Roll Call and Announcement of Hearing Procedure: Judy Moler, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:48 p.m., reviewed the hearing procedure and asked for roll call to be taken.

Members Present: Judy Moler, Matthew McCurry, Chad Depperschmidt, Jerry Desch, Jake Fisher and Brian Aubert. With six members present, a quorum was established.

Members Absent: Christi McKenzie.

Staff Present: Barry T. Beagle, Planning Director; Joelee Charles, Administrative Assistant; and, Joni Thadani, Assistant County Counselor.

Approval of March 12, 2018, Public Hearing Minutes: Mr. Fisher moved to approve the March 12, 2018, Public Hearing minutes, seconded by Mr. Aubert, and with a unanimous voice vote, the minutes were approved.

Communications: Mr. Beagle stated a letter from Paul and Janice Hanney was included in the agenda packet.

Ex Parte Communication by Members of the Commission: None were indicated.

Declaration of Conflict of Interest by Members of the Commission or Staff: Mr. Beagle stated his niece and nephew lived adjacent to the applicant’s property and did not have any influence during his preparation of the Planning Department’s staff report.

Zoning and Subdivision Items:

1. CU18/02 by Dale L. & Jerri D. Parnell seeking a Conditional Use Permit to establish a Reception, Conference & Assembly Facility on property zoned “RR-1” Residential Reserve District and located at 4834 SE 37th Street in Tecumseh Township.

Mr. Beagle stated the applicants want to use their existing salt box barn as an event center. The location includes the applicants’ home and is part of an established residential community. The Conditional Use Permit would allow a 100+ year old barn to be preserved and allow others to experience a piece of history. A 528 square foot addition was added on the south side and includes a prep kitchen, additional storage space and bathrooms. Social and corporate functions for under 99 people would be scheduled by prearranged contract. The applicants will be onsite to provide a watchful oversight any time the facility is in use.

The Conditional Use Permit process is to evaluate whether the proposed use in the location proposed is compatibility with neighboring property. Reasonable conditions may be attached to the use to maximize compatibility if the use is consistent with the proposed area. The principal issues that customarily affect compatibility are typically hours of operation, noise and traffic.

Hours of Operation--Events could be held seven days a week between 10 a.m. and 10:30 p.m. with guests to vacate the property by 11 p.m. Outside activities must cease by 9 p.m. or dusk, whichever comes first. The applicants anticipate most events will occur on the weekends. There are 24 homes on parcels of various sizes within a 1,000 foot radius of the applicant’s property which makes the impacts greater. The extent of hours of operation into the evening increases opportunity for conflict as well as the traffic. It may be possible to reduce the hours of operation and limit the days of availability in order to lessen the impacts.

Noise--The outdoor activities such as children’s birthday parties, family picnics, general gatherings and game activities will generate noise. Guests may also use a sound system which would be directed to the barn and only during the ceremony and not to exceed eight decibels. The applicant’s description of the ceremony is not defined. No setbacks are defined for how close guests and outdoor activities would be allowed in proximity to neighboring property lines; however, the applicant has installed five foot tall emerald green arborvitaes along portions of the north and east property lines. The applicant did not indicate whether the eight decibels would be measured at the property line or at the speakers that may
be used. It is not known at what point the noise or sound generated from the event center would impact neighboring property. The applicant does note, with added insulation to the barn, the noise and activities inside should not be perceptible beyond the property lines. There is a greater opportunity for conflict due to the close proximity of homes to each other. The possibility of prohibiting the use of a sound system could be one measure taken to minimize the impact. Even without the use of a sound system, there will be noise from the people participating in outdoor events. Noise would be reduced by 9 p.m. or dusk because outdoor activities must cease. However, it would seem unrealistic to assume no sound from outdoor events will be heard by neighboring property. Also, it is difficult to quantify how much is too much noise in relation to neighboring residential property.

