

GREENWOOD CITY COUNCIL

February 28, 2005 - 5:32 p.m.

PUBLIC HEARING

PRESENT

Council Members: Mayor Nicholson, Niki Hutto, Linda Edwards, Betty Boles, Herbert Vaughn, Johnny Williams and Barbara Turnburke; City Manager; Assistant City Manager; City Clerk; City Attorney; Phil Lindler; and Wallace McBride from the Index-Journal.

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting in the Municipal Courtroom was called to order by Mayor Nicholson at 5:32p.m. and he welcomed everyone to the meeting.

The City Attorney, John McCravy, gave the invocation.

STATEMENT AND QUORUM

Mayor Nicholson read the following statement, "In accordance with the Freedom of Information Act, Chapter 4, Title 30, Code of Laws of South Carolina, 1976, an agenda has been posted on the front door of City Hall and notification of this meeting has been given to the news media."

The Mayor then asked the City Clerk, Steffanie Dorn, if a quorum was present. She said, "Yes, Mr. Mayor, we have a quorum present."

Ordinance Annexing Approximately Nine Acres of Property off Calhoun Road

The Mayor said, "First on our agenda tonight, we have two public hearings. The format that we employ in the public hearings is, if there are individuals who would like to speak, we ask that you come to the podium, state your name and address for the record, and try to limit your comments to not

Owned by H.
Munnerlyn and
Brenda G.
Munnerlyn.

more than four or five minutes.”

The Mayor then read the first item and said, “First, I would like the individuals who want to speak in favor of this annexation.”

ED MUNNERLYN

“I’m Ed Munnerlyn, and part owner with my wife of the property that is under consideration. If it pleases the Council, I would like to put my comments off until after the opposition, so that I might answer any questions that may arise.”

MAYOR
NICHOLSON

“Okay. Thank you, sir. Is there anyone who would like to speak opposing the annexation of the nine acres? If you look on the overhead, this is a picture of the property that they’re talking about.”

W. HAROLD
BUZHARDT

“I’m W. Harold Buzhardt. I reside at 157 Crescent Road, and I’m one of the 14 property owners that touch the surrounding property. If I may, I would like to give you a small petition of three other members that also touch. They cannot be here tonight because they’re sick. They’re number five, six, and eight (pointing) and are opposed to it, just as the petition says.

First of all, I would like to say that I personally am not opposed to this property going into the City. What I’m opposed to is the rezoning classification. This property was attempted to be rezoned in 1996, but was denied by the then County Council. It’s from Mathis Street to Calhoun Road, and it’s all R1 on the Kimbrook side of that property. We would like to see it stay the way we bought it. It was that way when Mr. Munnerlyn bought his property, so we’re not taking anything away from him. We don’t want him to take away from us.

We believe in the R1 zoning system. When people buy lots and build homes, that’s all they can do; put their faith in it. I still ask you for your trust. We trust that you will do the betterment of whatever is necessary. Thank you, very much.”

MAYOR
NICHOLSON

“Okay. Is there anyone else to speak in opposition to this annexation?”

CHARLOTTE
CABRI

“My name is Charlotte Cabri. I live at 150 Crescent Road in Kimbrook. Kimbrook is not big, but a small subdivision. People have been raising families there for years. We have some who are now the children and grandchildren of those who settled there, so it’s just a small neighborhood.

I want to tell you about a family that located there. The family wanted a good place to raise their children, so they bought residentially zoned property. They expected it to stay residential and didn’t worry that their neighbors were going to build a gas station on either side, or behind them. That family can sleep well at night knowing they bought residential property and expected it to be protected by that residential zoning. That family was the Ed Munnerlyn Family, and we would like to continue under the same protection that family received. We think it’s the right thing to do.”

MAYOR
NICHOLSON

“Thank you. Is there anyone else to speak in opposition to this annexation?”

MIKE DORN

“My name is Mike Dorn. I’m a 27 year resident of 132 Crescent Road, Kimbrook. I want to concur with Mr. Buzhardt. I don’t have any problem with him going in the City, but I got a problem with the classification that he’s going in. I’m for anything that will improve the quality of life for the residents of the County and City. Unfortunately, what we got here is a quality downgrade for the residents of Kimbrook.

