. Spector said the voting members for cases Z-23-19, Z-23-20, Z-23-21, Z-23-22, Z-23-23, Z-23-24 and Z-23-25 would be Mr. Powers, Mr. King, Mr. Connor, Ms. Collins, and himself.

Z-23-19 JCCM Properties, LLC Seeks a *Variance* from Section 5.1 and Table 18-A to permit the construction of 4 additional residential units in the R1 zone.

Location: 189 South Main Street, Map 125 Lot 84 in the Residential-1 Zone.

Attorney Josh Lanzetta of Bruton and Berube explained his client is proposing to further develop his existing multi-family property. He said there are currently seven residential units in one building, and they are proposing to add an additional four units. Mr. Lanzetta explained there are two right-of-way easements located on the property, one is a water easement that has been dissolved, and the other would bisect the proposed new parking area. He said the proposed development will not affect the right-of-way, the development would improve some of the access. Mr. Lanzetta said all the issues pertaining to the right-of-way will be addressed at the Planning Board level.

Mr. Lanzetta read through the variance criteria. He said the variance is not contrary to the public interest because constructing four additional residential units on property that is already used as a multifamily represents a reasonable use of the property, and that the public interest is served by permitting the orderly development of property in a locus specifically zoned for residential use. The existing house has been used as a multifamily for decades, and adding a similar structure does not alter the essential character of the surrounding neighborhood, impact abutting properties, or affect the public. The spirit of the ordinance is observed because the project represents a reasonable use of property when balanced with the location, zone, surrounding zones, and historic use of property. Allowing the applicant to construct four residential units encourages the most appropriate use of land in Rochester's R1 zone when juxtaposed with the zone's intent to allow residential development. Substantial justice is done by granting the variance because it allows the applicant's property to be reasonably utilized considering abutting property use and its locus in the R1 zone. This proposal does not burden the public in any way, and substantially benefits the applicant by allowing them to reasonably use the property with no detrimental effect to surrounding properties. Surrounding properties have an associated value that is premised upon the existence of structures and features like those proposed on the property. The public is not served by prohibiting the applicant to construct four additional units on the property. There is no fair and substantial relationship between the general public purpose of the ordinance's provision prohibiting multifamily dwelling units and multifamily development on the property, and the specific application of this provision to the property because the property uniquely abuts multiple zones allowing multifamily dwelling units and multifamily developments and has been used to house a seven-unit multifamily dwelling for decades. The property has been used to house multiple dwelling units for decades and cannot be reasonably used in strict conformance with the ordinance as constructed.

Mr. Spector opened the public hearing. There was no one from the public to speak; Mr. Spector brought the discussion back to the Board.

Ms. Saunders said this is an expansion of a Non-Conforming Multifamily use. She said she doesn't believe the applicant has met the substantial justice or hardship criteria as there are no unique characteristics about the property that speak to the need of the expansion.

There was some discussion regarding the grandfathered multi-family use on the property. Mr. Lanzetta explained the use is allowed in the other zones that surround the property. He said because the property has been used as a multi-family for so many years the restrictions in the R1 zone is unreasonable which is the hardship.

Mr. Spector closed the public hearing.

The Board deliberated the variance criteria. Mr. King said he does not believe the expansion will affect the public interest because its been used as a multifamily for many years and substantial justice has been met because of the surrounding zoning which does allow multifamily would be met because and he believes there is a hardship with unique characteristics of the property.

A motion was made by Mr. King and seconded by Mr. Powers to approve case Z-23-19 citing all the criteria has been met and the expansion will not affect the community. The motion carried unanimously by a roll call vote.

Z-23-20 MPG Corporation Seeks a Variance from Sections 8.5.B(10)(a)[2] to permit a front setback of 6 feet where 300 feet is required.

Z-23-21 MPG Corporation Seeks a Variance from Sections 8.5.B(10)(a)[1][b] to permit a rear setback of 56 feet where 100 feet is required.

Z-23-22 MPG Corporation Seeks a Variance from Section 20.2.F(3) to permit fuel pumps and equipment to be 10 feet from the side lot line where 30 feet is required.

Z-23-23 MPG Corporation Seeks a Variance from Section 20.2.F(5) to permit a fueling canopy to be 6 feet from the side lot line where 20 feet is required.

Location: 4 Little Falls Bridge Road, Map 216 Lot 12 in the Granite Ridge Development Zone.

The Board opened the four variance requests for this property in order to have one discussion.

Attorney John Arnold of Orr and Reno presented the Board with a site plan of the proposed gas station with convenience store and coffee shop drive thru.

Mr. Arnold explained the parcel will have shared common access with the neighboring parcel located at 105 Farmington Road.

Applicant Tim Quinn of MPG Corporation explained they are a small family-owned business with twenty sites throughout New England. He said they have been building new and renovating existing stations into Garretts Family Markets, which is a new state of the art gas station. Mr. Quinn said they look forward to working with the City and becoming part of the community.