Traffic--A 28-stall parking lot on the south and east side of the barn is proposed. The requirement for off street parking is determined by whichever is less: one space per 150 square feet of the building which would be 16 spaces OR 1/3 of the occupancy load of 99 which would be 33 spaces. The applicant chose a 28-stall parking lot on the south and east side of the barn which exceeds the minimum off street parking required. With a maximum occupancy load of 99 people, this size of parking lot translates into an average of three and a half people per vehicle. Even by exceeding the maximum number of required spaces, it is not known whether the parking provided would be sufficient for guests. The regulations state parking must be located on the same lot as the event which means no off-site parking or parking within 37th Street or Tecumseh Road. To minimize parking exceeding the 28-stall parking lot, the facility could be restricted to no more than one event at a time and no event could exceed 99 people. Limiting the facility to no more than one event at a time would hopefully minimize the possibility of off site parking. With the possibility of multiple events being held at the same time on any given day between 10 a.m. and 10:30 p.m., the event center could generate a number of vehicle trips each day that would not otherwise be expected by the neighborhood. It is not known whether the added traffic would create a nuisance for the neighborhood especially realizing the guests will have until 11:00 p.m. to vacate the property.

The proposed event center raises a number of concerns due to the surrounding residential community. The tighter and more compact the residential community, the greater the opportunity for conflict. Residents would expect that neighboring residential property to be used in a manner consistent with the predominant character of the immediate surrounding area. The facility is a commercial use whose operation is anticipated to have impacts and be incompatible with surrounding residential property. This assessment is not a result of a negative perception of the applicant or their facility. If the applicant’s proposal was in a more remote setting or possibly on a larger tract of land that would absorb the anticipated impacts, it would be an acceptable proposal. However, the proposal in this case concerns a four acre parcel within a residential setting. It could be anticipated that the facility’s days and hours of operation, traffic generation and noise make it incompatible with neighboring residential property. Based upon these factors, staff is recommending disapproval of this request.

With no questions for Mr. Beagle, Ms. Moler called Ms. Parnell to make her presentation.

Jerri Parnell, 4834 SE 37th Street, Tecumseh, KS 66542.

- All neighbors within 1,000 feet of the barn were invited to discuss their proposal/site plan. Six attended. Asked neighbors to notify them if they had questions/concerns. Received one response.
- Have been making improvements to their barn for personal use.
- Have a large extended family and the barn is a place to hold family functions.
- She and her husband are volunteers at many places.
- Various people/groups have asked to use the barn for their functions.
- Will continue to use the barn for personal events and has had several over the past few years with no complaints from the neighborhood about traffic, sound or people.
- Has enjoyed entertaining outside groups.
- For comparison, visited with the owners of Grace Farm and Place in Time. Both are located in more residential type areas than theirs. All thought that with family type events, the problems were less.
- Wants to provide the opportunity for families, their neighbors and organizations they work with.
• If a neighbor asks to use their barn, they wouldn’t be able to because it wasn’t a personal event.
• Not a commercial business. No kitchen. No items sold. Simply a gathering place.
• She and her husband both work full time.
• Events could be scheduled during the hours of 10 a.m. to 10:30 p.m. Events would not be held during the whole time. It was the availability to offer to patrons.
• 11 p.m. could be considered late. Would be willing to change it so everyone is off the property by 10:30 p.m. and comparable to Reynolds Lodge at Shawnee Lake.
• As far as sound, they weren’t sure how to base it but chose 80 decibels which is comparable to a food processor. Could have used 100 decibels which is comparable to a riding lawn mower.
• Living in a rural area, there is a riding lawn mower running at any given time.
• The 80 decibels would be monitored at the arborvitaes located inside the property line on the north where they were 10 foot in and on the east where they were 5 foot in.
• An elementary school is located five houses north of their property. During the day, the children can be heard on the playground quite clearly. Teachers can be heard yelling and whistles blowing.
• Was not concerned about it and had not heard anyone raise any concerns about the sound at the school. A great school with excellent students/staff but the sound is part of their neighborhood.
• Due to Kansas weather, there is a really small window for people to have outdoor activities.
• Outdoor activities have been moved into the barn because of Kansas weather.
• Didn’t know if there would be that many outside activities.
• A sound system is needed for weddings in order for everyone to be able to hear what is being said.
• Would never ask their neighbors to alter their normal daily activities to accommodate any activity on their property whether contracted through the barn or their own personal activity.
• Neighborhood traffic comes from the elementary school and high school nine months out of the year on school days, for school events and sporting events that bring in cars from here and out of town.
• Adding 28 cars equates to approximately 10 percent of the school traffic and would not be as consistent. Anticipating one to two events per month. Thought the parking lot would be sufficient.
• Held several personal events with no issue of people crossing the property line. They advise them of the property line ahead of time and everyone has been very considerate of the property lines.
• The arborvitaes are located well within the property line and would allow for the addition of a privacy fence to further reinforce the property line if they are directed to do so.
• The fire department set the occupancy of 99. Wasn’t sure if any event would have 99 guests.

