

**BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS MEETING**  
**May 17, 2012**

<u>Members Present</u>	<u>Members Absent</u>	<u>Staff</u>
Mr. Dyer	Mr. Snipes	Alan Spencer
Mr. Campbell	Mr. Nicholas	Ken Gillie
Mrs. Rich		Renee Blair
Mr. Hiltzheimer		Emily Scolpini
Mrs. Evans		

Chairman Mr. Gus Dyer called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

**I. ITEMS FOR PUBLIC HEARING**

- 1. Variance Application Number PLVAR20120000158, filed by BKH Properties, LLC, requesting variances from Article 3M, Section E. 2b. and Article 8, Section C, Item 1(a), of Chapter 41 of the Code of Danville, Virginia, 1986, as amended (City of Danville Zoning Ordinance) at 1307 South Boston Road, otherwise known as Grid 3718, Block 006, Parcel 000001 of the City of Danville, Virginia Zoning Map. The applicant is requesting variances to allow a 5' side yard setback where 20' is required, to allow 12' side yard setback where 30' is required and to allow a 16' two-way drive aisle where 24' is required.*

Twenty-six (26) notices were mailed to surrounding property owners. One (1) respondent was unopposed; three (3) respondents were opposed.

Open the Public Hearing.

Present on behalf of the request was Mr. William Thomas Harville, owner and Mr. Bryant Gammon, High Mark Engineering. Mr. Gammon stated I am here to represent the applicant. I have a few packages to pass out if it is alright with everyone. First of all let me start off by saying that there are several requests in here. One is to allow a 5' side yard setback where 20' is required. We can amend that because if you look at the layout that refers to the side adjacent to the Advance Auto Parts store. We are not putting the building that close, but we are putting the trash facilities that close. We can actually revise that to say that only our trash facilities will go in there if that pleases the Board. The second thing is requesting a 12' side yard setback where 30' is required. I think we have spoken before that actually at the time I requested 12', I guess somehow it didn't get translated in the last revision of this that was sent out. I thought it was changed to 18'. In reality I can live with 20'. In the package that I handed out to you, what I have done is copied the exact verbiage that is in the variance request except I have modified what I am really requesting today, which is less than the variance as presented here. It is a better case scenario basically.

Mr. Dyer stated when you say less you mean more than, well less of a variance.

Mr. Gammon stated less of a variance, more of a setback. The short story is that it is going to be 5' along the side against the Advanced Auto Parts store. It will be a 20' setback against the residential side, which 30' is required; but we are doing 20' here instead of the 12' as written. The 16' two-way drive aisle, we are keeping that the same. In reality it is about 19'. I have actually developed the site plans completely but it just depends upon what staff does in terms of their measuring. If you remember what I presented before in terms of all of these particular issues, the reason that a 24' drive aisle is required is because of two-way traffic and turning movement. I presented before a layout showing that a regular passenger vehicle can make this maneuver into these parking spaces

without interfering with any of the others. What I am going to do is make the parking spaces for those three particular in the back wider. It is only supposed to be 9' wide as a minimum. It can be wider. I am making them 10' wide to be able to facilitate that turning movement. We have run auto turn analysis on this with passenger vehicles. It works fine and so, that is a new point. It is not truly a two-way area because you don't have any parking in the rear of the facility with this layout. It is really just a space for a car to pull in and back up. It is certainly functional from an engineering point of view. I know most of you were here last time. I am not going to go through all of the particular specific engineering issues. What I am really going to point on today, on the second page that I handed out to everybody, and I know everyone here is obviously familiar with the four points that we have to meet for you guys to be able to grant us a variance. I am just going to go through those one by one.

Mr. Gammon read the first bullet point under the Criteria Analysis in which he provided.