The property in question is an old established neighborhood. If Council allows this deviation, we’re skirting the zoning laws. If you allow this, then anybody in any residential area with two lots close to the City will try to skirt the law to get it to the type of zoning that they want to have. Certainly, these Mixed-Use developments are the wave of the future in real estate development. I have no problem with that, but to take an established residential area and turn it over to Mixed-Use, it just does not fit in an established area. Our residents are made up of

senior citizens that have been in their homes for 30 to 40 years. Many of them have various health problems, and can't come here to express their opinion tonight. We've got several second generations who returned to live in the homes that their parents have passed on to them. They also want their children to enjoy the same neighborhood that they grew up in.

Now, if this goes through, we're looking at growing traffic in an already congested area and increased noise. What about one of these retention ponds (mosquito infested breeding areas) that DHEC makes developers put in and nobody keeps up? Now, there's not one member on Council that would want one in their neighborhood. We would like to maintain single family residence for what we've got now.

Now, talk is going around our neighborhood that if this goes through, Mr. Munnerlyn is going to pick up and move his house. Only he can answer it, because I don't know. But why would he do that? Why? Because he don't want to spend every waking day looking at a liquor store, or smelling the emission from a dry cleaner, if they decide to locate there. Well our residents, some in their 70's and 80's, don't have that option. I know that Council is struggling for revenue, but at some point it comes down to doing what's right. I'm asking Council tonight, on behalf of my neighbors, to do what's right and reject this proposal."

MAYOR
NICHOLSON

"Thank you. Is there anyone else to speak in opposition of the annexation of the Munnerlyn property? Alright, seeing none, Mr. Munnerlyn?"

ED MUNNERLYN

"The comments that I heard were not different from what I expected to hear. Tonight, we're here to decide whether to annex or not annex. The Planning Board has already approved the County wide zoning ordinance, and the City has adopted it. So the question tonight is, do we go into the City?"

Now, I will answer some of these questions. I don't have any plans as to what I'm gonna do with the

property. There are lots of options, and that's what I want. Seven years ago, I did try to change the law and have it rezoned. That's not what I'm trying to do now. I'm just trying to go by the law. When I tried to change this zoning seven years ago, I proposed doing a PUD, which was a Planned Unit Development.

Somebody mentioned 14 houses that back up to my property. I wanted to develop 13 lots, plus my lot, of houses that were gonna sell for \$200,000 and above. It was to be a gated community with sidewalks and street lights, however at least this many (I can't tell how many of these people are against me and how many are against the next case) showed up in opposition. I guess it was a little more dense because, being on the inside of the curb, the lots would be a little bit smaller than those outside the curb, and the lots didn't measure to the size of R1.

That gentleman was wrong, because Council did not vote it down. I withdrew my request seven years ago, so it was never denied. I saw the opposition when I was trying to make a change to the law. During the last seven years, I've tried to sell it, but have not been successful. True, I'm on a four-lane, highway bypass, which is very difficult to have a residential house. That's why the Planning Board has recommended it be Neighborhood Commercial. Neighborhood Commercial, as you all know, has certain restrictions. If I decided to do something along those lines, I would certainly have to abide by any of the laws and regulations. So the only thing I'm trying to do is request for my property that I own on a bypass to be annexed into the City."

W. HAROLD
BUZHARDT

"Mr. Mayor, may I make a statement? One of the statements he referred to, I don't know if I'm the gentleman or not, but I am the one who brought this up. This did go before the County Council, because I was there. That agenda was on September 3, 1996, and he did try to withdraw it, but the Zoning Board wouldn't let him. They said that if he withdrew the request, he would bring it up again, so they said, 'No. We won't approve it.' That's why they denied

it. I was there, and he wasn't. Now, this was the County Council that met at the Depot in Ninety Six. I'm sure that the minutes on September 3rd will reflect that. I'm not wrong, I was there."

ED MUNNERLYN

"I yield that it may have happened. I don't know if I wasn't there."

W. HAROLD
BUZHARDT

"It happened."

MAYOR
NICHOLSON

"Okay. Do I have anyone else to speak?"

CHARLOTTE
CABRI

"I think one point of interest is, when you do look at that property, you can see that everything surrounding the property is the residential neighborhood, Kimbrook. His property is a pocket that goes into a residential neighborhood. So the part that's on Calhoun is only about a fourth of the property. The rest of the property boundaries abut to homes in the neighborhood, so that would cause a severe problem."

