

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF SODA SPRINGS, CARIBOU COUNTY, IDAHO, HELD FEBRUARY 8, 2022.

ROLL CALL SHOWED THE FOLLOWING PRESENT:

Charles Fryar–Chairman
Lori Anne Lau-Vice Chairman
Robert Johnson
Chris Guedes
Damien Guthmiller

ALSO, PRESENT:

Mitch Hart, Councilmember
Gregg Haney, City Attorney
Alan Skinner, City Planner/Engineer
Andrea Haderlie, Secretary
Brock & Paige Byram
Dawn Perkins
Sindy Koller
Julie Lakey
J. Craig Davis
Alisa Miller
Wayne Cutler
Steven & Patrish Barrick

EXCUSED:

Drew Erickson
Tysen Hopkins

6:00 PM Chairman Fryar called the meeting to order. Commissioner Johnson moved to dispense by reading the January 11, 2022 minutes, with a minor spelling error on page 3. In the first paragraph, “whole” needs to be changed to “hole.” He motioned approving the minutes with the correction. Commissioner Guedes seconded the motion. All in favor, motion carried.

Chairman Fryar opened the discussion for commission elections for Chairman and Vice-Chairman. He mentioned in the previous meeting they decided to postpone due to the commissioners being absent. He stated that Commissioner Erickson suggested Commissioner Fryar still hold the Chairman position and Commissioner Hopkins as Vice-Chairman. Secretary Haderlie mentioned that Commissioner Erickson still recommended this per his text message. Chairman Fryar questioned the Commission if there were any other nominations? Commissioner Fryar nominated Commissioner Lau for Vice-Chairman. Commissioner Lau stated she would accept the nomination. Commissioner Guthmiller seconded the nomination. *The Commission voted, all in favor of Chairman as Commissioner Fryar and Vice-Chairman as Commissioner Lau. Motion carried.*

Chairman Fryar opened the discussion for the public input meeting for accessory building/shipping containers. He asked that the audience be brought up to speed on the accessory building/shipping container discussion. Attorney Haney explained to the audience that we are determining if accessory building/shipping containers should be allowed in residential and for storage. He explained that currently, shipping containers are only allowed in

Industrial/Manufacturing Zones with conditional use. He mentioned that it is now being discussed whether they should be allowed in all the other zoning designations and what conditions they should be allowed or allowed by conditional use. Chairman Fryar explained to the audience what the process is for conditional use. He mentioned that the Commission is trying to get as much public input to amend the ordinance. Commissioner Guedes noted to the audience we are discussing whether they should be painted or not, should they be sided, no electrical or plumbing or running water, or allowed in residential. He questioned if they wanted residential or not and what they should look like if allowed. Vice-Chairman Lau asked the audience, are you okay with them being in commercial zones but not allowed in residential zones. She questioned if shipping containers should only be permitted for storage purposes? Or should they be allowed for home offices or sheds, or should they be regulated more due to the use of the unit? She questioned should we allow shipping containers in commercial and residential areas? Chairman Fryar said that the code was put in place in the '80s, and the Commission is trying to decipher the purpose of not allowing shipping containers in town.

Steven Barrick of 240 East 3rd South voiced he just moved to Soda Springs from Washington state where coffee shops/stands are everywhere. He expressed that he would like to use a shipping container for a building for a drive-thru coffee stand, with windows, and it would be painted flat black with a mural on the side of it. While he read the definition, he voiced that there is no power allowed or even allowed in town right now, which throws a wrench in his plan. He mentioned if you take the time, they could look professional for a commercial business and not just a box sitting on the side of the road. Chairman Fryar questioned what his opinion was on commercial vs. residential. Mr. Barrick voiced either-or; they have their place, watertight, reasonably inexpensive. He mentioned that if you look at sheds, they can be up to \$9,000.00, and you can buy a shipping container for \$4,000.00 that is already watertight as long as they are maintained and not a rusty pile of garbage; they serve their purpose. Patrish Barrick mentioned that shipping containers are being used to build houses. Mr. Barrick noted there is a vast array for them. Mrs. Barrick mentioned that in Las Vegas, they had built a strip mall out of shipping containers three or four stories high. Mr. Barrick voiced if you take the time, they could look nice. He thanked the Commission for their time.

