

**Board of Adjustment and Appeals  
Pinellas County  
April 1, 2026 Meeting Minutes**

The Board of Adjustment and Appeals (BAA) met in regular session at 9:02 AM on this date in the County Commission Assembly Room at the Pinellas County Courthouse, 315 Court Street, Clearwater, Florida.

**Present**

Alan C. Bomstein, Chair  
Jason Holloway, Vice-Chair  
Jose Bello  
Andrew Hunsicker  
Alonda Vaughan  
Robert Warner  
Deborah J. White

**Others Present**

Michael Schoderbock, Division Manager, Zoning and Project Management  
Maria White, Assistant County Attorney  
Eric Jewett, Code Enforcement Supervisor  
Ashley Pabilonia, Board Reporter, Deputy Clerk  
Other interested individuals

*All documents received by the Clerk have been filed and made a part of the record.*

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Bomstein called the meeting to order at 9:02 AM and provided an overview of the hearing process; whereupon, he requested that the members disclose if they have visited the subject property as each public hearing begins.

**QUASI-JUDICIAL STATEMENT**

Attorney White noted that the following hearings are quasi-judicial; and that only competent, substantial, fact-based testimony or evidence may be considered in the decisions by the Board; whereupon, she provided information regarding the types of evidence that are considered as such.

## **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

Due notice having been given to interested persons pursuant to Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance No. 90-1, public hearings were held for the following applications. All persons planning to give testimony were duly sworn by a Deputy Clerk.

### Case No. APL-26-01

APPLICATION OF FLORIDA DREAM CENTER, INC., THROUGH JOHN LANDON AND KATIE COLE, REPRESENTATIVES, FOR AN APPEAL

and

### Case No. APL-26-02

APPLICATION OF FLORIDA DREAM CENTER, INC., THROUGH JOHN LANDON AND KATIE COLE, REPRESENTATIVES, FOR AN APPEAL

Mr. Schoderbock referred to the above cases and reported that the applicant submitted a letter which indicated their intent to withdraw the applications; and that the cases will not be heard today.

No one appeared upon the Chair's call for proponents or opponents; whereupon, in response to a comment by Chair Bomstein, Mr. Schoderbock confirmed that no action by the Board is required for either case.

### Case No. TY2-26-01

APPLICATION OF TARPON COMMUNITY CHURCH, INC., THROUGH BRIAN AUNGST, JR., REPRESENTATIVE, FOR A TYPE 2 USE

A public hearing was held on the above application for a modification to a previously approved Type 2 Use to allow the addition of a 2,820-square-foot modular building to an existing place of worship in an RPD-W zone, for the property located at 475 East Lake Road in East Lake Tarpon. One letter in support of the application has been received.

Mr. Schoderbock introduced the case and presented the following staff recommendation:

Recommend Conditional Approval. Staff have no objection to the conditional approval of this request as it appears to meet the criteria for granting Type 2 Uses found in Section 138-241 of the Pinellas County Land Development Code.

The subject property is approximately 36.13 acres and is located on East Lake Road. The site is currently developed with a place of worship, Lakeview Church, which has been in operation since 1997.

Additionally, the subject property is tied to an existing master-planned development community known as Crescent Oaks. Lakeview Church would like to build a new one-story, 2,820-square-foot modular facility dedicated to its children's ministry. This ministry takes place during Sunday worship services at 9:30am and 11am, currently serving an average of 15-20 children per service, with a total weekly attendance of about 40 children. A Type 2 Use approval is required for a major modification of a place of worship on a residentially zoned property. The applicant has stated that this modular building will not be utilized as a daycare, preschool, private school, or administrative office. As a result, no additional parking is necessary for this expansion and would have minimal impact on vehicular traffic. Separately, the requested modification does not conflict with the existing development master plan. Approval should be subject to the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall obtain all required permits and pay all applicable fees.
2. Appropriate site plan review.
3. Operating hours and use of the modular building shall be limited to those specified in the applicant's narrative.

In response to Chair Bomstein's call for the applicant, Brian Aungst, Jr., Clearwater, appeared, related that he is present on behalf of the applicant, and provided background information regarding the request.

No one appeared in response to the Chair's call for opponents; whereupon, Ms. White made a motion for the staff recommendation of conditional approval in accordance with the findings of fact as outlined in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bello and carried unanimously.