MAYOR
NICHOLSON

"Thank you. Is there anyone else to speak in favor of or in opposition? Mr. Brown, what about making this contiguous? Was that ever answered?"

STEVEN BROWN

"The City Attorney has that information."

JOHN MCCRAVY

"The bottom line is, the contiguousness is questionable, if it can be done. First of all, I think there is a problem with the contiguous language in the statute as to whether it's contiguous or not. Looking at the current annexation, it doesn't go all the way to the corner. Second of all, Section 5 Page 110 talks about convenient right-of-way. If you cross the right-of-way, it would connect to contiguous property. That statute says that it could not exceed the width of the road. To me it would be an argument that it may exceed the width of the road in this particular case.

I talked to the Attorney General's Office and asked them to help us with an opinion on this. They said it is a factual matter, not a legal matter, so we did not

get an opinion from them. My best opinion is, if challenged, there might be a problem with the annexation. That's my opinion. So it might be a possibility that the landowner can get a judicial opinion through a declaratory judgement from the statute of what that may allow. I'd feel a lot more comfortable if that was done first before I could really recommend it."

MAYOR
NICHOLSON

"Okay. Thank you, Mr. McCravy. We will close the public hearing dealing with the annexation of this nine acre property off Calhoun Road owned by Mr. Munnerlyn."

A Request by
Funderburk &
Funderburk, LLC
to Rezone 41.25
Acres of Property
Located on East
Cambridge
Avenue and
Emerald Farm
Road from R-3
(Residential -
Single Family,
Medium Density)
to R-4
(Residential -
Medium Density).

The Mayor read the second item and asked, "If you look at the overhead, it'll show the location of the property. This has to do with the number of houses that can be put on an acre of property. First, is there anyone to speak in favor of this zoning change?"

DWIGHT
FUNDERBURK

"I'm Dwight Funderburk, and I'd like to address the Mayor and Council if I could. I'd like to go second in this thing, too, but I think it's better that I make the facts current, because I think what we have here is a factual issue. To give you a time line, we acquired the property about three years ago, and this project has been ongoing. This is an old Hearst Coleman drawing of an approved 1977 layout that was started for Linwood. We also took an early look at our initial stages of making a total development on this 40 acre lot layout in 2001. We came up with a layout which was less than that for lots of reasons, but we elected

not to do anything with 20 acres of this property.

This section here (pointing) has been withdrawn from the zoning request. Your agenda says not, but that has been done. We actually had this approved through the Planning system. We were actually permitted for all of our utilities that were designed and engineered. We actually have construction utility permits that were issued in March of 2003. In August of 2004, unbeknownst to us through the adoption of the new zoning ordinance, this property got rezoned. Before, it was R2 and all these drawings were based on a development standard of 10,000 square feet per lot. When the zoning changed, the new requirement is now 14,250 square feet per lot, and none of these lots meet that.

The reason that we were asking for the zoning change is, the Planning Department honestly made an oversight. I think they were instructed to take the existing zoning and match the new zoning as closely as they could to it. Well, it arbitrarily got zoned to R3. The old zoning is R2. R4 is for 10,000 square feet per lot, all single family. It's not a density issue here, but the square footage allowed within the lot. So if we start to build homes on these lots, which is where we were headed, then we're going to be building 50 homes on substandard lots, and that's a legal quagmire. So the reason for our request is to get the development to match with the new zoning. I'm not trying to build the houses any bigger, or smaller. I'm just trying to take our already approved project, with the utilities that are already in the ground, match the lot sizes before we start construction. That was simply the reason for the request. The 40 acres got put into the request because it was the total piece of the property. We have no plans for future development on the back side of that property. Economically, it doesn't make sense because the topography of the property will not sewer easily. We thought it might help just to withdraw that part, so we did. We just ask for that part to come out of the rezoning request.

So all we're asking for is a change from R3 to R4. That will give us a development standard that

matches up to what we already put in the ground. It is just a timing issue, with us going through the process and the City approving the new standards. We wouldn't even be standing here if that change hadn't happened. So that's it."

MAYOR
NICHOLSON

"One question, Dwight. You mentioned a change in the request?"

DWIGHT
FUNDERBURK

"It was a withdrawal. We just wrote a letter to the Planning Department."

MAYOR
NICHOLSON

"Phil?"