Ms. Moler asked if anyone had any questions for Ms. Parnell.

Mr. Desch asked if the operation was philanthropic or for profit. Ms. Parnell thought if a fee is required, guests would make a better effort to keep it clean, be respectful of the contract and follow the rules. By charging people, they could recoup some of the cost of the additional things they would need to provide for the safety of people in the barn and also to hold them accountable. Non profits would not be charged for their events.

Mr. Desch asked who would be overseeing it at 10 a.m. Ms. Parnell stated events would be held only on the days when one of them was off work to be onsite. Nothing would be scheduled otherwise.

Mr. Aubert asked about the lighting. Ms. Parnell stated motion lights would be placed on the south side of the addition. They initially wanted to install a pole light but neighbors raised concerns that the lights would be in their area. All of the parking is faced to the barn so there are no headlights to the road. They didn’t need to secure that part of the yard with lights. The lights on the building will shine downward. They will be motion lights but will also be on a switch. If there is no activity, they can turn them off.

Mr. Aubert asked about the location of the privacy fencing around the property. Ms. Parnell said they had no problem installing a privacy fence on the north where the arborvitaes are and down the east where it might be able to be viewed by a neighbor.
With no further questions for Ms. Parnell and no one to speak in favor, Ms. Moler asked if anyone wanted to speak in opposition.

John Stadler, 4839 SE 37th Street, Tecumseh, KS 66542.
- Not in favor.
- Been to wedding parties where things have gotten out of hand.
- Concerned about the traffic on 37th and Tecumseh. Numerous accidents at that intersection.
- Doesn’t let his dog out in the front yard due to the traffic flow.
- Concerned about the location sitting on top of a hill and people turning into the parking lot and the traffic coming over the hill.
- Doesn’t want to look at an asphalt parking lot out of his front window.
- Thinks it will hurt the value of his property.
- Concerned the motion lights will shine into his front window and doesn’t want to see them going on and off during events.
- Moved back to Topeka from Kansas City to get away from noise.
- It’s quiet and peaceful. Friendly neighbors.
- Concerned about the possibility of additional trash to pick up in his ditches from the added traffic. Doesn’t want to create more work for others and doesn’t want somebody causing more work for him.
- Concerned about people mistaking his newly built nice red/white shop for the red salt box barn and pulling and turning around in his driveway.
- Doesn’t want to put up signs in his driveway to indicate it was not the location for the event center or signs that say do not trespass. Doesn’t like clutter. Doesn’t want to clutter up his yard with signs.
- Concerned about the safety of his property due to people coming in for events. He would have to secure his property. Concerned about people coming back to steal when he was gone.
- Would cause extra traffic.
- His daughter’s bedroom faces the barn. Lights would shine in her room so she could not sleep.

Mr. Desch asked for the location of Mr. Stadler’s home. Mr. Stadler said it was straight across the street.

Janice Hanney, 3626 SE Tecumseh Road, Tecumseh, KS 66542.
- Is opposed.
- Zoned as a residential area. Homes were built/purchased with the appeal of being quiet, country living.
- An event center in the neighborhood would drastically change daily life and property values.
- Mrs. Parnell said she wanted them to continue their daily lives. With their concerns, it’s hard to do.
- The Parnell’s property is next to or adjacent to seven homeowners with other neighbors close by.
- Their entire north property line is adjacent to the Parnells and all of their property would be affected due to the proposed location for parking, activities and overflow parking.
- Told Mrs. Parnell that if she was buying a home she would not consider a property next to an event center for obvious reasons of noise, traffic and the number of people frequenting the neighborhood.
- The properties in the area will become undesirable for purchase.
- At the open house they were told that if they invested the money in the barn restoration they needed a way to recoup that investment.
- Contends that their decision to remodel and recoup their investment results in devalued property for the rest of the neighboring homeowners with no way for them to recoup their investments.
- Concerned the noise will be constant throughout the week and will continue later in the evening.
- Didn’t mind hearing the sounds of the neighborhood: lawn mowers, neighbors playing, the children at the school.
- Concerned about losing their quiet neighborhood.
- Since the Parnells were trying to recoup their investment, she believes requests would be booked often and during the week too.
- Concerned about the increased traffic and at the intersection where many accidents have occurred.
• Would result in a loss of privacy for the neighborhood; devalue their property and change of their daily living. In an area zoned for residential living, homeowners expect to be able to have these but through no act of their own they could lose them.