Mr. Arnold read through the variance criteria. He said allowing the reduced front and rear setbacks will pose no threat to the public safety, health or welfare, or alter the essential character of the locality. The proposed building setbacks are consistent with the building setbacks provided on all of the nearby properties on this side of Farmington Road. Notably, the 6-foot requested front setback is being measured from the underground fuel storage tanks. The City made a determination that the setback applies to the tanks even though they are

underground and not visible in any way. The closest above-ground structure to the front lot line is the fuel canopy, which is setback approximately 35 feet, and nearly identical to the existing fuel canopy setback at the Shell station across the street.

The diesel fueling canopy and pumps are located approximately 6 feet and 10 feet from the side lot line to accommodate maneuvering of large trucks. The proposed location is the only feasible location for truck traffic to enter the site from Farmington Road and access the pumps. The layout is driven in part by the shared access and parking lot interconnections between the property and 105 Farmington Road (the proposed carwash), which interconnections are express objectives of the Granite Ridge Development zone. The location of the diesel fuel canopy is understood and acceptable to both property owners and users and will not threaten public safety, health or welfare in any way. The spirit of the ordinance is to allow reasonable use of the property, and absent the requested variances, the property could not be developed at all. The variance would cause no harm to the general public because the proposed front and rear setbacks are consistent with other properties in the area and are still ample to provide meaningful separation between structures and uses on adjacent properties. The fuel setback variances are necessary to provide safe and efficient access for large trucks, and will have no impact on the public generally. Denying the variance would cause harm to the public because prime commercial property would remain vacant and undeveloped, rather than being put to a productive use that will contribute to the tax roll. Additionally, the benefit of the variance to the applicant is substantial, given that the property is undevelopable without setback relief. Granting the variance will not diminish surrounding property values, for the same reason cited. The property would remain undeveloped which would negatively impact the surrounding commercial property values. Bringing new business to the Granite Ridge Development zone will foster economic growth and help to drive up surrounding property values. The property is unique in that it is a relatively small and shallow lot in the Granite Ridge Development zone. When the required setbacks are applied, there is not buildable area remaining. Most of the properties in the Granite Ridge Development zone are much larger and deeper, and while there are a few adjacent properties of similar dimensions, those have largely already been developed. Absent relief from the required front and rear setbacks, no reasonable use can be made of the property. The proposed use is reasonable because the structures are modest in size and situated centrally on the property to maximize the setbacks to the extent possible.

Mr. Spector opened the public hearing.

Jim Waterman, the applicant for 105 Farmington Road said he fully supports the project presented.

There was no one further from the public to speak; Mr. Spector brought the discussion back to the Board.

Ms. Saunders explained that staff had anticipated variance requests for setbacks for this lot because when the Granite Ridge Development Ordinance was rewritten, they knew that this was one of two parcels that did not have the size to support the new dimensional requirements because it was one of the smallest lots in the district. She said for that reason they meet the hardship criteria in that their lot size is unique compared to other lots in the zone.

Ms. Saunders explained the other two variance requests are from the section of the Ordinance specific to gas stations, not specific to a specific zoning district. Although the size of the lot may be a hardship, this lot is actually larger than the most recent gas station proposal at the corner of Brock Street and Columbus Avenue, and larger than many other gas stations across the city. Ms. Saunders went on to say this may be more of a situation of trying to fit too many eggs (gas station, convenience store and drive thru) in one 1.89 acre basket.

Mr. King said he is concerned about safety in regard to the diesel pumps being located so close to the side lot line. Other board members agreed and asked about further levels of review. Ms. Saunders explained when the applicant goes for site plan review both police and fire will review the plan. The Board discussed moving the side lot line with the applicant. Mr. Arnold said even if they were to move the lot line closer to the neighboring property it wouldn't change the layout of the site or where things are located.

The Board deliberated the variance criteria. The Board discussed the number of diesel fuel pumps the applicant is proposing. Nicole Duquette of GPI Engineering explained there are three pumps with two fueling lanes. Mr. Spector asked if they could reduce the number from three to two. Ms. Duquette explained if they remove one pump it would reduce the fueling lanes to one. Mr. Quinn explained the site is desirable because they are able to have two fueling lanes for large trucks, one entering from Little Falls Bridge Road and one entering from Farmington Road.

Ms. Saunders suggested the Board ask for a revised plan that the Board is more comfortable with.

Mr. Spector closed the public hearing.

Z-23-20 MPG Corporation Seeks a Variance from Sections 8.5.B(10)(a)[2] to permit a front setback of 6 feet where 300 feet is required.

A motion was made by Mr. King and seconded by Mr. Powers to approve case Z-23-20 for setbacks as presented citing all criteria has been met. The motion carried unanimously by a roll call vote.

Z-23-21 MPG Corporation Seeks a Variance from Sections 8.5.B(10)(a)[1][b] to permit a rear setback of 56 feet where 100 feet is required.