Mr. Gammon stated really what I want to paint a picture of today is not only would it produce an undo hardship on the property owner, but it would also produce an undo hardship on the adjacent property owner. In summary it really comes down to the layout that I presented if you look at it we have the rear of the building adjacent to the residential area. The rear of the building does not have any lights in the back. It does not have any access doors on the back. There are no pedestrians that will be walking through there. Basically it is the back of a building itself. All of the parking is up on the other side. If you look at what staff has presented and this was in the package that they sent to you, I have a copy right here. I think everyone has probably seen the layout that staff presented at the last meeting. This layout is how they are saying this is how they can get it to work. I think I went through the issues last time as to why this doesn't work. It works from a two dimensional point of view, but from an overall engineering point of view it doesn't work. You have to consider topography. You have to consider storm water management and water quality. All of those things in combination have to be able to work together to get this site to work. The point that I really want to make today is this particular issue, it is the fact that if you look at the layout that they have, they have parking that is behind the building. You see how close it is to the residential property line. They also have a sidewalk that is between the building itself and the residential houses. You would have people parking in the rear. They would be very close to the property line. You would have the noise, congestion, and the radio, just talking and trash, all of that. You would also have pedestrian traffic going between the building itself and the residences. If you think about the spirit of the law of why the 30' was actually enacted, it is because they want to give an additional setback, a little bit of additional privacy space for areas that were adjacent to residential areas. At the same time if you think about the layout that you would be forced to do, because of the particular uniqueness of the lot and it is narrow in nature, it has topography issues, and all of those particular things; in order to get this to fit you would be having to do a layout like this even though it wouldn't work completely like I've mentioned before. You end up with a worse scenario than if the Board granted the variance. By granting the variance, you meet the spirit of the law better than if you acted in strict ordinance.

Mr. Gammon read the four criteria under the criteria analysis stating his reasoning for meeting the criteria.

Mr. Gammon stated I think today, the Board has the opportunity to, I think certainly from a legality point of view that these four issues can be said that they have certainly been met. I think that the Board understands that certainly having additional businesses in this area is going to produce additional income for the City. How much? I just finished doing a little study in Martinsville. It ends up adding to about \$22,000-\$25,000 per year in tax revenue in addition to the jobs that will be added to the area. You are probably talking about five to eight additional new jobs. It is a better scenario certainly than if you did a strict application of the Ordinance. As an example of another situation where you guys have granted something similar to this, I don't know all of the particular

details because I am not from here; but I will just describe it as I was told. There was a fence that was going to be installed and the strict application of the Ordinances had been presented. I believe it was required to be a 4' tall fence and it was in an area that had some topography to it. Because of a drop that would end up going down the guy could not end up putting the fence in just like the Ordinance would allow. The only way he would be able to do that would be to come in and put a chain link fence in. The chain link fence would not have been something that would have agreed with the neighborhood at all. He wanted to put a brick column type of fence in. My understanding is that the Board of Zoning Appeals approved that because the strict application of the Ordinance as it was applied would have created something that would be even worse for the community than what was presented by the applicant. I think we have an exact scenario of the same thing here. There are a lot of other specific and technical issues about what we are doing and how we are under one acre and how we will do water quality. All of those things are very relevant, but when it all comes down to it, if you think about case law and you think about precedence, you guys have an opportunity. Certainly I think we have met the four criteria. I think it is a good asset to have this business in the community. If you guys have any questions I can answer them at this time.

Mr. Dyer asked the 20' setback that is proposed against the residential area, is that going to be just a grassed or landscaped area?

Mr. Gammon responded it is.

Mr. Dyer asked that is not paved? Is it going to allow for any type of vehicle traffic?

Mr. Gammon responded it is not. Actually if you take a look at the third sheet, the layout sheet, the only thing that I have in there is a pipe to pick up roof rain. Yes, it is a grassed area.

Mr. Dyer asked there is no vehicle traffic, no pedestrian traffic, no garbage cans or anything like that?

Mr. Gammon responded no, sir. The garbage is on the opposite side that is adjacent to the Advanced Auto.

Mr. Dyer asked the wall of the building which is going to be 20' off of the property line, how high is that?

Mr. Gammon responded I think it is 14' tall.

Mr. Dyer asked is there any type of parapet wall?

Mr. Gammon responded no. The A/C units will not be on the roof though. They are actually behind the building itself.

Mrs. Rich asked on a concrete slab in the back?

Mr. Gammon responded that is correct.

Mr. Dyer asked so there is nothing on the roof of the building that creates any type of noise, generates any light?

Mr. Gammon responded no, there shouldn't be.

Mr. Dyer asked there are no roof mounted signs or anything that light up that could be seen from the building?

Mr. Gammon responded no, not that I am aware of. This is a corner lot type of store. The signage is actually on the face of the building. It should not be something that is above it and shining to where it would bleed over.