Mr. Aubert asked how long they have lived at their location. Ms. Hanney said they have lived there since 1994.

Adrian Noe, 3549 SE Tecumseh Road, Tecumseh, KS 66542.
• Taking care of his mother’s estate and property. His brother will probably be moving into the house.
• His mom and dad moved there when he was four years old and he is sixty now.
• Concerned about the zoning being changed and people operating businesses in a residential area.
• Concerned about the hours of operation and types of parties.
• If they sell the business and someone else took it over and wanted to do the same type of thing, there was no guarantee that they would be as considerate.
• Concerned about the number of cars coming in and not enough parking spaces.
• Concerned about parking on the road. Tecumseh is a busy road and people abuse the speed limit.
• Concerned about the sound. Didn’t consider a wedding to be loud. Worked part time as a DJ for weddings. It would be hard to monitor the sound and realize how far the sound would carry.
• There was no guarantee how people would act.
• Concerned for his fellow neighbors and their privacy.
• Had nothing against the individuals.
• Thought there would be issues from the activity and how it would affect the people around there with lights, sound, etc.

In response to the comment about parking on the road, Mr. Beagle stated the 28-stall parking lot would have to be sufficient to accommodate the parking for each event. There could be no on street parking.

Mr. Depperschmidt asked what would happen with the Conditional Use Permit if the property was sold. Mr. Beagle said the Conditional Use Permit would transfer with the new owner.

Mark Coon, 4827 SE 37th Street, Tecumseh, KS 66542.
• Had similar concerns as those who commented before him.
• Concerned about the parking lot.
• Property value is an issue.
• Concerned about theft. Has an outbuilding that opens directly to the exit of the Parnell’s property.
• Concerned about the sound.
• Concerned about people parking in the street and tearing up the ditches.
• Concerned about alcohol being served and the potential problems that could arise from that.
• Was told at the open house that the permit would not transfer if the property was sold.
• Has lived at this location since 2001.

Eunice Cochran, 3635 SE Tecumseh Road, Tecumseh, KS 66542.
• Has lived at this location for over 50 years.
• It is a nice quiet area and very peaceful and safe.
• Concerned about all the issues previously raised.
• Understood if additional parking was needed, an area west of the house would be used and the entrance would go into their property.

Mr. Beagle stated the applicant’s initial proposal did provide for overflow parking; however, any parking should be confined to the 28-stall parking lot that is shown on the site plan.
Rocky Busenitz, 4910 SE 37th Street, Tecumseh, KS 66542.
- Owns the property on the back side of the barn.
- He and his wife have five children. They have sacrificed and worked hard to afford their home and it has taken many years to build up the equity.
- Paid top dollar for the house because it had everything they wanted: location, privacy and the view.
- A real estate appraiser told him it would have a negative impact on their property.
- A real estate agent told him it would definitely eliminate potential buyers and reduce demand and property value. An estimate on the conservative side is 5% to 10% but it could be much more. In dollars it equates to $15,000-$30,500.
- Concerned about the strangers coming into the area and for the safety of his two small children.
- Concerned about break ins, trespassing and crimes of opportunity.
- Concerned about alcohol being served and the safety of those attending school functions in the area.
- Concerned about parking and traffic safety.
- Didn’t think the 28-stall parking lot will be adequate.
- The Parnells seem like nice people but the next owners may not be.
- Concerned about the access to the pond and potentially a dangerous situation.
- Concerned about the water pressure and potential drainage issues.
- Feels it would disrupt their lifestyle and would change the feeling of them owning a piece and part of the American dream.
- This is their dream home and neighborhood.

