



Spartanburg County

Planning and Development Department

Board of Zoning Appeals MINUTES

July 27, 2021

**Members
Present:**

Jack Gowan, Jr., Chairman
Michael Padgett, Vice Chairman
Kae Fleming
Thomas Davies
Angela Geter
Glenda Brady

**Members
Absent:**

Jason Patrick
Louise Rakes
Marion Gramling

Staff Present:

Joan Holliday, Planning Director
Leigh MacDonald, Development Manager
Darrell Weathers, Landscape Administrator
Rachel Dill, Planner
John Harris, County Attorney

NOTICE: Pursuant to Section 30-4-80 of the S.C. Code of Laws, the annual notice of meetings for this Board was provided on or before January 1, 2015 via the County website. In addition, the Agenda for this Meeting was posted on the bulletin board at the entrance to the Administration Building as well as on the County's website and was emailed to all persons, organizations, and news media requesting notice.

1. Call to Order

Chairman Jack Gowan, Jr. called the meeting to order.

2. Approval of Minutes May 25, 2021 Meeting

Mike Padgett made a motion to approve the minutes as submitted with the request to correct the spelling of Lavoy as reflected in the staff report and minutes. Kae Fleming seconded the motion. The motion carried with a vote of 6 to 0.

3. Unfinished Business –

4. New Business –

Leigh MacDonald addressed the Board and said that staff member, Rick Carpenter, was no longer with Spartanburg County Planning and Development and that Laurie Oakman had created the staff reports presented that evening. Ms. MacDonald said she would be stepping in while Ms. Oakman was on vacation.

A. Variance Request:

Mavis Tire- 3808 & 3810 Boiling Springs Road

Tax Map Number: 2-44-01-015.00 & 2-44-01-015.02

Variance on Front Setback – McMillin Boulevard

Variance on Front Setback – Rainbow Lake Road

Leigh MacDonald was sworn in and presented the following staff reports:

Variance Request 1
Staff Report

Mavis Tire			
Meeting Date: July 27, 2021			
Address	3808 & 3810 Boiling Springs Rd, Boiling Springs	Ordinance	ULMO
Factual Dates	Variance Application Received	06/29/2021	
	Deadline for Variance	06/29/2021	
	Public Notice	07/11/2021	
	Adjoining Property Owner Notification	07/08/2021	
	Variance Signs Posted on Property	07/9/2021	
Applicant	Boiling Springs LLR, LLC		
Applicant Status	Owner		
Map Number	2-44-01-015.00 & 2-44-01-015.02		
Acreage	1.22 acres		
Staff	Laurie Oakman		

Request:

1. The applicant is requesting to reduce the total front setback required in Section 2.02-1 Dimensional Standards, Table 3b – Commercial & All Other Uses - Setbacks and Other Requirements of the Unified Land Management Ordinance.

Type	Requirement	Requested Setback	Variance
Front Setback (Rainbow Lake Rd.)	40 ft.	30 ft.	10 ft.

Background Information:

The subject site is currently occupied by a convenience store. The applicant is proposing to demolish the existing structure and construct a Mavis Tire facility. This proposed development would include a 6,500 square foot structure that is 23 feet in height and contains 34 parking spaces. The subject site sits on a parcel surrounded by two Collector streets and an Arterial street. The existing structure does not appear to meet the front setbacks. However, the applicant is proposing to construct the new structure further back into the parcel in order to meet the SC 9 Arterial setback. This new alignment of the building will create an encroachment into the two other front setbacks.

Staff Position:

Staff has determined that the proposed automotive maintenance facility will be classified as a high intensity commercial use. If granted the two front setback variances, the applicant will be able to meet all other requirements of the Ordinance.

The applicant could meet the Ordinance by orienting the new structure in a way that would meet all setbacks, but it would require a building-front orientation away from Boiling Springs Rd. The proposed building orientation, along with required landscaping, will enhance the appearance of the corridor and achieve compatibility with the surrounding commercial properties developed in recent years in the vicinity.

Staff Analysis:

The Board may grant a variance for an unnecessary hardship if it makes and explains in writing all of the following findings. The fact that property may be utilized more profitably, if a variance is granted, may not be considered grounds for a variance.

1. There are extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property

Staff Analysis. The extraordinary conditions existing on this site are three required front setbacks that reduce the buildable area of the property. The front setbacks are from two Collector Streets each with a minimum setback of 40 feet and an Arterial street with a minimum setback of 50 feet.