Mr. Dyer asked were you involved in the development of the Dollar General store out on 41?

Mr. Gammon responded yes.

Mr. Dyer stated this appears to be a very similar layout.

Mr. Gammon stated absolutely.

Mr. Dyer asked when you have a 30' setback that setback can include parking. What is required, a 5' buffer?

Mr. Gillie responded on the front it is a 5' and on the side it is 2 ½'.

Mr. Dyer asked so they would only be required to have 2 ½' of grass and the rest of it could be asphalt and parking if this were developed in an alternate way.

Mr. Gillie responded if it abuts a residential district no, because you do have a landscape buffer between.

Mr. Dyer asked what is the landscape buffer?

Mr. Gillie responded it can vary. You can have a very intense buffer which is very narrow.

Mr. Dyer asked what is the narrowest it could be?

Mr. Gillie responded 10'.

Mr. Dyer stated so you could have 10' of grass and 30' of asphalt. Since we got a lot of issues that we are dealing with here, the other question that I have is about the setback on the right hand side of the building. I mean the building itself is way more than 20' off. It is actually the dumpster pad. Is that what is intruding it? Does the City consider that?

Mr. Gillie responded yes.

Mr. Dyer asked you are not allowed to put a dumpster in a setback like that?

Mr. Gillie responded no.

Mr. Gammon stated that is why I have revised in terms of the way that I had requested it, because what is written here is 5' setback. What I would propose is to say "to allow trash facility." That away if we changed our minds and walked out of here tomorrow, we can't take our building and throw it up against that property line.

Mr. Dyer asked there is nothing in the Code that allows for parking spaces to be wider if the driveway is narrower? I can see how that could have an effect, because obviously if you have an

angled parking spot, then you are allowed to have a narrower driveway. The width of the parking spot does play into the width of the driveway, right?

Mr. Gillie responded the angle of the parking space. An angled parking space would be traveling in one direction. You don't have vehicles going side by side. You need a 12' travel lane to allow a vehicle to go in. No point on anything we have is less than 12' drive aisle. That is why for two-way traffic it is 24'.

Mr. Dyer stated the driveway aisle has to be 24' and Mr. Gammon is proposing 19'. Is that what you said?

Mr. Gammon responded actually I am requesting 16'. Once again it all depends where they are measuring at. If they are measuring at this exact parking area, I've got 19' there; but if they were to go back to the back and measure it right up to where the dumpsters are at, it is about 16' there. Once again, you are not going to have your parking stalls there. I am asking for 16' because of technicality. I want to make sure that I cover myself from a legal perspective. In reality, the layout that I have from my opinion gives you 19'. I am making those three spaces that actually don't have 24' wider to be able to make that turning movement with a passenger vehicle.

Mr. Dyer asked a 24' driveway allows for parking on both sides of that 24', right?

Mr. Gammon responded yes.

Mr. Dyer stated you've only got parking on one side. There is not the issue of worrying about pulling out of the spot and bumping into the car. Actually there is a curb there that you could, however far it is from the back of your tire to the back of the curb, your car could go over that a little bit.

Mr. Gammon stated that is what I have depicted here.

Mr. Dyer asked what size dumpster is this? Do we know?

Mr. Gammon responded they ended up putting a typical regular dumpster in there. The area that they allow for that is fenced is just a 12' x 20'.

Mr. Dyer asked and that is fenced? It is screened?

Mr. Gammon responded it is.

Mr. Dyer asked and that is adjacent to the Advanced Auto Parts store?

Mr. Gammon responded right. I have it as basically 5' off of the property line.

Mr. Dyer stated you mentioned that you are limited to this egress into the property. Is that something that was required by the State because this is a US Hwy? Why are they not allowed to put their driveway entrance anywhere they want?

Mr. Gillie responded there is an agreement between Advanced Auto Parts property there and this property because of the distance separation requirement between properties. In order to have a driveway it has to be X number of feet away from a property line or X number of feet between driveways. In order for Advanced to get the driveway that they wanted in the location they wanted,

they had to do a joint access easement between these two properties. There is not enough room to put another driveway on this property.

Mr. Dyer asked the City views that as a positive, that one driveway is better than two?

Mr. Gillie responded correct.

