

MINUTES TO BE ADOPTED BY THE GREENVILLE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT  
JUNE 23<sup>RD</sup> 2019

The Greenville Board of Adjustment met on the above date at 6:00 PM in the City Council Chambers of City Hall.

Bill Johnson - Chairman - *	
Nathan Cohen - *	Christopher Lilley - *
Michael Glenn - *	Rodney Bullock - *
Ann Bellis - X	Hunt McKinnon - *
James Moretz - *	Dillion Godley - *
Sharon Evans - *	Stephen Atkinson - *

The members present are denoted by an “\*” and those absent are denoted by an “X”.

**VOTING MEMBERS:** Johnson, Lilley, McKinnon, Bullock, Moretz, Evans and Glenn

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Ms. Elizabeth Blount, Planner II.

Ms. Camillia Smith, Secretary, Notary

Mr. Donald Phillips, Assistant City Attorney

Kelvin Thomas, Communications Technician

**MINUTES**

Mr. Moretz made a motion to approve the May 23<sup>th</sup>, 2019 minutes as presented, Ms. Evans seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Attorney Phillips reviewed information. As stated on pages 2 to 3 of the Meeting Handout available to the Public, the EVIDENCE TO BE CONSIDERED BY THE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT IS AS FOLLOWS:

- A. The Board of Adjustment is a quasi-judicial body that makes a decision concerning an application, petition or appeal based on the evidence presented by those in favor as well as those in opposition.
- B. The members of the Board of Adjustment are lay persons and as such, the rules of evidence that are followed in a court are relaxed for cases heard before this body.
- C. Though the rules of evidence are relaxed, it does not mean they are ignored. Only evidence that is material, competent, and substantial will be considered and may be used by the Board in its decision-making process.
- D. The Board may not consider, nor is it admissible to present or offer affidavits, letters or other writings in support of or in opposition to a matter before the Board unless the person who prepared the writing is testifying. These writings are considered hearsay.

1. Statements by a person such as “In my opinion, the application will create a traffic hazard,” is not an admissible opinion and may not be considered by the Board.
  - a. However, such an opinion may be admissible if it is made by an expert or a person who is qualified to give opinions concerning traffic hazards, is making a presentation to the Board concerning his or her investigation and the basis for his or her conclusion in the report.
  - b. A lay person can give an opinion but he or she also must present facts to show how the proposal affects his or her piece of property specifically and not just in a general way.
2. A statement that another person who is not present and not testifying either supports or doesn't support the petitioner or application is hearsay and is not admissible.
3. The same rule applies to both the applicant and those in opposition.

Pursuant to North Carolina General Statute 160A-388 and Section 4 of the Board of Adjustment's Rules of Procedure:

4-3. No member of the Board of Adjustment shall participate in either the discussion or vote on any special use permit, variance, or appeal from an administrative officer's decision in any manner that would violate the affected persons' constitutional right to a fair and impartial decision maker.

Prohibited conflicts include but are not limited to a member having a fixed opinion prior to hearing the matter and not willing to consider changing his or her mind; and undisclosed ex parte communications with the person before the Board, any witnesses, staff, or other Board members. Decisions on either a request for recusal by a member or objections by a person appearing before the Board shall be decided by a simple majority vote.

4-4. No Board Member shall take part in the hearing, consideration, or determination of any matter in which that Board Member is involved or has a financial or personal interest. Personal interest shall be defined as having a family member involved in the project under consideration, a neighborhood association involvement where a Board Member is on the governing body of such association, or where the Board Member is involved in a conflict or dispute with the applicant on a matter unrelated to the application. If a Board Member has such a conflict, he shall declare the conflict and request to be excused from voting on the issue. A majority vote of the remaining members present shall be required to excuse the member.

4-5. No Board member shall vote on any matter deciding an application or appeal, unless he shall have attended the public hearing on that application or appeal.

4-6. No Board member shall discuss any case with any parties in interest prior to the public hearing on that case, provided however, that members may receive and/or seek information pertaining to the case from any other members of the Board.

If a Board member has had an ex parte communication that also needs to be disclosed at this time.

The notary swore in staff and all those speaking for and against the request.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

### **PUBLIC HEARING ON A REQUEST FOR A SPECIAL USE PERMIT BY ST.PETER'S CATHOLIC SCHOOL**

The applicant, St. Peter's Catholic School, desires a special use permit to operate a school pursuant to Appendix A, Use (8)g, (8)h and (8)i of the Greenville City Code. The proposed use is located at 2606 E. 5<sup>th</sup> Street. The property is further identified as being tax parcel number 27009.