Paige Byram of 150 Springview voiced she would like to see shipping containers be allowed in town, and they can be made to look nice; she would prefer to see them outside residential zones but allowed in commercial zones. She voiced that having no power ran to them is not a big deal. Having them painted to look nice is doable, and she would like to see this.

Julie Lakey of 295 West 3rd South voiced that she does not see a problem in commercial if they are taken care of but one hundred percent against them in residential; she thinks looking out her window in her neighbor's yard rear view, side view, or front view. Seeing a train car/shipping container, she does not want to see them. She mentioned looking across the street if they put up a nice shed that is different than a shipping container, in her opinion. Commissioner Guedes questioned how you would feel about it if they required siding in residential zones. Mrs. Lakey voiced that she thinks that might be okay because it will look like a shed. She questioned are you talking about the structure of them being covered with siding and

not just paint, but she is worried that people would place them on the property and wait till the next year to put siding on it. She does not want to see something like that happen. She mentioned as long as they are industrial and commercial, they would be okay. She mentioned that she would like to see what the Commission would like to have them look like because we don't want to lose our town's look and for it to look industrial. She stated we have many old buildings on Main Street, but they still look nice, and she does not want to lose our town's look. She mentioned in other places in our city, like commercial and industrial; she does not want to see them doubled up like stacked on each other; she is concerned. She stated if they are small shipping containers and covered with siding in residential and set on a pad, she is okay with it, but she does not want to see them without siding. She would not put one in her backyard because it would devalue her property and everyone around it.

Alisa Miller at 160 North Hooper Ave voiced she believes they are better in commercial and industrial zones. She expressed that she would rather see them well taken care of and people working with the city for upkeep and not have them dilapidated and would much rather see that than broken-down sheds. She explained she does not want them in residential and does not see a problem with running power to them. She stated she does not want to see them in her neighbors back yard, but she does not see a problem if it is made to look like a shed and part of a house in the neighborhood. She pointed out it is a much more economical way for people to upgrade their living space if they cannot add on to their homes. She expressed if the city and community could come up with rules and regulations to make sure that it fits in with the look of our community but still fits the needs of others, it would not be a problem.

J. Craig Davis of 1734 Cedar View Rd. voiced he represents seven generations in Soda Springs. He expressed he has seen a lot of changes and a lot of opportunities be missed; he has worked for himself for fifty years. He stated he has taken care of the cemetery for fifty years and owns the Idan-Ha Drive-in. He voiced he has a lot of conex/shipping containers, about twelve to fifteen of them; they are all in good shape and are filled with tools, so they are not lying around the yard. He expressed he is here to try to be a good neighbor. He stated that 99.9 % of the population does not care or they would be here. He expressed that if someone has a gripe, he would like to contradict that just a little bit. He mentioned he could see the siding if that is what you wish, or he could see paint if that is what you want, but he would like someone to show him a better building. He stated these are bulletproof, you could stick a quarter stick of dynamite and close the door, but you cannot do that with these other accessory buildings. He stated power and water; we already have rules and regulations. There are already plumbing inspectors and electrical inspectors; he can see some concerns, but most of that is safety; he can't imagine putting water in shipping containers unless you have sewer, which goes under the public health or plumbers. He explained most of this stuff is already regulated, and he had no idea he needed a permit, and his shipping containers have been there for over fifteen years. His theory was if it wasn't anchored to the ground and portable, it was alright. He stated that all of his shipping containers are on a solid foundation, and they are level and secure. They are mouse-proof, airtight, and watertight. He stated there is repair work on everything; it does not matter what it is. Brock Byram questioned what his opinion on residential vs. commercial is. Mr. Davis expressed commercial is industrial, in residential, he can't see a problem. He stated he respects your view on this, but it would be who your neighbor is and if they take care of their

stuff, and if any neighbors have any complaints talk to him if there is a problem with his property. Commissioner Guedes questioned how he feels about being required to have a permit? Mr. Davis stated that buildings, storage units, or carports are not the same color. Some contractors try to make the colors mesh, and if you drive out to the Dike with the new houses built out, nothing is the same color. He questioned whether we would force everyone to paint them the same color. Commissioner Guedes asked what about the bright pink ones with the word painted across its side or graffiti down its side? Mr. Davis expressed he likes bright colors and does not want to be like everyone else. He stated his containers had been there for fifteen years. Commissioner Johnson questioned if he had any in residential zones? Mr. Davis noted that he does not have any in residential zones.