Mr. Dyer asked it is apparently at a crossover in the highway?

Mr. Gillie responded it lines up close enough with the crossover and one entrance is always better than two because you have less points of conflict.

Mrs. Evans stated you were talking about planting grass on the back of the building. Have you thought about anything else, Leyland Cyprus, anything that will grow tall?

Mr. Gammon responded it is not just grass. When I was answering that question what I really meant was that it is not going to be paved at all. It is not just grass. It will actually be landscaping. That is required by Code anyhow. It is a landscape buffer that is required there just like he was mentioning that we are going to put in that area.

Mrs. Evans asked will it be tall landscaping?

Mr. Dyer stated that is something that we can stipulate.

Mr. Gammon responded we were thinking about at one time putting a fence there. We even mentioned that to staff. It depends, because some property owners don't want a fence there. They want to see the landscaping right up beside of it, because they don't want to see the other side of the fence or maintain the fence. Normally, it is Dollar General standards, if you are adjacent to a residential area you put a fence up. That is what we typically do, a 6' tall fence. We can certainly do that. We also have to put in the landscaping that is required and as he mentioned there are options in terms of the width of it. I believe it is 10' wide. Is that correct? I don't know the particulars on what type of trees have to go in there. I think if you use evergreens, most Ordinances say that you have to put in 6' tall evergreens like Leyland Cyprus or something like that. If you put deciduous trees, usually they have a specific requirement of the size of the tree. Most places have a 2" or a 2 1/2" caliber. Those are what I would expect that we would end up putting there. I assume that your Code already addresses that issue and we would have to do that anyhow.

Mr. Gillie stated there are a number of trees depending on the buffer requirement that you have to have. There is a diagram in the back to show people what the various numbers are.

Mr. Dyer stated it is designed to be a screen.

There was discussion about the different types of landscaping.

Mr. Gammon stated I can tell you certainly that we are going to work to do whatever that we can to make sure that everyone is happy. We don't want the residents to be upset. We think this is a better layout because the building itself acts as a buffer; but we plan to either put a fence up and some trees, or put the trees up if the residents don't want the fence.

Mrs. Evans asked do you consider the back of the building and those trees being a safety issue for the residents back there where someone could hide and possibly break into their houses?

Mr. Gammon responded no I don't because you are not going to have pedestrians end up being back there. If you had a parking lot in the back for example, you would have people back there that could see that they could go back there and hide. The other layout that he had where you had a sidewalk that goes down the side of the building is where I could see someone hanging out and doing something. Once again, if you put a fence up; they couldn't get over the fence anyhow. I don't see that as a safety issue.

Mrs. Evans asked how are you going to prevent them from walking behind the building?

Mr. Gammon responded it is not that you are going to prevent them from walking behind the building. It is on the fact that people would not typically end up going back there.

There was discussion about the potential safety issues that could arise.

Mr. Gammon stated we could put some security lights that shine down on that area. We don't want to put something that is intrusive in terms of lighting, but it may be something that Dollar General might want to do anyhow. Those things are not very expensive. Some motion type lights back there is something we can look at doing.

Speaking in favor of the application was Mr. Wayne Fuller. Mr. Fuller stated I have seen almost every plan that Mr. Gammon has presented. I do feel that what is presented today is the best, especially with the grass barrier, no parking, and no sidewalk back against the residence. One other thing is he said five jobs, but I believe the average is fourteen and a half jobs for a Dollar General store. That could be a positive. Mr. Harville, haven't you spoken with all of the residents behind the property?

Mr. Harville responded all of the business owners and residents that touch the property. Some are across the street. I have personally spoken to nine of the people that were on the list. I haven't had any criticism from them at all once I explained to them what Mr. Gammon went through with you all this time and the last time we were here. There is no access to the back. They were concerned about what Mrs. Evans had said, people walking back there. With the building aiming toward the auto parts store and the front going out toward South Boston Road, there is no activity at all on that side and that was the main concern that I got from several of the residents. Beyond that, I haven't personally had anything negative once I went and talked to the individuals myself. There were several that were not there. I left my name, information, why, who, what and when to contact me. I have not been contacted by anyone.

Mrs. Evans asked have you talked to the Chatman's?