Ms. Blount delineated the property identified as R6S Residential Single Family character type by the Horizon 2026 Greenville Community Plan. The subject property is located in the Northeastern portion of the city. Being operational since 1946 the school has not done a Special Use Permit when it expanded; therefore, a Special Use Permit is needed for the removal and addition of a larger modular classroom in a new location.

**Zoning of Property:** R6S (Residential Single Family)

### **Surrounding Zoning:**

North: R6S (Residential Single Family)  
South: OR (Office Residential)  
East: R6S (Residential Single Family)  
West: R6S (Residential Single Family)

### **Surrounding Development:**

North: St. Peter's Parking Lot and Playground, Single Family Dwellings and Duplexes  
South: Greensprings Park  
East: St. Peter's Catholic Church and Greenwood Cemetery  
West: Village Green Apartments and Single Family Dwellings

### **Description of Property:**

The subject property is 3.06 acres in size with approximately 440 feet of frontage along E 5th Street, 300 feet of frontage along Beech Street and 454 feet of frontage along E 4<sup>th</sup> Street. The property contains St. Peter's Catholic School which has been in existence since 1946. The school currently houses Pre-K( 3) through eighth grade. The applicant

desire to remove an existing modular classroom and add a larger modular classroom in a new location; thus, intensifying the use.

**Comprehensive Plan:**

The property is located within the Traditional Neighborhood Medium to High Density character types as designated by the Horizon 2026 Greenville Community Plan. The proposed use is in compliance with the Future Land Use Plan which recommends small scale institutional and civic development for the subject property.

**Notice:**

Notice was mailed to the adjoining property owners on June 13, 2019. Notice of the public hearing was published in the Daily Reflector on June 17 and June 24, 2019.

**Related Zoning Ordinance Regulations:**

**Definition:**

*School.* A use of land or building for academic instruction authorized and administrated by Pitt County School System or other comparable private schools.

**Specific Criteria:**

School.

All structures shall maintain minimum side and rear setbacks of 50 feet greater than that required for single family residences within the district

Shall be subject to the bufferyard regulations: however, no principal or accessory building shall be located with 50 feet or any adjoining property or public street right of way line.

**Staff Recommended Conditions:**

Site plan and building permit approvals are required prior to the installation of the modular unit.

**Other Comments:**

The proposed project must meet all related NC State fire and building codes for the associated use prior to occupancy.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Planning staff is of the opinion that the request can meet all the development standards required for issuance of a special use permit upon proper findings by the Board.

Chairman Johnson opened the public hearing.

Mr. Doug Jones, Principal of St. Peter's Catholic School spoke in favor of the request. Mr. Jones stated that the facility is almost 30 years old and the school is in need of new Guidance Counselor and School Resource Officer offices.

**No one spoke in opposition of the request.**

Chairman Johnson closed the public hearing and asked for staff's recommendation.

Ms. Blount stated that staff had no objection to the request with the recommended conditions

**Mr. Hunt made a motion to adopt the Finding of Facts with the recommended conditions, Ms. Evans seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.**

**Mr. Bullock motion made to approve the petition with the conditions, Mr. Glenn seconded the motion and it passed unanimously**

#### **PUBLIC HEARING ON A REQUEST FOR A SPECIAL USE PERMIT BY SALEH AZZMZMI**

The applicant, Saleh Azzmzmi, desires a special use permit to operate a Tobacco Shop Class 1 pursuant to Appendix A, Use (10)ff. of the Greenville City Code. The proposed use is located at 700 S. Memorial Drive. The property is further identified as being tax parcel number 15242.