Vice-Chairman Lau questioned if there are regulations on bully barns or tin sheds for colors? She mentioned this would be the only building material we would be regulating for color. Attorney Haney voiced that color is not the issue; it is the names painted on them from the companies that owned them, and they are sold as-is; color is the people's preference. Vice-Chairman Lau mentioned when the neighbor parks their toy hauler or camper in their backyard, it can be painted and say anything they desire on it, and we don't have any say over what it looks like. Mrs. Lakey stated that they are not a permanent fixture either, and if someone decides to put in a shed and if it isn't already painted, they will probably paint it, so the wood does not deteriorate on it. She expressed if they are still going to allow shipping containers in residential areas, they should be sided to blend in the residential area. She mentioned she does not care what color they pick; most people try to make it look like their house. She stated that she worried about large containers and suggested that the Commission consider how large a container should be allowed. Vice-Chairman Lau voiced that there are already restrictions in the zoning code for how much a percentage per the zoning designation can cover a person's lot.

Mr. Davis expressed double-decker shipping containers are very sturdy; how many do you see going down the railroad; they are very secure. He mentioned he does put equipment on top of his shipping containers during the winter, and the wind does not blow them away; you can chain them down. He explained when he first heard about this ordinance; he thought this would be detrimental to his business and him.

Brock Byram of 150 Spring View voiced J. Craig Davis is an excellent asset to the community, and we are lucky to have him. He mentioned that he agrees with Mr. Davis, commercially, he does not see a reason to limit shipping containers, at the same time, he does not know if you need to put power and water in shipping containers because he does not see a need for that; if you allow that people will keep pushing that boundary. Vice-Chairman Lau asked for clarification on that. Mr. Byram stated he does not see any reason for power and water to be needed to be plumbed into shipping containers no matter the zoning. He mentioned that as for residential, he does not see a need for a shipping container to be placed in residential areas, which is his option. Chairman Fryar questioned at all? Mr. Byram voiced at all, and you go back to the issue of enforcement; how, who, what permit is needed, is there a yearly fee; enforcement has not been a strong suit for however many years you want to go back; it is hard to enforce, and nobody wants to be the bad guy.

Councilmember Hart mentioned to Chairman Fryar to look at a couple of hypotheticals; if shipping contains are allowed in residential and for those that already have them in

residential would have to follow the ordinance, if it is permitted by special use permit those that already have them will have to apply for the permit. Chairman Fryar voiced yes; that is how he understands it, and all the shipping containers that have been placed in residential or commercial have done so legally. Attorney Haney mentioned, except for those in manufacturing/industrial zones. Mr. Byram explained the railcar that has been there at the high school, and he thinks that it predates the zoning code and the railcar at Vaughan Smith's. Councilmember Hart voiced that he highlights that it could be a scenario not allowed in residential or commercial. Then the shipping containers would have to be removed technically. He mentioned we would have to make people understand that if it is not allowed, it will be enforced, and if it isn't legal, are they going to have the remediate it/remove it. City Planner/Engineer voiced that they are currently allowed with a conditional use in M-1 and allowed in M-2 zoning.

Chairman Fryar mentioned the only zones that would fall under is the industrial parkway. In the last meeting minutes, Vice-Chairman Lau wanted to clarify that there is a dozen-ish in residential, and she thought the dozen-ish was in a commercial zone. Attorney Haney voiced that she was right; most are in commercial zones. Vice-Chairman Lau continued that there is only a handful in residential zones. Attorney Haney mentioned that there are three or four at best. Chairman Fryar explained that there were more than he had thought there were; when he went driving around, he was surprised at how many he did not notice, and they had been there for an extended amount of time, and he had never paid attention. He voiced one of the critical points everyone is concerned with is what they look like. No one wants a garbage can in their neighborhood or backyard. He looked at different sheds in town, and there are a lot of sheds that don't look as good as a shipping container, and as a community, everyone wants them to look nice and be proud of your home or a neighbor to detract from your property value. Attorney Haney commented that you picked the point, people don't take care of their sheds no matter what they are made of, so that is a rule of thumb; imagine a bunch of metal rusted shipping containers all over town because that is what you are going to get. Commissioner Guedes mentioned if you don't take care of the shipping containers, they don't look too shabby in fifteen years vs. a woodshed that is falling down; that is when we get back to the enforcement of the code. He explained if the ordinance states no visible rust, there should be no visible rust, but then we are back to who is knocking on doors to enforce it. Brock Byram voiced that Vice-Chairman Lau had an excellent point; we are looking at enforcing painting a shipping container, but none of the other accessory dwellings have this regulation as far as aesthetics. They could paint it fourteen different colors, and nothing could be done about it. Paige Byram mentioned could we say no graffiti; she feels as if the graffiti would be a more significant issue. Brock Byram mentioned there is a difference in a shipping container that goes back and forth on the ocean vs. one that gets hauled on a train with graffiti on it, and they are painted to withstand the salt from the sea; the paint is going to last for a fair amount of time. The shipping container that has been used once is far better than the shipping container used several times over the ocean.