Mr. Harville responded a couple of times. The last time that I talked to Mrs. Chatman, their lot is actually the one that is going to back right up to the building, and I talked in length with him before when I got it zoned HR-C 2 years ago. The concern of the Chatman's was also shared with the lady across the street and so I explained to them the situation. I did not get the impression from Mrs. Chatman that she had an issue. I did not talk to Mr. Chatman, but I did leave the same letter with her after I spoke with her for him to call me if he had any questions about it. I didn't hear from them.

Mrs. Evans stated my concern is that they are still opposed.

Mr. Dyer asked do you know when that letter was received? This is a letter that was based on the second posting, right?

Ms. Blair responded correct. There was a second set of letters sent out.

Mr. Dyer asked do you have any idea if that was received before Mr. Harville went out? Do you know when you spoke to them?

Mr. Harville responded within a week from the time that we did this the first time. I have not heard from anybody on the second go round. I did not go back and contact anybody.

Ms. Blair stated they were mailed on May 1<sup>st</sup>.

There was discussion about the responses received from surrounding property owners.

Close the Public Hearing.

Mr. Dyer stated I think the case that Mr. Gammon brought up was the case of Will Leggett's fence. I hope people have been by to see the fence because it is extremely nice. I drive by it every day. That fence does not meet the City's Ordinance. In essence it is much better than what the City's Code required, but at the same time it did require a variance. I think the point Mr. Gammon was making is that he feels like and it was presented before the Board for your consideration that maybe 20' of grass is better than 10' of grass and the rest of it parking lot.

Mrs. Evans asked I have a question for staff. Mr. Leggett's fence was that approved by the BZA before or after the laws became much stricter?

Mr. Gillie responded that was approved probably three or four years ago.

Mr. Dyer stated it hasn't been that long.

Mr. Gillie stated they all start running together. It was under the new Zoning Code.

Mr. Dyer stated we are allowed to consider the setting of the situation. I guess it is really a matter of opinion as to whether this exceeds what the Code requires as far as allowing for privacy.

Mrs. Rich stated I think it gives the Chatman's a nice barrier against commercial property. It is planted and they have that 20' buffer and maybe require that they have motion detector lights in the back, so if somebody does go back there at night the lights will go on. Otherwise, it would be kept dark.

Mr. Dyer asked so you would ask for some concessions from the applicant?

Mrs. Rich responded yes.

Mr. Dyer stated Mrs. Evans you mentioned the trees being a certain height.

Mrs. Evans stated on the side and on the back.

There was discussion about what is actually the back of the building.

Mr. Dyer stated there are two other issues. One of them is the setback on the right hand side of the building where basically the only thing that is intruding into that setback is a dumpster. To be honest with you I was not aware that a dumpster is considered part of the building.

Mr. Gillie stated it is a structure just like any other, so it has to meet the minimum setback requirements.

Mr. Dyer asked even though it is moveable? It is not permanent.

Mr. Gillie responded they have to enclose them and once they enclose them.

Mr. Dyer stated it is enclosed by a fence and a fence is allowed.

Mr. Gillie stated it can be enclosed by a fence or solid walls. It depends on how they chose to do it.

Mr. Dyer stated even if this is built out of brick and cinderblock if it is not more than 6' tall then it is still considered just a fence or wall and that is allowed to intrude.

Mr. Gillie stated we have some people that have covered them over.

Mr. Dyer stated what I am talking about is the Wendy's on Piney Forest Road. They just recently built a nice block wall around their dumpster and it appears to me that is right on the property line.

Ms. Blair stated it is not on the property line. Their property line is actually the center of the shared drive aisle with BB&T, so they are 20' off.

Mr. Dyer stated ok, my mistake. That is an issue and the issue about the three additional parking spaces, when the number of parking spaces is calculated for this building, how is that determined? Is it based on the square footage of the building?

Mr. Gillie responded correct.

Mr. Dyer asked how many spaces are required per square foot?

Mr. Gillie responded it is five for the first thousand and then four for each additional thousand. We discount areas for walls, bathrooms, mechanical rooms, and we will give them a break on storage room in counting that as less space if they have any. You need a final floor plan to make that determination.

Mr. Dyer asked so there is a possibility that they may have more parking spaces based on their final floor plan?

Mr. Gillie responded based on what we have come up with, we are pretty confident on the number.