Case No. VAR-26-01

APPLICATION OF RICKY BRUMETT AND KELSEY BRUMETT FOR A VARIANCE

A public hearing was held on the above application for a variance to allow for the construction of a 1,000-square-foot detached accessory dwelling unit where 750 square

feet is the maximum size allowed within the Coastal Storm Area or flood hazard area, for the property located at 3820 McKay Creek Drive in unincorporated Largo. One letter in support of the application has been received.

Mr. Schoderbock introduced the case and presented the following staff recommendation:

Recommend Denial. The subject property consists of two platted lots, lots 43 and 44 of the Harbor Hills 1st Addition Subdivision and is developed with a detached single-family home located entirely on lot 44. The property is in the Coastal Storm Area (CSA), the McKay Creek floodplain, and hurricane evacuation zone A. The applicant plans to construct a new 1,000-square-foot detached accessory dwelling unit on lot 43, adjacent to the current residence.

In residential districts, accessory apartments, garage apartments, and guest houses may be permitted as accessory uses to any single-family detached home. An accessory dwelling unit must have an entrance that is separate from the primary unit, and it must contain sleeping quarters, a bathroom, and a full kitchen with a sink, cooking unit, and refrigerator. It is recognized that accessory dwelling units are commonly used to mitigate the shortage of affordable housing by providing small dwelling units that are ancillary to the principal residence.

The Land Development Code states that an accessory dwelling unit shall not exceed 750 square feet in size if the property is within the CSA or flood hazard area established in Land Development Code Section 158-23. This proposed structure exceeds the size limit by 250 square feet.

Staff recommends denial of this request as it does not meet the Criteria for Granting Variances found in Section 138-231 of the Pinellas County Land Development Code (LDC).

During the Development Review Committee meeting discussion, the following staff concerns were raised: residential development in the CSA and floodplain, the lots could be split and a new home built upon the vacant lot, and no site-related hardship presented.

In response to queries by Chair Bomstein and Ms. White, Mr. Schoderbock confirmed that the Code's limitation of accessory dwelling units (ADUs) to 750 square feet within the CSA or a flood hazard area is intended to reduce potential loss during a flood hazard. He also clarified that, if the subject property's lots were split, a new house could be built and

would need to meet zoning regulations, setbacks, height restrictions, and floodplain and elevation requirements; that the previously stated square footage limitation applies solely to ADUs, not to primary dwelling units; and that a 1,000-square-foot ADU could be constructed if the subject property was not located in a CSA or floodplain.

Upon the Chair's call for the applicant, Kelsey Brumett and Ricky Brumett, Largo, appeared; whereupon, Ms. Brumett provided background information regarding the request, including that the intent of the proposed ADU is to create a safe, functional living space for elderly family members; that the limitation of 750 square feet for an ADU presents challenges when designing a living space that accommodates accessibility needs; that a property located on the same street as the subject property received approval in 2024 to construct an ADU which exceeds 750 square feet and is closer in proximity to a body of water than the applicant is proposing; and that the location chosen for the proposed ADU considers the spatial constraints of two grand oak trees and their critical root zones, designations in multiple flood zones, and the natural slope of the subject property.

In response to a query by Chair Bomstein, Mr. Schoderbock related that while similar variance requests for additional space above the 750 square footage maximum have previously been received, he is not aware of any requests made for properties in the vicinity of the subject property; whereupon, responding to comments and queries by Ms. White, Ms. Brumett explained that while the majority of the subject property is in Flood Zone X, the property is still considered as located within the CSA due to a small portion of the property being classified as Flood Zone AE; and that the intent is to build the ADU on the farthest point from the waterway.

Responding to comments and queries by Mr. Hunsicker, Mr. Schoderbock provided information regarding flood zone classifications, the County's 100-year vulnerability assessment floodplain, and associated elevation requirements; whereupon, discussion ensued regarding the potential impacts of splitting the subject property into two lots and constructing a separate single-family home. During discussion, Ms. Brumett responded to comments and queries by the members and discussed challenges associated with accommodating construction of the home, including preservation of the grand oak trees, driveway reconfiguration requirements, and considerations related to neighborhood character and the applicants' intended use of the property.