Vice-Chairman Lau voiced what we have not touched on is former Councilmember Lau had the idea all accessory buildings should be treated the same regardless of building material. She questioned why there was so much heartburn with steel shipping containers. Julie Lakey

voiced she did not buy a home along the railroad and does not live near the railroad to look at railroad cars or listen to them; she bought a house not near the railroad tracks, and she does not want that taken from her if they allow shipping containers in residential zones. Commissioner Johnson questioned if you have a small number of conex in residential. Can those be grandfathered in and then created the ordinance to say that no more are allowed in residential from this point? Brock Byram commented he thinks it could be done, but you have to ask the question in those residential areas: What do they look like? He mentioned he had seen a couple in residential that do not look very nice in residential areas. Commissioner Johnson voiced that if they are allowed in residential areas, we would want to be stricter about how they look vs. industrial or commercial. Patrish Barrick expressed that you would want to be more stringent in residential because it would directly reflect what this community looks like. She mentioned that when people drive into town and see a rusty metal box that is not taken care of, it detours them from stopping in town and stopping at places of business. She expressed in residential, if it has to be sided and you give them an array of colors to choose from; same with commercial, it has to meet XYZ criteria for you to obtain it or place it. Vice-Chairman Lau questioned if there is a difference for commercial shipping containers like Lallatin's that have been there for thirty years and are freezers; probably six people have seen those in town; to her, they are out of sight well as well as J. Craig Davis shipping containers. She questioned if they are not on the main street or insight should they be treated differently? Brock Byram asked if you look at the property next to Bowman's Gym, you will see the old single-wide sitting there and the abandoned vehicles. He questioned what was better? Sindy Koller voiced she could see a small shipping container in residential zones instead of junk and garbage everywhere. Julie Lakey mentioned she agrees with her, but those people will fill that container and also around it. Brock Byram voiced what Councilmember Hart stated is authentic; there will be so many scenarios no matter what you do or look at and how you police everything. Chairman Fryar mentioned that if we go this route, the best way is to do it initially. He commented that it does not matter the material for accessory buildings. They all look good the first day and become broken down over time; when the building inspector comes to sign off on your permit, he will make the checklist of what needs to be done. Brock Byram questioned, you can buy dented shipping containers and paint them. Is that going to be up to code? He commented that you could buy the ones that have been beaten up and dented all over and buy them for cheap that is not watertight. Commissioner Guedes mentioned that we are looking at the International Building Code and the new section about the structural integrity of shipping containers. Brock Byram questioned what year is that. Commissioner Guedes mentioned that it is the International Building Code 2021. Brock Byram mentioned that the city had not adopted it yet. Commissioner Guedes mentioned we had discussed it, and we could adopt that one section because it is a new section and looking at an outside source to address structural integrity. Brock Byram voiced if a person cares about his home or business, you're going to take care of it; that is your investment. J. Craig Davis mentioned it would hurt the small businesses if they cannot have them; you can't buy a shed stronger than a shipping container. He mentioned that when he started buying his shipping containers, he was buying them for \$1200.00, but they are now over \$4000.00 to \$6000.00. Brock Byram mentioned when they purchased theirs for Soda Sip, it was \$5500.00. J. Craig Davis mentioned even for scrap; they are worth \$3000.00.

Paige Byram mentioned that she had seen shipping containers turned into homes, soda shops, and mother-in-law suites, and it depends on how you want them around town and how many you can put on a lot.