Gracie Nelson, 5035 SE 37th Street, Tecumseh, KS 66542.
- Owns the property with her sister and has it been part of the Nelson family farm since her grandparents built it at the beginning of the last century.
- Remembers the original owners of the Parnell family’s house and has many fond memories.
- Her roots in the neighborhood go really deep. They will always be part of the community.
- Commenting in the opposed but there should have been another category for people who are very worried about this project.
- Strongly believes that people have the right to do with their property as they wish within limits.
- Strongly believes in the safety, security and peace of their neighborhood.
- Concerned about the increased traffic and speeding drivers on SE 37th. Worries it will be more dangerous. Has already lost a family member to a fatal accident on that road.
- Concerned about the noise. Those drinking alcohol make more noise.
- Moving the celebration indoors at an early hour helps but noise carries across the fields and most of them go to bed early.
- Understands the Parnell family lives on the premises and will monitor the activity during an event.
- Once the event center is opened, the property is changed forever.
- The next owners may be rowdy and irresponsible. There is no way to know what will happen in the future.
- All kinds of possibilities open up that were not there before.
- No matter what the final decision is, she wishes the Parnell family well and understands they have put a great deal of effort and sweat equity into their potential business. They have thought about some of the issues that may come up. If the permit is granted, the Parnells should put an equal if not greater effort into keeping the dialogue going. Issues will arise. They always do in any business. They should give a solid commitment to work respectfully and in good faith to resolve the issues promptly, reasonably and fairly.

Rusty Simerl, 3620 SE Tecumseh Road, Tecumseh, KS 66542.
- Lives north of the Parnells with his wife. Been there since 1999 and raised their family there.
- In opposition.
- Moved into the area because of it is a quiet, rural residential area with families similar to theirs.
- There are young families with children and older adults also.
- They work together, watch out for each other's homes and are good neighbors. Want to keep it that way.
Concerned about the parties and the alcohol being served.
Concerned about the noise and safety.
The intersection at 37th and Tecumseh Road is dangerous and there are accidents there every year.
Concerned about the property values. They moved into the area because it was quiet and a nice residential area. Don’t have to worry too much about crime or other activities like that.
Afraid the event center will change the character of the neighborhood.

Travis Naylor, 3639 SE Tecumseh Road, Tecumseh, KS 66542.
Shares the concerns of most of his neighbors.
Wouldn’t want to have any of his neighbors that wanted to start an enterprise or do things with their property that wouldn’t have an opportunity. Seemed a little bit overboard.
Concerned if it was approved, what they would have to do to get it reversed if problems came up.
Didn’t think it would be fair to people if they had invested a huge amount of money assuming that it would always be available and that they had invested wisely and had to back out and be stuck with the cost. He would be concerned if he was making that investment.
Was not aware of the process for revoking a special use permit but assumed it would be fairly lengthy and require some type of legal action against the owners to get it removed.

With no further comments in opposition, Ms. Moler asked if Ms. Parnell had a rebuttal.

Jerri Parnell, 4834 SE 37th Street, Tecumseh, KS 66542.
First introduced to the barn when she bought land from the original owner and was invited to an annual potluck for the neighbors. The owner loved for people to come to the barn for activities.
Doesn’t look at the events as parties and doesn’t like parties or drink.
A friend owns the Woodward in town. She has helped with activities. She has learned how to control people by talking to them and not be mean so they are accountable for their event.
There has been one accident in the three years they have lived there.
In regard to the lights on the barn, the entrance and the exit to the parking lot is well between the two properties and quite a few feet away.
The county selected the safest place for the entrance to be at the bottom of the hill. The township also thought it was a good place. Up higher would have been unsafe for people coming in and out.
Didn’t think they were getting in anyone’s way.
A drainage report was being completed. It is an old field with old terraces. A terrace is located right in front of the barn at the end of the parking that will make all of the water that comes from it flow right out to the ditch just on the other side of the entrance and exit.
Talked to the water district and they had plenty of meters and the water pressure was fine.
The parking lot will be asphalt millings and once compacted can be painted/striped for 28 cars.
Doesn’t intend to have events that exceed 28 cars.
They have the authority to shut an event down if people are in violation of the contract.
Doesn’t think there will be lots of events because they both work full time and do a lot of volunteer work.
There would be more landscaping so it would be a nice setting and beautify the area.
Understands the neighbors’ concerns.
Although it is not commercial, it is a gathering place.
A Place In Time in Tecumseh had a lot of homes around it. Friends’ houses did not devalue when the business was operating.
The neighbors were terribly concerned about it when it opened but those neighbors gave that neighbor an opportunity to try. Asking for the opportunity to try it.
Thought the permit would expire if they sold it. Has no plans to sell. This is their forever home.
They do like to entertain and that is why they like the barn.
Down the street from her, a young man, who lived in the community for years, turned his dairy into a commercial storefront. There was a lot of upheaval about the dairy. Traffic, sound, smell, etc. But they gave him a chance and let him open the dairy. They gave him the opportunity to try.
• She was one of them that spoke up for him and invested in his business. His business failed. Her money is gone but she gave one of her neighbors the opportunity to try to succeed.
• If it would help to add a privacy fence on the north and the east by the pond, they would.
• Has no problem with removing alcohol out of the building and make it a non alcohol location.