In response to a query by Chair Bomstein, Ms. Brumett indicated that splitting the subject property to build an additional single-family home would require a reconfigured driveway and would impact the grand oak trees; whereupon, Mr. Hunsicker made a motion to approve the request upon the basis that, if the lot was separated, it could be developed into a larger residence; that the request is in consideration of the preservation of the grand

oak trees; and that while the property line is adjacent to McKay Creek, the proposed structure is in Flood Zone X and would be built outside of the Base Flood Elevation.

Attorney White advised that the members relate their motion to approve or deny this item to the Criteria for Granting Variances, as listed in the staff report; whereupon, Mr. Hunsicker restated his motion to approve on the basis that the property consists of two platted lots; that the proposed ADU requires a larger space to accommodate accessibility; and that the grand oak trees are not impacted.

Mr. Holloway then made a motion to amend that the grand oak trees qualify under Subsection B of the Criteria for Granting Variances as an unnecessary hardship. Responding to a query by Attorney White, he confirmed that his motion is in contravention of the staff report; whereupon, the motion was seconded by Mr. Warner.

At the request of Mr. Schoderbock, and in response to a query by Chair Bomstein, Mr. Hunsicker confirmed that he wishes to amend his motion to include payment of permits and fees, compliance with standards in LDC Section 138-3210 C pertaining to ADUs, and the preservation of the grand oak trees; whereupon, Mr. Warner also confirmed that he is still seconding the motion. Upon the Chair's call for the vote, the motion carried unanimously.

#### Case No. VAR-26-02

#### APPLICATION OF JOHANNE CHAMPAGNE, THROUGH JENNIFER WHITAKER, REPRESENTATIVE, FOR TWO VARIANCES

A public hearing was held on the above application for the following variances requested for the R-4 zoned property located at 1823 Sylvan Drive in unincorporated Clearwater:

1. A variance to allow for the construction of a 1,242-square-foot detached two-story garage addition having a 4-foot front setback from the western property line where 20 feet is required and a 4-foot side setback from the northern property line where 6 feet is required.
2. A variance to allow for the construction of a detached two-story garage addition approximately 1,242 square feet in area on a parcel, which is 426 square feet larger than the existing 816-square-foot primary residential structure.

One letter in opposition of the application has been received.

Mr. Schoderbock introduced the case and presented the following staff recommendation:

Recommend Conditional Approval. Staff has no objection to the conditional approval of this request as it appears to meet the Criteria for Granting Variances found in Section 138-231 of the Pinellas County Land Development Code.

The subject property is approximately 0.18 acres, developed with an 816-square-foot single-family home that was constructed in 1956. The site is also developed with an inground pool, pool screen enclosure, and detached shed. The applicant would like to construct a new two-storage detached garage, approximately 1,242 square feet in area. The detached garage is intended to provide vehicle storage on the first floor, with a hobby room, storage space, and bathroom on the second floor. A variance is being requested as the proposed 1,242-square-foot garage addition would exceed the size of the existing 816-square-foot primary residence. Per Sec. 138-3510 (2) of the Land Development Code, residential accessory structures must be subordinate in area, extent, and purpose to the primary residential structure and use served. The proposed detached garage would be 426 square feet larger than the existing 816-square-foot primary residence. The applicant is also requesting approval to reduce the front setback from the western property line to 4 feet, where a 20-foot setback is required in the R-4 zone, and to reduce the side setback from the northern property line to 4 feet, where a 6-foot setback is required. These variance requests are driven by certain site constraints: the existing single-family home is set back significantly from the front property line and the presence of a septic tank and drain field at the rear of the lot limits options for locating a garage that would comply with all setback requirements. Additionally, mature vegetation that the applicant wishes to preserve further restricts placement of the proposed detached garage to a specific area on the property.