**Ms. Blount delineated the property. The property is located in the northern portion of the city. The two unit commercial building currently houses a conventional restaurant with a drive thru. The building is just off of Memorial Drive and has frontage on both S. Memorial and Stantonsburg. The subject property is located at the intersection of two major thoroughfares that are primary traffic carriers into the city and it's a gateway corridor into the city. The property is also located near the Medical District.**

**Zoning of Property:** MCH (Medical Heavy Commercial)

#### **Surrounding Zoning:**

North: MCH (Medical Heavy Commercial) and CH (Heavy Commercial)  
South: MCH (Medical Heavy Commercial)  
East: CH (Heavy Commercial) and R6S (Residential Single-Family)  
West: MCH (Medical Heavy Commercial)

#### **Surrounding Development:**

North: Tokyo Express, McDonald's, Burger King, and Boost Mobile

South: CVS, Taco Bell, Cookout Restaurant, Speedway and Economy Inn  
East: Single-family dwellings  
West: Wells Fargo, Cooke & Associates Construction Company, and Vidant Medical Center

**Description of Property:**

The subject property is 0.57 acres in size and contains a 3,738 square foot commercial building with two units. The building currently houses a conventional restaurant with a drive-through. The property has approximately 120 feet of frontage along S. Memorial Drive and 233 feet of frontage along Stantonsburg Road. The property is located at the intersection of two major thoroughfares (roads which are the principal traffic carriers of the city), a gateway corridor and a connector transportation corridor.

**Comprehensive Plan:**

The property is located within the Mixed Use High Intensity character type as designated by the Horizon 2026 Plan. The proposed use is in compliance with the Future Land Use Plan which recommends commercial development for the subject property.

**Notice:**

Notice was mailed to the adjoining property owners on June 13, 2019. Notice of the public hearing was published in the Daily Reflector on June 17 and June 24, 2019.

**Related Zoning Ordinance Regulations:**

**Definition:**

*Tobacco Shop (Class 1).* An establishment that, as a substantial portion of the use, entails the retail sales of tobacco products including, but not limited to, cigarettes, cigars, chewing tobacco, shisha, unformed or loose tobacco, and/or similar products. For the purpose of this definition, a substantial portion of the use is established if:

- (1) At least 20% of the establishment's floor area open and accessible to customers is used for the display and/or stocking of tobacco products as provided herein; or
- (2) At least 40% of the sign area of the establishment's on-site signage that is visible from public rights-of-way advertises tobacco products as provided herein.

**Specific Criteria**

Section 9-4-103(BB)

*Tobacco Shop (Class 1)*

(1) No tobacco shop (class 1) shall be located within a 500-foot radius of an existing or approved school. This measurement shall be made from the exterior wall of the proposed tobacco shop (class 1) to the nearest exterior wall of any existing or approved school.

(2) No tobacco shop (class 1) shall be located within any certified redevelopment area.

**Staff Recommended Conditions:**

Hours of operation shall not surpass 9 pm, EST. No one under 18 years of age shall be allowed in the establishment.

No retail sales of any smoking apparatus to include but not be limited to water pipes, hookah pipes, bowls, water bongs or similar products.

No drive through window shall be permitted.

No LED letters, light strips or signs shall be permitted on the glass nor the outside of the building.

Advertisement shall not cover more than 25% of the windows nor doors.

No advertisement shall be located on the south side elevation of the unit.

Entrance shall be the front entrance only due to the configuration of the traffic flow and the anticipated increase in vehicular and pedestrian movement on the property. Appropriate signage shall be placed on the rear door indicating not an entrance.

No loitering or outdoor activities permitted.

The establishment shall not operate or evolve into a hookah café or a tobacco shop (class 2).

No smoking permitted on the premises.

Must comply with all federal, state and local laws.

**Other Comments:**

The proposed project must meet all related NC State fire and building codes prior to occupancy.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Planning staff is of the opinion that the request can meet all the development standards required for issuance of a special use permit upon proper findings by the Board.

Mr. Godley asked staff about the difference between a tobacco shop class 1 and class 2.

Ms. Blount explained that tobacco shop class 2 includes the selling of smoking apparatus.

Mr. Glenn asked staff about the location of signage on the building.

Ms. Blount explained that the signage can be located anywhere on the building but it cannot exceed 25% of the total surface area.

Mr. Moretz asked if there was a difference between signage and advertisement.

Ms. Blount stated that signage is the name of the shop and that advertisement promotes the products being sold.

Mr. Glenn asked if advertisement was limited to Memorial Drive.

Ms. Blount stated that the condition for no advertisement only applied to the side of the building closest to the existing CVS building due to the building being located at a major thoroughfare.

Chairman Johnson opened the public hearing

The applicant, Saleh Azzmzmi, spoke in favor of the request. He spoke about his business providing smoking alternatives, having FDA approval and being tested with underage shoppers. He stated that no one underage will be allowed in the shop.