Ms. Moler closed the hearing and asked for discussion.

Mr. Aubert asked Ms. Parnell if there would be any flexibility. The unknowns cause fear and major concerns. All the people have valid concerns. He would have the same concern if he was a homeowner there. Ms. Parnell said the noise level and hours of operation were set based on the Grace Farm and from Place In Time. They set those ranges for a variety of options. If they have an event, it would be the only event for that day. She didn’t see them happening all the time. They received positive from people in the area. She didn’t expect all of her neighbors to know her character or anything about them. Basically, they pass on the road and wave at each other. She was asking them to trust that they were not that type of people.

There were no further questions. Ms. Moler asked if anyone had a motion.

Mr. Depperschmidt stated he was a huge advocate of agritourism and thought this fit into the same category. He is also a big advocate of landowner rights and being able to do what you want but it also includes all those in attendance who have concerns about it and a lot of discontent.

Mr. Fisher stated he was impressed with the large number of people who showed up. Very encouraging to see that people are paying attention and took the time to be present. It’s encouraging to see that people were reasonable. Has many of the same concerns raised about property values. He is a huge property rights advocate. But when you live in an area like this, you also have to take into consideration that people can’t do whatever they want on their property without adversely affecting the neighbors.

Mr. Fisher moved to disapprove the Conditional Use Permit, Ms. Moler seconded the motion. There were no additional questions or discussion. With a vote of 5-1-0 (Mr. McCurry dissenting), the Conditional Use Permit was disapproved.

Public Comment on Non-Agenda Planning and Zoning Items: None were indicated.

Discussion of Planning Related Issues:

Proposed 2019 Planning Budget

Mr. Beagle stated the Planning Department’s proposed 2019 budget request was provided to them for their review and endorsement. It shows a reduction of $5,382 or a 1.9% decrease due to the elimination of a part-time intermittent position. The majority of the budget is for staff wages. No new major initiatives were proposed. The certainty of the Comprehensive Plan is not known so no additional funds were requested for consultant services for rewriting the Zoning and Subdivision Regulations. The budget hearing with the County Commission is scheduled for July 26th.

Mr. Fisher moved to approve the Planning Department’s proposed 2019 budget, Mr. Depperschmidt seconded the motion. With a vote of 6-0-0, the Planning Department’s proposed 2019 budget was approved.

Discussion of Comprehensive Plan

Mr. Beagle stated that all pertinent documents were placed on the Planning Department’s website for the public to access. A press release would be issued to all the media outlets.

In discussion of the issue papers, Mr. Beagle stated that when he drafted them, they were intended to be a resource for the Planning Commission. They were meant to offer background information and resource materials for their benefit. He wanted to make sure they represented their views and if any modifications were needed. Mr. Desch thought they were very well done and provided more information than what they
could have. Ms. Moler thought it would be important to hear the public's comments during the hearing and make any modifications then.

In discussion of the format for the public hearing, Mr. Beagle stated it would be important for them to provide the details of the process. Ms. Thadani stated the format should include an introduction, public comment from those in favor and then from those against, and finally the Planning Commission's discussion. She encouraged them to make comments after a motion and a second were offered or if they wanted to amend the motion. They each needed to explain their position. Any amendments would need to be considered before the final vote. The issue papers could not be revised once a vote was taken. If they didn’t feel comfortable voting on June 20th, they had the authority to make a motion to postpone and have another public meeting. It would not have to be republished but announced at the meeting that it is being continued and the vote will be on a later date. Ms. Moler stated the deadline is July 3rd.

Adjournment:

Mr. Fisher moved to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Depperschmidt, a unanimous voice vote declared the public hearing be adjourned, which was at 8:34 p.m.