The applicant has provided conceptual architectural elevations of the proposed side-loaded detached garage, which is designed to complement the front elevation of the existing single-family home and maintain the architectural aesthetic of the primary home's front façade. The proposed design of the detached garage appears to meet the intent of the residential accessory structures and uses section concerning architectural compatibility with the primary structure as required within the Land Development Code. The scale and size of the detached garage is appropriately sized to meet the applicant's daily needs and is not intended to serve as an additional living quarters. Additionally, the current driveway

will be removed, and a new driveway will be built, designed to fit a side-loaded garage to avoid any possible queuing in the public right-of-way. Approval should be subject to the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall obtain all required permits and pay all applicable fees.
2. The proposed detached garage shall be a side-loaded entry.
3. The applicant shall obtain a tree permit and submit a plan that demonstrates the preservation of existing trees and outlines mitigation measures for any proposed tree removal to address potential impacts on the subject property's existing trees.
4. The proposed design of the detached garage shall be architecturally compatible with the primary structure as required within Sec. 138-3510 (6) of the Land Development Code.
5. All other setback requirements shall be met.
6. The proposed detached garage shall not be used as living space.
7. The proposed detached garage shall not be used for commercial use.
8. The applicant shall obtain a right-of-way utilization permit for the removal of the existing driveway and the construction of the new driveway.

Referring to a document included in the agenda packet, Mr. Schoderbock noted that, following completion of the staff report, additional information was received, including an arborist report which recommended removal of a tree that the applicant had proposed to preserve; and that several proposed conditions of approval are related to preservation and siting of the tree.

Upon Chair Bomstein's call for the applicant, Jennifer Whitaker, Safety Harbor, appeared and indicated that she is the representative for the property owners. Johanne Champagne and Pierre Marciszewski, Clearwater, also appeared and introduced themselves; whereupon, in response to comments and queries by Chair Bomstein, Mr. Marciszewski, with input from Ms. Champagne, confirmed that removal of the tree on the subject property is not anticipated. He also explained that the arborist was retained to address concerns regarding the tree's location, size, and likelihood of survival if a garage is constructed in the selected location.

Chair Bomstein disclosed that he visited the site and described various features of the subject property and surrounding neighborhood; whereupon, Ms. Whitaker provided an overview of the parking challenges and spatial constraints of the lot due to the narrow width of Sylvan Road and positioning of water ditches on both sides of the roadway. She also indicated that the applicant intends to match the design of the proposed garage with the existing home; and that the applicant is willing to follow any recommendations regarding the tree, including its potential removal to accommodate siting the garage farther back on the lot.

In response to queries and comments by Mr. Holloway and Chair Bomstein, Mr. Schoderbock briefly discussed limitations on the placement of the proposed garage due to efforts to preserve existing mature vegetation and the tree, as well as the prevalence of setback variances throughout the neighborhood that likely predate zoning code and setback requirements.

No one appeared upon Chair Bomstein's call for objectors; whereupon, Ms. White made a motion for staff's recommendation of conditional approval in accordance with the finding of facts as outlined in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Mr. Holloway. In response to a query by Chair Bomstein, Ms. White confirmed that her motion does not require any change to the tree or its removal; and that the decision to do so is left to the applicant.

Responding to a query by Mr. Hunsicker, Mr. Schoderbock explained that, if the applicant proceeds with removal of the tree, the arborist report demonstrating the need for removal would satisfy requirements pertaining to the tree permit, preservation plan, and mitigation measures for proposed tree removal; whereupon, following the Chair's call for the vote, the motion carried unanimously.

#### Case No. VAR-26-03

#### APPLICATION OF AFRAM MALKI AND LINA MALKI, THROUGH DREW DONEGAN, REPRESENTATIVE, FOR A VARIANCE

A public hearing was held on the above application for a variance to allow for the construction of an eight-foot-tall masonry wall with columns having a ten-foot front setback where 25 feet is required, for the property located at 3465 Keystone Road in East Lake Tarpon. No correspondence relative to the application has been received.

Mr. Schoderbock introduced the case, which includes the following staff recommendation:

Recommend Conditional Approval. The Development Review Committee staff has no objection to the conditional approval of this request as it

appears to meet the Criteria for Granting Variances found in Section 138-231 of the Pinellas County Land Development Code (LDC).