STEVEN BROWN

"Mr. Mayor, let me answer that. The only people that can authorize, or accept, his request to withdraw is City Council. That's why it's listed on the agenda. The letter has been written, a request has been made, and it's before you tonight for whatever action you take. You can either accept that request to withdraw, or you can let the request go through as it was originally submitted. That's why it's still showing 41.25 acres. They have requested it, and we have the letter in hand."

DWIGHT
FUNDERBURK

"I'm sure we felt that was the right thing to do, because we don't have any future plans for it. I'm sure that there are a lot of opposition for whatever reasons, but at the end of this, I'll be glad to answer some questions. This is not a density issue, we're talking about the same number of lots, the same number of houses, the same number of everything. I was not here for the Planning Commission because I was out of town, but as we talked with the Planning Commission, the committee recommended the change to the Planning Commission. I think they thought it was the right thing to do. It was an oversight. That's basically what happened."

MAYOR
NICHOLSON

"Okay. Thank you, Dwight. Is there anyone else to speak in favor of the zoning change? Is there anyone to speak in opposition to the zoning change?"

FRANK ELLIOTT

"My name is Frank Elliott, and I live at 117 Woodland Way. As a parent of two small children, I'm very

concerned about the amount of traffic that would be created by adding this many houses to the area. We already have an excessive amount of cut-through traffic. You can see where Woodland Way is between Marshall Road and Cambridge Extension (pointing to the overhead). Even before this issue came up, I expressed concerns to the Police Department about the amount of speeders that we already have coming through there. It's a narrow street without sidewalks. If you want to walk with your kids or whatever, you would already have to be careful, but I wouldn't feel real good about it with any traffic added to what we already have.

It's already a chore at times when exiting onto Cambridge Extension, because of the amount of traffic coming from the Five Points area. There's a sharp curve in the road where our street goes out, almost in front of this property. Most of the time, you're already in the road before you even realize that a car is coming, and you can't get up to speed in time before they're right on your bumper. I'm just really concerned about the traffic problems that this has created. I understand that there may be a need for this kind of housing in Greenwood, but I just don't think we should do it at the expense of destroying the quality of life in the existing neighborhood. Thank you."

MAYOR
NICHOLSON

"Okay. Is there anyone else? Mr. Wakefield, I think I saw your hand."

JAMES
WAKEFIELD

"Your honor and members of the Council, I'm here on behalf of my brother."

MAYOR
NICHOLSON

"Just for the record Mr. Wakefield, your name and address."

JAMES
WAKEFIELD

"I'm sorry. James A. Wakefield, 1314 Henderson Avenue, Greenwood, South Carolina. I'm here in the interest of my brother who lives in San Pedro, California, and owns 52 acres of the R2 property there. Several years ago, when he purchased this property, it was designated as a wildlife reserve by the Forestry Commission. There are any number of wild game on that property, and someone else will

speaking to the issues of the game and what is taking place. I would like to, on his behalf, present to you what is happening in that area.

Mr. then read a statement on behalf of his brother, David Wakefield.

- attach -

MAYOR
NICHOLSON

"Is there anyone else to speak in opposition?"

JACK COLLINS

"I'm Jack Collins, at 316 Emerald Farm Road. I wish to submit to the City Council a total of 173 signatures of people in opposition to the rezoning. With the exception of Mr. Wakefield's signature, who just spoke and is obviously opposed to it, every contiguous owner is included to this list."

Mr. Collins distributed copies of the petition to City Council.

JOHN MCGEE

Mr. Mayor and Council, my name is John McGee. I own property at 114 Woodland Way, which is the street directly in front of this development. A couple of weeks ago, I mailed a letter, that I had the opportunity to present at the Planning Board meeting voicing my opposition, to the Mayor and Council. I hope all of you had an opportunity to read that. I will not read that letter in full, but I would like to state my reasons for the opposition to this zoning and voice a couple of extra concerns that were raised.

First of all, I have no problem with the property being in the City Limits. I think the City increasing its boundaries is very good. I do have a problem with the changes that have been made on this particular problem over the past 20 years. Every time a new developer has come before the Planning Board and the Council to present a program, the density, housing, or the type of development that goes there has been changed. As a result, you can see from

when the development originally started with the first three or four houses that were built, to the last three or four house that were built. They were changed from where the homes were required to have carports, porches, and be partially bricked to those that do not have carports attached to the side. So many changes keep going on with this property that I have a concern over the lacks in the Planning Board and City Council.