Mr. Glen asked if he understood the conditions that would come with this permit if it is approved.

Mr. Azzmzmi replied that he did but just not the one regarding signage.

Ms. Blount interjected with the difference between signage and advertisement. The name of the business can be on the wall, we are talking advertisement on the wall facing CVS. The name of the business can be anywhere on the building but ads for particular products can't.

Mr. Moretz asked if he understood about the smoking apparatus.

Mr. Azzmzmi replied yes he did and the way it usually works is that people from Phillip Morris will come and visit the store and tell him what he can and can't have and abide by the law and state regulations.

Mr. Johnson suggested that he abide by the signage and advertisement requirements.



Ms. Blount replied that signage is based on the frontage of the building. It is 1.5 times the amount of building frontage that he has, and he has to stay within that cap. The sign companies would know what that cap is. That is the maximum signage he can have on any side of the building.

Mr. McKinnon asked about what is considered "frontage".

Ms. Blount replied that the measurement is taken of only his frontage not the entire building.

Mr. McKinnon asked if the measurement included that blank wall in front of CVS.

Mr. Johnson asked Mr. Azzmzmi about the controlled entrance that he mentioned in his application. The fact that no one under 18 will be allowed and how that will work with a front and back door.

Mr. Azzmzmi replied that yes he will, that both doors will be unlock and he can post a sign on one saying exit or entrance.

Mr. Moretz interjected that one of staff recommendations is that the back not be used as it opens out into the drive thru of the restaurant.

Ms. Blount replied that it can be used as an emergency exit but not an entrance. This is due to the flow of traffic of the Tokyo Express drive thru, when someone steps out that back door they step into the traffic of the restaurant.

Mr. McKinnon asked if they had to walk around to exit the building

Ms. Blount replied no and that the parking is on the Stantonsburg side of the building

Mr. Glenn stated that the building has a Memorial address but a Stantonsburg entrance.

Mr. Justin Mullarkey, representative of the landlord and the tenant, spoke in favor of the request. Mr. Mullarkey stated that he had objection to the controlled entrance. He believes the building was designed to accommodate having dual entrances. The second objection was to the 9pm closing time. He believed it would hamstring the business and hamper profit. He thinks an 11pm time would be more profitable as it is still light outside at 8pm and the customer from the business next door that closes at 11pm would be potential customers. He asked for an explanation of why that burden was put on this business. He also asked for a few minutes with his client to discuss the dual entrance and the other conditions.

Mr. Johnson replied that if the board approved the request, the condition are the conditions and that's it.

Mr. Donald Phillips, City Attorney, replied that we have already been lax in the procedures already and that the way for him to appeal any decision would be to go before the Superior Court. That is the option.

Mr. Malarkey stated that they don't want to have to do that but they were not aware of staff conditions until tonight.

Mr. Phillips replied that another option would be to table that matter until another meeting. Although it unusual, he stated it be “okay” to give them the opportunity to discuss the conditions seeing as they are just hearing them.

Ms. Evans asked for clarity on the hours of operation condition.

Mr. Mullarkey asked if there any way to strike staff recommendations or some of staff recommendations or do we have to table the entire thing and throw the baby out with the bathe water. And say we could live with this and can’t live with that.

Mr. Phillips replied essentially staff has made their recommendations and the applicant is challenging two of them that I have heard, now it is up to the board to decide whether to throw the baby out with bathe water or modify it.

Mr. Mullarkey asked that in the board discussion that they consider the restriction on the LED lights as they are limited on signage in this location, but they will concede to the ad restriction but will have signage on the south side of the building. The LED lights and hours operation is very restrictive.

Mr. Johnson replied that we need to know that he understands and that his inclination is to table the request to next month. This will allow you to come back with a rendition of your proposed signage.

Mr. McKinnon asked could we have clarification from Ms. Blount on the hour restriction.

Ms. Blount replied the applicant’s application stated that the hours of operation were 8am to 5pm. She called him and asked if he really wanted to close at 5 and his response was no I really would like to stay open until 9pm. That is why the time is a condition.

Mr. Atkinson asked what the square footage of the shop was as it appears to be a small space.

Mr. Mullarkey replied that space was approximately 1250 square feet

Mr. Atkinson replied will that include your displays, counter, cashier and storage.

Mr. Mullarkey replied yes and it was an efficient space.

Mr. Atkinson replied that it very efficient, I am concerned with fire and safety codes and getting in and out of the building.