The subject property is approximately 7.58 acres zoned Residential Agriculture-Wellhead Protection Overlay (R-A-W), developed with a single-family home, residential accessory structures, and an associated driveway. The property has direct frontage along Keystone Road which is considered a County arterial road that receives over 17,000 average annual daily trips. Additionally, Keystone Road is a designated Scenic Noncommercial Corridor (SNCC) – this section of roadway is further subtyped as Rural/Open. The applicant would like to build an 8-foot-tall masonry wall, featuring 12-inch-wide concrete columns, along the entire frontage of the residential lot, spanning approximately 401 linear feet. Per the Land Development Code, opaque decorative walls in residential areas within the front setback are limited to a maximum height of four feet. In the current R-A-W zoning district, the minimum front setback requirement is 25 feet. The nearest section of the proposed wall would be situated 10 feet from the front property line. According to the applicant, placing the 8-foot-tall masonry wall near the roadway is intended to address challenges presented by a heavily trafficked roadway, enhance security, and preserve a clean, cohesive design, all while ensuring there is no adverse impact on neighboring properties.

Over the past decade multiple other walls and height variances have been granted on other similar situated parcels within the general area. It is staff's opinion that the construction of the 8-foot-high masonry wall is consistent with the rural development pattern and character of the residential properties located along the Keystone roadway corridor. Approval should be subject to the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall obtain all required permits and pay all applicable fees.
2. The wall shall not encroach into any wetland areas on the property.
3. The proposed wall and columns shall maintain a "finished appearance" per Code Section 138-3701 (a).
4. The applicant shall meet SNCC landscape buffering standards per Code Section 138-3660 requiring trees and hedge along the outside of the wall.

5. The construction of the wall shall meet all floodplain related requirements per Code Section 158-332.
6. All line-of-sight distance requirements shall be met.

Referring to a survey included in the agenda packet, Mr. Schoderbock pointed out a wetland area east of the subject property and noted that building the masonry wall to the 25-foot setback would impact the wetland; and that the proposed variance would move the wall forward and outside of that area.

Upon Chair Bomstein's call for the applicant, Drew Donegan, St. Petersburg, appeared, indicated that he is the applicant's representative, and provided background information regarding the request; whereupon, he indicated that the applicant purchased the subject property with the intent to build a new home; and that variances have been approved for higher walls than what the applicant is requesting for other properties along Keystone Road.

No one appeared in response to the Chair's call for opponents; whereupon, in response to a query by Chair Bomstein, Mr. Schoderbock confirmed that a number of variances related to the construction of walls have been approved for properties in the neighborhood in which the subject property resides, as well as for other nearby subdivisions. Responding to additional comments and queries by the Chair, Mr. Donegan confirmed that the proposed masonry wall will feature a painted, stucco finish; and that the applicant will maintain both sides of the wall, including any required landscaping.

Mr. Holloway made a motion based on staff's recommendation for conditional approval, which was seconded by Ms. White; whereupon, responding to a query by Chair Bomstein, Mr. Holloway confirmed that his motion is in accordance with the findings of fact outlined by staff. Upon the Chair's call for the vote, the motion carried unanimously.

#### Case No. VAR-26-04

#### APPLICATION OF TONY TANG, TRE. AND QUAN THIEU VUU, LIV. TRUST, FOR FOUR VARIANCES

A public hearing was held on the above application for the following variances requested for the R-3 zoned property located at 844 Brookwood Drive South in unincorporated St. Petersburg:

1. A variance to allow for the construction of a new single-family home having a 12-foot-6-inch front setback to the western property line along the Brookwood Drive South right-of-way, where 20 feet is required and a 10-foot front setback to the

eastern property line along the Brookwood Court South right-of-way, where 20 feet is required.

2. A variance to allow for the construction of a front porch as part of the proposed new single-family home having a 6-foot-3-inch front setback to the western property line along the Brookwood Drive South right-of-way, where 10 feet is required.
3. A variance to allow for the construction of an in-ground pool having a 14-foot-8-inch front setback from water's edge to the western property line along the Brookwood Drive South right-of-way, where 20 feet is required, and an 11-foot front setback from water's edge to the eastern property line along the Brookwood Court South right-of-way, where 20 feet is required.
4. A variance to allow for the construction of a detached two-story accessory dwelling unit approximately 576 square feet in area having a 10-foot-4-inch front setback to the western property line along the Brookwood Drive South right-of-way, where 20 feet is required and a 10-foot front setback to the eastern property line along the Brookwood Court South right-of-way, where 20 feet is required.

One letter in opposition of the application has been received.