Now, a part of this property used to be in the County, which enforced the original covenants that were presented with the land. As a result, we got a proposal now to build homes that are of a high density, which does not suit with the surrounding neighborhoods. All of you know that Woodfields is zoned as an R2 neighborhood. With its lot and home sizes, it really qualifies for an R1 development inside the City of Greenwood.

With that in mind, I'd like to read you the rest of my reasons for the opposition. First of all, more homes per acre will directly impact the surrounding environment and the esthetics of the neighborhood. Now, Frank has already addressed the fact that the traffic coming through Woodland Way has expediently increased over the years, based on the growth in the County. Woodland Way is used as a 'cut-through' that has a very dangerous curve. I've actually seen a wreck on that curve from someone who was speeding and lost control. It does pose an issue for the residents who live there. Those who are trying to raise children want to enjoy walking up and down the street with their families.

I'm also opposed to this simply because Woodfields, as I said, should be an R1 neighborhood instead of R2. I think I heard Dwight make the statement that he was looking to make a change from R3 to an R4 because of some setback requirements. I don't see how allowing the R3 and R4 in this place suits with how the rest of the neighborhoods in the surrounding areas are developed. So, I'd like for all of you to read my letter that I've sent to you. I'm sure you had an opportunity to take those things under consideration today. Thank you."

MIKE REID

“My name is Mike Reid, and I live at 405 Emerald Farm Road. I want to start off by thanking the City Council and the Mayor for their attention to this rezoning request. I would like to ask those that are against this rezoning change to stand so that you can see the support that’s against it. Could those people stand? Thank you.

I want to first point out that this change to R3 from the original R2, before the zoning change, took a lot of consideration during the City-wide zoning change. They looked at the surrounding homes and felt it was closer to that. True, if you had to place it between the current R3 and R4, R2 in the old zoning would fall in between, with the major change being in the setback requirement. That is 10 feet to the property line (pointing). He has made a lot of these lots 70 feet wide. If you take 10 feet on either side, it don’t leave you much. Those houses are squatty and close together, if you compare that to what else is there. The other lots in Linwood Subdivision are 100 feet wide. That’s the standard. That’s what it’s like there when you allow someone to come in with less restrictions than he had when he bought this property. When he bought it as R2 in the old City zoning, it still had those 10 foot setbacks. If you give him R4, it’s gonna reduce that. It’s gonna lower the quality of the lots, as far as the other people in the neighborhood, and allow it to be substandard, as far as we’re concerned. It’s not gonna be conducive to what else is there.

If you look around it, all the other homes on Emerald Farm Road, other than Linwood, are at least an acre. Many of them have multiple acres. I have 30 acres, and many of my neighbors have more than that. The two houses across the street have an acre each. There isn’t anyone less than that. If you go across to Woodland Way, one person commented that those lots are more like what is being proposed to Linwood. No, they’re 130 feet on average in front. In fact 3/4 of the ones that are in Woodland Way are an acre lot, or more. I got a handout I’ll give you at the end so that you can look at this. I looked it up on GIS to make

sure I had my facts right, and this is not conforming to what is currently in the community.

Also, I want to point out that the Joint Planning Commission, upon listening to the concerns of the neighbors, unanimously opposed this zoning change. Those citizens listened to us, discussed it, and 100% voted against offering this change. I want you to respect their input because they did consider it. In fact, we had to come twice because they tabled it the first time. The second time, they voted unanimously against this change.

Now, if you look at that 10 foot setback, again this is the way it's been on the sides (pointing). If you look at what was approved in this new plan he has for a subdivision, it has a line that shows a 40 foot setback from the front. Also, if you look at the Linwood Covenants, it also says 40 foot setbacks to the front. I'm opposed to any change of that. I want him to respect those covenants and zoning with the setbacks that he's currently got. He's already been approved for this subdivision. We're not here to fight that, though I wish I could. There's no point in doing something you can't do, but you allowed major changes to a subdivision without input from the community.

If you look at the map (pointing), you'll see that little red streak down the middle going out to Cambridge. He has closed that out so that 3/4 of the lots he's proposing has no other access than to go out onto Emerald Farm Road which is my road. It's a substandard road that is narrow, without lines, and emergency vehicles could potentially have a problem going in and out of there.