2. These conditions do not generally apply to other property in the vicinity

Staff Analysis. The conditions on this site do not generally apply to other adjacent properties. Parcels in the general vicinity are not impacted by three front setbacks in addition to side and rear setbacks requirements.

3. Because of these conditions, the application of the ordinance to the particular piece of property would effectively prohibit or unreasonably restrict the utilization of the property.

Staff Analysis. The strict application of the ordinance would unreasonably restrict the design of the site and cause incompatibility with regards to the orientation of the structure along Boiling Springs Road.

4. **The authorization of a variance will not be of substantial detriment to adjacent property or to the public good, and the character of the area will not be harmed by the granting of the variance.**

Staff Analysis. The authorization of a variance, as it relates to the setback reduction for the proposed structure, is not anticipated to have a negative impact on overall community character. In fact, the proposed site plan, in staff’s estimation, is the best scenario for enhancing the appearance of the Corridor.

Attachments:

1. **Aerial Map from GIS**
2. **Variance Application**
3. **Site plan**
4. **Frontal view of project site**

Variance Request 2
Staff Report

Mavis Tire			
Meeting Date: June 29, 2021			
Address	3808 Boiling Springs Rd.	Ordinance	ULMO
Factual Dates	Variance Application Received	06/29/2021	
	Deadline for Variance	06/29/2021	
	Public Notice	07/11/2021	
	Adjoining Property Owner Notification	07/08/2021	
	Variance Signs Posted on Property	07/09/2021	
Applicant	Boiling Springs LLR, LLC		
Applicant Status	Owner		
Map Number	2-44-01-015.00 & 2-44-01-015.02		
Acreage	1.22 acres		
Staff	Laurie Oakman		

Request:

1. The applicant is requesting to reduce the total front setback required in Section 2.02-1 Dimensional Standards, Table 3b – Commercial & All Other Uses - Setbacks and Other Requirements of the Unified Land Management Ordinance.

Type	Required Setback	Proposed Setback	Variance
Front Setback (McMillin Blvd)	40 ft.	10 ft.	30 ft.

Background Information:

The subject site is currently occupied by a convenience store. The applicant is proposing to demolish the existing structure and construct a Mavis Tire facility. This proposed development would include a 6,500 square foot structure that is 23 feet in height and contains 34 parking spaces. The subject site sits on a parcel surrounded by two Collector streets and an Arterial street. The existing structure does not appear to meet the front setbacks. However, the applicant is proposing to construct the new structure further back into the parcel in order to meet the SC 9 Arterial setback. This new alignment of the building will create an encroachment into the two other front setbacks.

Staff Position:

Staff has determined that the proposed automotive maintenance facility will be classified as a high intensity commercial use. If granted the two front setback variances, the applicant will be able to meet all other requirements of the Ordinance.

The applicant could meet the Ordinance by orienting the new structure in a way that would meet all setbacks, but it would require a building-front orientation away from Boiling Springs Rd. The proposed building orientation, along with required landscaping, will enhance the appearance of the corridor and achieve compatibility with the surrounding commercial properties developed in recent years in the vicinity.

Staff Analysis:

The Board may grant a variance for an unnecessary hardship if it makes and explains in writing all of the following findings. The fact that property may be utilized more profitably, if a variance is granted, may not be considered grounds for a variance.

- 1. There are extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property**

Staff Analysis. The extraordinary conditions existing on this site are three required front setbacks that reduce the buildable area of the property. The front setbacks are from two Collector Streets each with a minimum setback of 40 feet and an Arterial street with a minimum setback of 50 feet.

- 2. These conditions do not generally apply to other property in the vicinity**

Staff Analysis. The conditions on this site do not generally apply to other adjacent properties. Parcels in the general vicinity are not impacted by three front setbacks in addition to side and rear setbacks requirements.

- 3. Because of these conditions, the application of the ordinance to the particular piece of property would effectively prohibit or unreasonably restrict the utilization of the property.**

Staff Analysis. The strict application of the ordinance would unreasonably restrict the design of the site and cause incompatibility with regards to the orientation of the structure along Boiling Springs Road.

- 4. The authorization of a variance will not be of substantial detriment to adjacent property or to the public good, and the character of the area will not be harmed by the granting of the variance.**

Staff Analysis. The authorization of a variance, as it relates to the setback reduction for the proposed structure, is not anticipated to have a negative impact on overall community character. In fact, the proposed site plan, in staff's estimation, is the best scenario for enhancing the appearance of the Corridor.