Mr. Mullarkey replied that that would be taken up with the building code. It was built to that standard and of it were in violation then that would be the fire Marshall.

Mr. McKinnon interjected that safety is one of the criteria that the decisions are based on.

Mr. Phillips stated that there is still evidence being received and discussions being had, we need to make a decision on the request to table the matter and move on.

Mr. Godley asked if there was lead way to allow the chairman to call a 5 minute recess for the sake of expediency on their behalf and help them get on the same page.

Mr. Phillips replied that is an option but don't want to do that if the applicant is seeking to table the matter.

Mr. Godley asked have we restricted operating hours before.

Ms. Blount yes we have.

Mr. Johnson asked if Mr. Mullarkey understands what was said.

Mr. Phillips asked that Mr. Mullarkey state what firm he is with as he is representing the landlord.

Mr. Mullarkey replied that he is with Eastern Trust Company, a commercial real estate firm here in Greenville. He stated that he will defer to his client on whether he will table the application.

Mr. McKinnon asked if the Special Use Permit go with the location not the applicant.

Ms. Blount replied that is correct.

Mr. Moretz asked if the board itself can request that a matter being tabled.

Mr. Phillips replied that you can if you think you need more time.

Mr. Mullarkey replied that they have agreed to table the application until the future as the lease of the property is contingent on him getting this permit.

Mr. Johnson asked for a motion to table the application.

**Mr. Bullock made a motion to table the application, Mr. Moretz seconded the motion and it passed unanimously**

### **PUBLIC HEARING ON A REQUEST FOR A SPECIAL USE GREENVILLE UTILITIES COMMISSION**

The applicant, Greenville Utilities Commission, desires a special use permit to operate a public utility (water treatment plant) pursuant to Appendix A, Use (4)a. of the Greenville City Code. The proposed use is located at 1700 Old River Road. The property is further identified as being tax parcel number 20440.

Mr. Christopher Lilley asked the board opinion if he needed to be rescued because his firm, Overton Group, represents Mr. Dixon, the representative of the request.

Mr. Phillips stated that the board to consider in order to refute any appearance of a conflict.

Mr. McKinnon asked Mr. Lilley if he had worked on the project or been involved in any way with the project.

Mr. Lilley replied no.

Mr. Glenn made a motion to recuse, Mr. McKinnon seconded. No one voted in favor and all voted in opposition. Mr. Lilley removed on the board as a voting member.

Ms. Blount delineated the property. The property is 147 acre and is located in the Northwester portion of the city. The subject property is split into three (3) parcel and has 965 square feet of frontage along Old River Road. It currently houses an existing water treatment plant and needs expansion. The expansion will cover 3.84 acres of the existing parcel. A fence and berm surrounds the property and prevents public access to the subject property and the surrounding properties. The current zoning is RA20 and the subject property is located within the Potential Conservation and Open Space and Industrial/Logistics character types as designated by the Horizon Plan. The proposed expansion will be located in the Industrial/Logistics portion of the property. Therefore the use is in compliance with the Future Land Use Plan which recommends Industrial Development for the subject property.

**Zoning of Properties:** RA20 (Residential Agricultural)

**Surrounding Zoning:**

North: RA20 (Residential Agricultural)  
South: RA20 (Residential Agricultural)  
East: RA20 (Residential Agricultural), O (Office) and IU (Unoffensive Industry)  
West: RA20 (Residential Agricultural)

**Surrounding Development:**

North: Single Family Dwellings and Mobile Homes  
South: Vacant Lots  
East: Vacant Lots  
West: Vacant Lots

**Description of Property:**

The subject property is 147 acres in size, split into three parcels and has approximately 965 feet of frontage along Old River Road. The proposed use is an expansion to the exiting Greenville Water Treatment Plant. The proposed use building coverage is 3.84 acres in size. The property is secured with no access to the public or neighboring properties. The property also has an existing berm around the perimeter of the plant development that provides screening for the property.

**Comprehensive Plan:**

The subject property is located within the Potential Conservation and Open Space and Industrial/Logistics character types as designated by the Horizon Plan. The proposed building for the request will be located in the Industrial/Logistics future land use portion of the property; therefore, the proposed use is in compliance with the Future Land Use Plan which recommends industrial development for the subject properties.

**Notice:**

Notice was mailed to the adjoining property owners on June 13, 2019. Notice of the public hearing was published in the Daily Reflector on June 17 and June 24, 2019.