I do not think he needs any other permission to build within the rights of what he got when he had his approval back in 2002, or even when it was zoned R2. I am not in favor of letting this man continue any further degradation of our community.

Now, this closer housing and increased density is not in the community, or the City's, best interest. Additionally this is the Heritage Corridor; something

that we should be protecting. Emerald Farms is down Emerald Farm Road. It is one of the major sites in Greenwood that we're looking for tourists to come and visit. What do you want them to see when they come to this town, trailer parks and houses next to each other?

We are against this as a community, and with the Joint Planning Commission. There's a lot of things I wish could be a little different, like having input when major changes are made to a subdivision. There's no place, from that I understand, for the community to actually have any input when that comes before your Planning Commission.

Also, on the piece of land that he's asking to remove, there are 20 foot high banks, and a 50 feet deep, approximately 300 feet long, commercial type industrial dump. This is positioned in the old creek bed that runs directly into the pond, that my neighbor and I jointly own, in my front yard. We have been getting tremendous runoff, and you can see that it's not designed for something you'd want in the City. It has a hole in a spot where there is gravel and you can see an 18 wheeler back up to a log. I've asked members to see it, and some of you have. This is something that tells me of what he would do with the land in my community, if you give him any more chances to do more than what was already approved.

I'm also opposed to what I just learned about someone having a subdivision like this and not pay taxes on their lots. He can just sit on it and pay for undeveloped land. He's not paying the taxes that I pay. I have a small house in the City that is less than \$40,000, and my taxes are over \$900 a year. If people who have approved subdivisions when he bought it, he paid probably based on the fact that he already had permission to put all these houses in, but he doesn't have to be taxed at that rate. I wish there was something you can do about that. I wish there was something you can do about this landfill type ravine he's put on this property.

I don't know what you can do in the future. All I know

is, the matter before you is whether to go from R3 to R4, and I stand very much opposed to it. It's not what rights he had before, and it's not what rights I ask that you give this man at this time. Thank you very much for your attention."

MAYOR
NICHOLSON

"Is there anyone else to speak in opposition?"

DWIGHT
FUNDERBURK

"I'd like to clarify a couple of points. I totally understand the concerns. I think it's very important to know that there's an approved subdivision that we intend to meet a big need of quality housing in this town. The things we've done there are heading in that direction. Mr. Wakefield talked about the observations of that retention pond, and he's exactly right. That means it's working. It was designed to hold that settlement, and it's holding it. It's not designed to hold water, and he's exactly right. So it's working.

We intend to do a good job with landscaping and to have a nice City community that's well lit, well designed, quality housing. The only issue here is, are we going to build 50 houses in this town, or 50 houses on substandard lots? It's not going to change the lot sizes. The old standard was 70 feet wide, and our minimum is 70 feet wide. Most of them are bigger than that. We exceeded the standards, but are just trying to get the paperwork to match the development. That is all we're trying to do."

MAYOR
NICHOLSON

"Thank you."

MIKE REID

"Can I speak one more time, Mayor? He already has approval for a subdivision. When we talked about the lots, there are 10 or more that are 70 feet or less. We're simply asking you to let him build, and let's watch what quality houses he puts there, but do not give him any more restrictions. I would love for him to come back and talk about that ravine that's cut behind this property. It would be a danger to anybody that builds a home back there, but he already has his approval.

He's asking for more than he's ever had with this R4, and I, along with every other citizen there, am opposed to it. The conformity issue is, it's less than what is there. There's nothing around it that resembles a 70 foot lot. Also, the will of the community is 100% against it being there. If he wants to put his own home there, that would be wonderful. We'll welcome him as a neighbor, but not as R4. Let him build with what he has there, under the restrictions that protect us. Only those zoning restrictions can protect us from gentlemen like this, and what they may do after they get more ability to do other things. Thanks again."

MAYOR
NICHOLSON

"Thank you. We will close the public hearing now dealing with the rezoning of the property on East Cambridge and Emerald Farm Road, and the public hearing part of our meeting. Now, we will move into the business portion of our meeting."

There being no further business, the public hearing was adjourned at 6:28 p.m.

Floyd Nicholson, Mayor

Attest:

City Clerk and Treasurer