Dr. Wayne Cutler of 261 South 2nd West and owner of Gem Valley Veterinary at 661 North Hooper Ave. stated he has three shipping containers at his clinic, and he had applied for the conditional use permit with Caribou County. He mentioned they are single one-time hauls and set up, and he thinks they are a great option, especially if they look nice; he can see from the city's standpoint the difficulty when you start to look at all of this. He questioned who says this one works and that one does not? He stated that a conditional use permit is about \$365.00 vs. a building permit costs. He commented that you could not control what others do; how do we treat these differently than prefab sheds vs. bully shed? Yes, they are structurally different, but how do we separate those with a trailer with four wheels on it. He voiced that it becomes a big headache; it's a more significant storm than what we are talking about today, throwing in all those what-ifs in there. He suggested when issuing permits; they have to meet what you want; you can have guidelines. He suggested issuing a temporary permit for six months, and it is not signed off until every guideline is met during those six months, then they have the option to reject that permit. He stated that you want to have teeth in it, but no one wants to be the bad guy. He explained that if you come in and tell Craig after fifteen years that we don't like these, that will hurt some feelings. J. Craig Davis voiced he honestly didn't think they would be a problem. Dr. Cutler mentioned from regulation and trying to make everyone conform; he defiantly can see the argument of how do you treat a prefab vs. conex vs. semi-trailer differently than a stick-built he thinks it is hard to justify. There should be a set of regulations on what it should look like, and use your permit to get them set up and acceptable from the start. He expressed we cannot control how people take care of stuff; twenty years from now. He mentioned as far as residential, he would not be against a 10 foot, but a 40 foot does not belong in residential; siding is a good idea, and surrounding neighbors have to agree not to create waves, but everyone least everyone is happy.

Vice-Chairman Lau clarified there is no discussion about allowing things with wheels; semi-trailers, there is no ambition to allow those. Attorney Haney mentioned that the ordinance intended to clean that up as accessory buildings. Brock Byram said it is not a conex ordinance; this is an accessory buildings ordinance. Vice-Chairman Lau explained in theory, these are all not acceptable as accessory buildings and made it very clear. The discussion morphed into allowing some shipping containers and these precise uses and rules. Still, there is no ambition to allow something with wheels to be an accessory building. Planner/Engineer Skinner mentioned right now it excludes railroad cars, semi-trailers, mobile homes, construction trailers, recreation travel trailers, vehicles, or buses as storage accessory buildings in the proposed ordinance. Vice-Chairman Lau clarified you could have a travel trailer; you can't turn it into your long-term storage.

J. Craig Davis questioned the ones that are now in place would have to be moved? Attorney Haney asked if they were already there and used as such? He clarified we are not allowed to create any law ex-post factor that is in the constitution. Mr. Davis stated he does have a lot of stuff in an old school bus. Attorney Haney explained they are not prohibited, and that is why we are getting that cleaned up; it is just over the years people expected people to

follow the golden rule. Councilmember Hart mentioned an example of how things change; back in the eighties when the city of Conda was disappearing, there was a surplus of underground phosphate ore railcars, and there was a big push for people in town to adopt them than place them around town and celebrate the history of underground phosphate mining. Some of those got scattered around town, the cuteness wore off, and some of them still sit; things do change. He mentioned that Attorney Haney is correct; you cannot go back in many cases, so you try to establish more defined ground rules going forward. Attorney Haney commented when that bus turns to rust and cannot be used anymore, it will have to be removed, and another one cannot replace it. Mr. Davis stated that is okay. He will be gone by then. Attorney Haney mentioned if you put something there illegally, the city could make you remove it. Mr. Davis stated he would wait to hear from everybody then.

Vice-Chairman Lau expressed why we are saying shipping containers placed in residential and commercial could theoretically be removed if illegally placed; since the seventies or eighties, it has been noted in the code they were not allowed. Attorney Haney mentioned they would have to show that they were there before 1987; in that year, they were made illegal in residential and commercial.