Attachments:

- 1. Aerial Map from GIS**
- 2. Variance Application**
- 3. Site plan**
- 4. Frontal view of project site**

Leigh MacDonald presented the Board with an aerial image, street view, and image of the structure to be demolished. Ms. MacDonald said that the applicant was seeking a reduction in the front setback(s) for McMillin Boulevard and Rainbow Lake Road. She said that the applicant would meet the requirements of the ordinance if they altered the proposed orientation of the building.

Ms. MacDonald stated that the orientation toward Boiling Springs Road would have a better appearance since the other nearby structures were also fronting on Boiling Springs Road. Mike Padgett asked if the structure were orientated to face McMillin Boulevard, if the site would meet the requirements of the ordinance. Ms. MacDonald said the ordinance could be met if the structure faced McMillan Boulevard.

Tom Davies asked if the reorientation of the building would give access to the two collector roads, Rainbow Lake Road and McMillin Boulevard. Ms. MacDonald said access would come from McMillin Boulevard and Rainbow Lake Road, but would not have access from Boiling Springs Road.

Ms. MacDonald said that the applicant was present and would be able to answer any questions the Board may have. She presented the Board with a rendering of the overall site and building.

Chairman Jack Gowan opened the public hearing.

Mr. Gowan asked if anyone was present to speak in favor of the variance.

Brian Miller was sworn in. Mr. Miller said that he was the civil engineer representing Mavis Tire and pointed out the entrances marked by black arrows. He said that operationally the bays and parking drive aisles were more conducive to the presented layout. Angela Geter asked if the access would be on McMillin if the variances were granted. Mr. Miller said yes, that it would shift the entrance to McMillin.

Chairman Gowan asked if anyone else wished to speak in favor of the variance. Hearing none, he asked if anyone was present to speak in opposition of the variance. Hearing none, he closed the public hearing.

The Board discussed the request among themselves.

Mike Padgett remarked that the proposed orientation would be more appealing and align with other businesses, but reorientation would not prohibit the use so he was not in favor of the variance request.

Kae Fleming made a motion to approve the variance request for a reduction in the front setback on McMillin Boulevard on the determination that the request meets all the criteria for granting a variance as set forth in Section 5.02-2(2) of the ULMO and the SC Local Government Comprehensive Planning Enabling Act (SC Code of Laws, Title 6, Chapter 29) as expressed in the Staff Report. Angela Geter seconded the motion. The motion carried with a vote of 4 to 2 with Tom Davies and Mike Padgett in opposition.

Angela Geter made a motion to approve the variance request for a reduction in the front setback on Rainbow Lake Road on the determination that the request meets all the criteria for granting a variance as set forth in Section 5.02-2(2) of the ULMO and the SC Local Government Comprehensive Planning Enabling Act (SC Code of Laws, Title 6, Chapter 29) as expressed in the Staff Report. Kae Fleming seconded the motion. The motion carried with a vote of 4 to 2 with Tom Davies and Mike Padgett in opposition.

- B. Variance Request:
 - CPC Livestock Nutrition Mill – 684 Edgefield Road
 - Tax Map Number: 3-07-00-139.00
 - Variance on Front Setback – Interstate 85

Leigh MacDonald presented the following staff report:

Variance Request

Staff Report

CPC Livestock Nutritional Mill			
Meeting Date: July 27, 2021			
Address	684 Edgefield Road, Cowpens	Ordinance	ULMO
Factual Dates	Variance Application Received	11/24/2020	
	Deadline for Variance	06/29/2021	
	Public Notice	07/11/2021	
	Adjoining Property Owner Notification	07/08/2021	
	Variance Signs Posted on Property	07/09/2021	
Applicant	B.J. Smith		
Applicant Status	Owner		
Map Number	3-07-00-139.00		
Acreage	32.18 acres		
Staff	Laurie Oakman		

Request:

2. The applicant is requesting to reduce the total front setback required in Section 2.02-1 Dimensional Standards, Table 3b – Commercial & All Other Uses - Setbacks and Other Requirements of the Unified Land Management Ordinance.

Type	Required Setback	Proposed Setback	Variance
Front Setback (I-85)	50 Feet	40.5 Feet	9.5 Feet

Background Information:

The subject site is currently occupied by CPC Livestock Nutritional Mill. The original building is approximately 15,250 square feet. The applicant is proposing to expand the existing building by 12,000 square feet largely on the front of the building because of the location of silos and internal operation of the business.

The property fronts directly on Interstate 85 which is classified as an Arterial Street and requiring a 50-foot variance. The staff mistakenly informed the applicant they did not need a variance because they fronted on a Collector Street (the frontage road), which would have required a front setback of forty (40) feet which the applicant would have been able to meet. The applicant relied on the information provided by staff to order their customized, pre-

fabricated building material for their addition, which is now onsite and awaiting a building permit.