## **Related Zoning Ordinance Regulations:**

### **Definitions:**

*Public utility building or use.* Any above-ground building or use necessary for the delivery of electric, water, sanitary sewer, storm drainage, gas, telephone, cable TV or other utility service system which meets any one of the following conditions. Distributed Antenna Systems (DAS) and supporting DAS equipment are not considered a public utility or use.

- (1) Utilizes structures in excess of 100 total square feet;
- (2) Utilizes any structure in excess of 15 feet in height;
- (3) Requires any on-site permanent maintenance or service attendant;
- (4) Requires or utilizes three or more parking spaces; and
- (5) Creates noise, smoke, dust, odor, glare or any other condition which may have an adverse impact on area properties or uses.

### **Specific Criteria:**

(M) *Public utility, building or use.*

- (1) Any proposed use shall maintain a residential appearance to the greatest possible extent and shall be consistent in scale and environment with surrounding properties.
- (2) Any parking area designed to serve more than four vehicles shall be located in the rear of the principal structure.

## **Staff Recommended Condition**

Proposed project must maintain sound levels in accordance with the City of Greenville Noise Control Ordinance.

Site plan and building permit approvals are required prior to construction.

## **Other Comments**

The proposed project must meet all related State of North Carolina fire and building codes prior to occupancy.

## **Staff Recommendation:**

Planning staff is of the opinion that the request can meet all the development standards required for issuance of a special use permit upon proper findings by the Board.

Chairman Johnson opened the public hearing.

Phil Dixon, representative of Greenville Utilities Commission, spoke in favor of the application. He stated that the property has been a water treatment plant since 1983 and it underwent an expansion in 2002 in order to have the capacity to clean 22.5 million gallons of water a day. 17 years later we now need and are required by law to expand once again because they have reached 80% of our capacity. The average use of the plant is 13.4 million gallons a day in 2018 but last month we had a single day record of 18.1 million gallons and like I said our capacity is 22.5 million. That leads us to the 80% threshold and the Public Water Supply people want you to begin planning for an expansion. GUC intends to expand to 32 million gallons per day, that's would give us 13.9 million gallons per day of excess capacity. Greenville has a unique situation because fresh water pass by it and when that water reaches the Pamlico it hits salt water, that salt water acts like a brick wall that causes the water to backup and pass by Greenville again. This allows Greenville to take more water out of the river and gives it a supply of water for the next 50 years. Many of the 19 counties in Eastern Carolina are able to do the same. This allows Greenville to sell water to other counties and it also allows for economic development because of the fact that we can provide fresh water. This expansion is critical to the bright future of Greenville. The expansion will cost 47.5 million and if approve we have already completed about 90% of the design and will like to collect bids this year if approved and will like to have the project completed by 2022.

No one spoke in opposition of the request.

Chairman Johnson closed the public hearing and asked for staff's recommendation.

Ms. Blount stated that staff had no objection to the request with the recommended conditions

**Mr. Moretz made a motion to adopt the Finding of Facts with the recommended conditions, Ms. Evans seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.**

**Mr. Bullock motion made to approve the petition with the conditions, Mr. Glenn seconded the motion and it passed unanimously**

**PUBLIC HEARING ON A REQUEST FOR A SPECIAL USE PERMIT BY WILLIAM DAVIS- ASKED FOR CONTINUANCE TO JULY 25TH MEETING**

The applicant, William Davis, desires a special use permit to operate a fraternity house pursuant to Appendix A, Use (2)r. of the Greenville City Code. The proposed use is located on 418 W 5th Street. The property is further identified as being tax parcel number 15719.

**Mr. Moretz made a motion to continue the request until the July 25th meeting of the Board of Adjustment, Mr. Bullock seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.**

## **ELECTIONS**

The role of Chairman and Vice Chair were up for elections.

**Mr. Johnson nominated himself to continue in the role of Chairman. The board voted unanimously to elect Mr. Johnson as Chairman.**

**Mr. Glenn nominated himself to continue in the role of Vice Chair. The board voted unanimously to elect Mr. Glenn as Vice Chair.**

**With no further business to discuss, Mr. Moretz made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Ms. Evans. Motion passed unanimously.**

**Meeting adjourned at 7:09 pm.**

Respectfully Submitted

**Elizabeth Blount  
Lead Planner**