Chairman Fryar asked the audience about using a shipping container/conex box as a building material? He mentioned they have been using shipping containers to build homes, or you have two shipping containers and add a roof between them, you would have a carport. Brock Byram stated that he thinks it is a wonderful idea. Chairman Fryar mentioned as of right now, that is not allowed because it is a shipping container. He questioned the audience if shipping containers were to be used as something else. Patrish Barrick commented that they have built multi-million-dollar homes as their central living unit out of shipping containers. They combined 6-10 shipping containers to create a gorgeous home. She mentioned it depends on what you want it to look like. Attorney Haney noted that they could be expensive to maintain from his studies. Secretary Haderlie mentioned it is repurposing a steel structure into something useful instead of just sitting somewhere. Brock Byram said he still does not love the idea of building a home with shipping containers if a regular citizen with no knowledge of how to make it and weld it properly could have the potential for it to look like trash vs. a skilled welder like Custom Iron Works doing a fantastic job on it; you would have to enforce who is okay to do it and who is not. Cindy Koller mentioned that is why you would have the building inspector. Vice-Chairman Lau expressed that there are regulations on who can build your home. Steven Barrick noted the quality of work; if you put in a junction box, the electrical inspector will inspect it.

Vice-Chairman Lau mentioned that there are already safeguards that we as a city don't need to worry about if we adopt the building code. Attorney Haney voiced if we adopted the building code 2021, it would answer those types of questions. Vice-Chairman Lau commented to suggest it to the city council to do that. Paige Byram questioned whether anything says you can put two or three together. Commissioner Guedes mentioned it goes back to that thirty-five percent rule. Brock Byram asked, what if they want to stack seven high? Secretary Haderlie said you are only allowed two and a half stories per the zoning code in R-1 and R-2 residential.

Vice-Chairman Lau pointed out each zoning has its restrictions on height per the zoning designation. Brock Byram questioned in the 2021 IBC do you have to have a certified welder

inspector to put two shipping containers together? Planner/Engineer Skinner mentioned that you could do a structural engineer to inspect it and stamp it in the commercial. Commissioner Guedes pointed out it all has to be done by a structural engineer to a specific weld to put two shipping containers together. J. Craig Davis mentioned anything that requires anything to do with safety; he takes it out to Custom Iron Works even though he has a certified welder working for him. The Commission and audience discussed structural engineers at length. Vice-Chairman Lau mentioned before Dr. Wayne Cutler's suggestion that no one had come up with the idea for a temporary permit and come back in six months to sign off for the final approval; She feels there is some potential merit there. Attorney Haney commented that with a conditional use permit, if they do not comply with it, you can take it away from them. Vice-Chairman Lau voiced if we choose not to blanket them with a conditional use permit, we do a temporary permit and a final permit six months later. Councilmember Hart pointed out that it would be a conditional use permit. Patrish Barrick asked if you do a conditional use permit in six months, a year, or more and keep giving them conditions if these items are not met; can you go back in ten years and have new requirements? Chairman Fryar mentioned the easy answer is yes, but the problem is enforcement; who will go back in ten or fifteen years and look; it is a lot easier up front to say what the conditions are before it is signed off on. Mrs. Barrick pointed out that everyone is concerned with what it will look like in the long run. Chairman Fryar commented that is the hard one, how to police it or enforce it.

7:12 PM-Vice-Chairman Lau was excused from the meeting.

Brock Byram questioned why are we policing them if it is not enforced for this type of container? Attorney Haney mentioned that the city has a right to implement health and safety regardless of what it is. Commissioner Guedes noted from this discussion that there is no issue with commercial or industrial; it is more with residential.

7:15 PM Commissioner Guedes was excused from the meeting. A quorum was lost.

Chairman Fryar pointed out that a conditional use permit gives the city more control to say this will work or this will not work, but the drawback is it tends to be a bit of an expense for the property owner. Patrish Barrick pointed out that it just has to be a generalized list of what is expected.

Alisa Miller mentioned from her research on previous shipping containers discussions; it is apparent that it needs to be decided if the ordinance will be commercial and industrial or include residential. She stated that you could determine what the shipping container should look like and a grandfather clause for those who already have them on their property. She said now, moving forward, her opinion has changed that it should not be allowed in residential zones because you open a whole can of worms. Still, there are already parameters for those zones with commercial and industrial. Chairman Fryar mentioned that we are trying to decide which zones should be allowable; currently, it is only industrial, working on the standards for each zoning. He voiced he is leaning towards conditional use for residential because it allows you to put in conditions and allows neighbor input.

7:24 PM The meeting was adjourned.