Mr. Schoderbock introduced the case and presented the following staff recommendation:

Recommend conditional approval for the construction of the single-family home and front porch. Recommend denial of the pool and accessory dwelling unit. The subject property is 0.11-acre triangular platted lot of record (Brookwood Subdivision Lot 97) with two frontages along Brookwood Drive South and Brookwood Court South. The site is currently improved with a single-family home built in 1952, along with a carport and an above-ground pool. The applicant is proposing to demolish the existing single-family home and accessory structures to construct a new two-story residence of approximately 1,600 square feet in area, an inground pool, and a 576-square-foot two-story accessory dwelling unit. A pool screen enclosure is not included in the proposed development plan.

Sec. 138-3505 (a)(3) of the Land Development Code states that when a property has frontage opposite the primary frontage, a front setback requirement also applies to that opposite frontage. Therefore, a front setback is applied to both the Brookwood Drive South and Brookwood Court South frontage – requiring a 20-foot front setback for future development on this property. Additionally, the required side setback on the southern portion

of the property is 6 feet, and the proposed development plan complies with that requirement. There is no rear setback requirement for this property. As a result of these setback requirements, the applicant is seeking approval to construct the new single-family home and front porch closer to the western and eastern property lines than normally allowed by Code. The accessory dwelling unit and inground pool are also proposed to be positioned closer to the eastern and western property lines as well.

Staff has no objection to the conditional approval of the request to construct the single-family home and front porch, as it appears to satisfy the Criteria for Granting Variances found in Section 138-231 of the Pinellas County Land Development Code. However, staff cannot support the addition of the inground pool and accessory dwelling unit request as it does not meet the criteria for the granting of a variance found in Section 138-231 of the Pinellas County Land Development Code. The placement of the accessory dwelling unit and inground pool appears to over maximize utilization of the lot. Although the lot configuration presents certain design challenges, these accessory improvements can be reconfigured to meet the required minimum building setbacks. The Land Development Code's setback requirements are intended to ensure that residential accessory structures meet minimum criteria and all other applicable standards of the underlying zoning district. Approval of the construction of the single-family home and front porch should be subject to the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall obtain all required permits and pay all applicable fees.
2. The front porch shall remain unenclosed.

At Mr. Schoderbock's request, Mr. Jewett indicated that the subject property is being advertised and used as a short-term rental; and that the applicant does not have a Certificate of Use for operating a short-term rental, as required by Section 22-319 of the Pinellas County Code of Ordinances; whereupon, responding to a query by Chair Bomstein, Mr. Schoderbock clarified that a homeowner must live in the on-site primary residence or the associated ADU in order to utilize either structure as a short-term rental.

Upon Chair Bomstein's call for the applicant, Tony Tang, St. Petersburg, appeared, provided background information regarding the request, and confirmed that he is currently renting out the existing home; whereupon, Mr. Holloway advised Mr. Tang that it is a criminal offense to hold a homestead exemption for a property on which the owner does

not reside. He also suggested that the exemption be removed and reapplied for once residence is established.

No one responded to the Chair's call for objectors; whereupon, in response to a query by Mr. Bello related to the offense, Attorney White related that she can only provide guidance regarding procedures under the BAA's purview; and that it is the members' decision whether to grant the variance.

Chair Bomstein suggested that a condition for approval could be added to require the applicant to obtain the appropriate permit to operate a rental property and/or relinquish the homestead exemption; whereupon, brief discussion ensued regarding physical constraints of the subject property and staff's recommendations related to the requested variances.

Mr. Bello made a motion for conditional approval of the construction of a single-family home and front porch and denial of the construction of a pool and ADU, with the condition that the applicant correct the record regarding the legal matter at hand. The motion was seconded by Ms. White; whereupon, Chair Bomstein restated the motion, indicating that it is for conditional approval of staff's recommendation based on the findings of fact outlined in the staff report; and that the motion adds a condition which requires that the applicant must obtain a permit for the property to be used as a rental and correct the property's homestead exemption status. Upon the Chair's call for the vote, the motion carried unanimously.

#### **MINUTES OF THE MARCH 4, 2026 MEETING**

Mr. Hunsicker made a motion to approve the March meeting minutes, which was seconded by Mr. Bello and carried unanimously.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Bomstein noted that the next BAA meeting is scheduled for May 4; whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 10:00 AM.