A motion was made Mr. Powers and seconded by Mr. Connor to approve case Z-23-21 as presented citing all criteria has been met. The motion carried unanimously by a roll call vote.

Z-23-22 MPG Corporation Seeks a Variance from Section 20.2.F(3) to permit fuel pumps and equipment to be 10 feet from the side lot line where 30 feet is required.

A motion was made Mr. King and seconded by Mr. Connor to continue the variance application to the August 9, 2023 meeting to allow the applicant time to revise the site plan in regards to the diesel fuel pumps to reflect less of an impact to the setback. The motion carried by a 4 to 1 roll call vote.

Z-23-23 MPG Corporation Seeks a Variance from Section 20.2.F(5) to permit a fueling canopy to be 6 feet from the side lot line where 20 feet is required.

A motion was made by Mr. King and seconded by Mr. Connor to continue the variance application to the August 9, 2023 meeting to allow the applicant time to revise the site plan to reflect less of an impact to the setback. The motion carried by a 4 to 1 roll call vote.

The Chairman then focused on the abutting property at 105 Farmington. Both Variances were opened.

Z-23-24 GR Development, LLC Seeks a Variance from Section 8.5.B(10)9a)[1][b] to permit a rear setback of 25 feet where 100 feet is required.

Z-23-25 GR Development, LLC Seeks a Variance from Section 8.5.B(10)(a)[2] to permit a front setback of 10 feet where 300 feet is required.

Location: 105 Farmington Road, Map 209 Lot 1 in the Granite Ridge Development Zone.

Mr. Arnold read the variance criteria. He said allowing the reduced front and rear setbacks will pose no threat to the public safety, health or welfare, or alter the essential character of the locality. The proposed building setbacks are consistent with the building setbacks provided on all of the nearby properties on this side of Farmington Road. The proposed 10 foot front setback and 25 foot rear setback are measurements to equipment which the City has determined must comply with the setbacks. However, this equipment is small

and unobtrusive. The actual building setbacks are much larger, approximately 85 feet in the front and 65 feet in the rear.

The spirit of the ordinance is to allow reasonable use of property, and absent the variance for the setback, the property could not be developed. The proposed setbacks are consistent with other properties in the area and are still ample to provide meaningful separation between structures and uses on adjacent properties. Denying the variance would cause harm to the public because prime commercial property would remain vacant and undeveloped, rather than being put to a productive use that will contribute to the tax roll. Additionally, the benefit of the variance to the applicant is substantial, given the property is undevelopable without setback relief. Granting the variance will not diminish surrounding property values for the same reason cited above. The property would remain undeveloped which would negatively impact the surrounding commercial property values. Bringing new business to the Granite Ridge Development zone will foster economic growth and help to drive up surrounding property values.

The property is unique in that it is a relatively small and shallow lot in the Granite Ridge Development zone. When the required setbacks are applied there is no buildable area remaining. Most of the properties in the Granite Ridge Development zone are much larger and deeper, and while there are a few adjacent properties of similar dimension, those have largely already been developed. Absent relief from the required setbacks, no reasonable use can be made of the property. The proposed use is reasonable because the structures are modest in size and situated centrally on the property to maximize the setbacks to the extent possible.

Mr. Spector opened the public hearing.

Tim Quinn, the applicant for 4 Little Falls Bridge Road said he is in full support of the project.

Ms. Saunders explained that once again, staff had anticipated variance requests for setbacks for this lot because when the Granite Ridge Development Ordinance was rewritten, they knew that this was one of two parcels that did not have the size to support the new dimensional requirements because it was one of the smallest lots in the district. She said for that reason they meet the hardship criteria in that their lot size is unique compared to other lots in the zone.

Mr. Spector closed the public hearing.

The Board deliberated the criteria.

Z-23-24 GR Development, LLC Seeks a Variance from Section 8.5.B(10)9a)[1][b] to permit a rear setback of 25 feet where 100 feet is required.

A motion was made Mr. Powers and seconded by Mr. King to approve case Z-23-24 as presented citing all criteria has been met. The motion carried unanimously by a roll call vote.

Z-23-25 GR Development, LLC Seeks a Variance from Section 8.5.B(10)(a)[2] to permit a front setback of 10 feet where 300 feet is required.

A motion was made by Mr. Powers and seconded by Mr. King to approve case Z-23-25 as presented citing all criteria has been met. The motion carried unanimously by a roll call vote.

7. Other Business/Non-Scheduled Items:

Ms. Saunders announced the Community Input Session for Natural Resources Master Plan will take place at Hanson Pines on Monday July 17th at 5:00pm.

8. Adjournment:

A motion was made by Mr. Connor and seconded by Mr. Powers to adjourn at 9:05 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

Crystal Galloway,
Planner I

and

Shanna B. Saunders,
Director of Planning & Development