Mr. Dyer stated I am assuming this store has a rather significant area for storage, because most stores do.

Mr. Gillie stated no they don't.

Mr. Gammon stated it is about 7390 square foot of retail area and all of the rest is not retail area. Initially we determined how many parking spaces that we needed and we thought we could fit them here; but actually we have gone through everything with Renee and we have the minimum number of parking spaces required for the exact building.

Mr. Dyer stated that is what is required by the City of Danville. Obviously you have stores all over the country. Do you have other stores that require less parking spaces?

Mr. Gammon responded the minimum by Dollar General is thirty-one.

Mr. Dyer stated that is the least amount that they want. The only reason I bring this up is because I have been by the store on 41, I have been by the new store on 29 across from the Danville Golf Club, I been by the new store on 86, and none of them are even close to the parking lots being full. This type of business does not generate seventy-two cars at any one time.

Mr. Harville stated I would say five to nine cars.

Mr. Dyer stated the four options available to the Board in considering a motion.

**Mrs. Rich made a motion to approve Variance Application PLVAR20120000112 as requested with the following conditions: motion security lights are placed on the rear and side (north and west sides) facing the residential property, and the trees planted be high and full enough to act as a sound buffer as well as screening. Mr. Hiltzheimer seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 4-1 vote (Mrs. Evans voted in opposition).**

## II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

**Mr. Hiltzheimer made a motion to approve the minutes from the April 19, 2012 meeting. Mrs. Rich seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 5-0 vote.**

## III. OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Gillie stated there a couple things on the last case that the Board just approved. The dumpster, there was no mention of it only allowing a dumpster; now he can construct his building that distance from the property line. When you said as advertised, he has offered 20' setback, but because of what was advertised, it had listed as 5', so he can ask to put the building at 5' and we have to allow it, because the motion was as advertised. If you are going to add conditions to it, it is kind of a minor point.

Mr. Dyer asked is that not something you can bring up during the meeting?

Mr. Gillie responded no, I can't. That is why I am trying to tell you now. We are not opposed to anything. The conditions were fine. Just submit that the conditions are as submitted by the applicant or as recommended by the applicant afterwards. He can come in now and ask and I have got to give it to him. I won't because I will tell him that is not what it was. He could challenge me and we come back to this Board. When you go through it and meet those criteria, you have also got to spell those out. If somebody challenges it, I don't think he will; but if he would the record reflects that kind of stuff. We have got to be more precise on those.

Mr. Dyer stated in other words, you could have said "recommend approval based on the four criteria submitted by the applicant."

Mr. Gillie stated and the modified application per the applicant, which would have changed those numbers to what is was here.

There was some discussion about the Board taking training classes.

Mrs. Evans asked are you going to challenge this?

Mr. Gillie responded we have decided, more than likely in this case we will not challenge it. There are some other site issues that we have to work through. If we can't get the siting issues, there is a

chance that he will come back for two additional things later on. The site plan shows stripped aisles in front and also shows a stripped area in the back near the loading dock. We don't allow for parking areas to end in painted stripes. They have to be in landscaped areas. We've talked and he says that he can't get his trucks in there. There is a chance that this case may still come back to you. I don't know if we will appeal what was approved now, but you may see it again.

Mr. Dyer asked do we have anything for next month?

Mr. Gillie responded not yet, but they have until the 20<sup>th</sup> to apply.

Mr. Campbell asked the applicant called me on my cell phone and I didn't quite understand how he received it.

Mr. Dyer stated I think as a Board member that is a matter of public record.

Mr. Gillie responded any phone numbers, anything that you have provided us; we have to provide to them, because it is public record.

Mr. Campbell asked is it legal to talk to them? What is the extent that we can talk to them?

Mr. Spencer responded you are free to say "I don't want to talk to you about this."

Mr. Campbell asked if one of the members wanted to talk to them is it a certain line that you do not cross or what?

Mr. Spencer responded no, I think you are free to discuss anything with anyone.

Mrs. Evans stated we just can't do it as a group.

Mr. Spencer stated two or more of you talking about public business is a meeting, but you are talking to the applicant; and of course he is not a member of the Board. You are free to talk to the applicant about anything.

There was discussion about the legal issues of Board members talking to applicants outside of public meetings.

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:50 a.m.

---

APPROVED