Staff Position:

The 9.5-foot variance will not have a substantial impact in this location on I-85. The frontage road (Edgefield Road) is to be closed and end in a cul-de-sac at this site. The building addition, along with the required landscaping, will provide a better appearance along the I-85 corridor. There is no anticipated detriment to surrounding properties or the public good.

Staff Analysis:

The Board may grant a variance for an unnecessary hardship if it makes and explains in writing all of the following findings. The fact that property may be utilized more profitably, if a variance is granted, may not be considered grounds for a variance.

1. There are extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property

Staff Analysis. The subject property is impacted by the widening of Interstate 85. The building and its internal structure requires the location of silos on the left side that prohibit the expansion on that side.

2. These conditions do not generally apply to other property in the vicinity.

Staff Analysis. We do not know how many buildings in the vicinity have limiting factors internal to their operations. However, we did not find any that have existing external silos that limit where an expansion could be placed.

3. Because of these conditions, the application of the ordinance to the particular piece of property would effectively prohibit or unreasonably restrict the utilization of the property.

Staff Analysis. Strict application of the ordinance would not limit the applicant's ability to build their proposed addition but it will call for major changes to the existing building and its internal functioning.

4. The authorization of a variance will not be of substantial detriment to adjacent property or to the public good, and the character of the area will not be harmed by the granting of the variance.

Staff Analysis. The authorization of a variance, as it relates to the front setback, would not have a negative impact on overall community character. The ramp has been or will be closed, and there will no longer be access to the Interstate via Edgefield Road.

Attachments:

1. **Aerial Map from GIS**
2. **Variance Application**
3. **Site plan**
4. **Map of Road Construction from SCDOT website for I-85 Widening Project**
5. **Frontal view of project site**

Leigh MacDonald presented the Board with an aerial image, site plan, and street view. Ms. MacDonald said that staff had made an error and told the applicant that the setback would be for 40', the requirement for a collector road. She remarked that the actual frontage was on I-85 and the required setback would be 50' not 40' as initially stated by staff.

Ms. MacDonald stated that the applicant had purchased materials with the intention to build with a 40' setback and that SCDOT had denied access off I-85. She also said that there would not be a detriment to close the ramp from I-85 to Edgefield Road.

Chairman Jack Gowan asked if right-of-way would change if the ramp was closed. Director, Joan Holliday, said that it would be a part of the SCDOT right-of-way. The property line will not move.

Chairman Gowan opened the public hearing. He asked if anyone was present to speak in favor of the variance. Hearing none, he asked if anyone was present to speak in opposition. Hearing none, he closed the public hearing.

The Board discussed the request among themselves.

Angela Geter made a motion to approve the variance request for a reduction in the front setback to 40.5 feet from 50 feet on the determination that the request meets all the criteria for granting a variance as set forth in Section 5.02-2(2) of the ULMO and the SC Local Government Comprehensive Planning Enabling Act (SC Code of Laws, Title 6, Chapter 29) as expressed in the Staff Report. Kae Fleming seconded the motion. The motion carried with a vote of 6 to 0.

- C. Variance Request:
 Sugar N' Honey Wax Lounge – 1381 Boiling Springs Road
 Tax Map Number: 7-04-00-001.00
 Variance on Front Setback – Boiling Springs Road
 Variance on Left Side Setback

Leigh MacDonald presented the following staff reports:

Variance Request 1

Staff Report

Sugar N' Honey Wax Lounge			
Meeting Date: July 27, 2021			
Address	1381 Boiling Springs Road	Ordinance	ULMO
	Variance Application Received		06/29/2021

Factual Dates	Deadline for Variance	06/29/2021
	Public Notice	07/11/2021
	Adjoining Property Owner Notification	07/08/2021
	Variance Signs Posted on Property	07/09/2021
Applicant	Erik Horton	
Applicant Status	Engineer	
Map Number	7-04-00-001.00	
Acreage	1.30 acres	
Staff	Laurie Oakman	

Request:

1. The applicant is requesting to reduce the total front setback required in Section 2.02-1 Dimensional Standards, Table 3b – Commercial & All Other Uses - Setbacks and Other Requirements of the Unified Land Management Ordinance.

Type	Required Setback	Proposed Setback	Variance
Front Setback (Boiling Springs Road)	50 Feet	24.5 Feet	25.5 Feet

Background Information:

The subject site is currently vacant and was previously occupied as a single family residence. The structure is approximately 1,130 square feet and was built in 1951. The applicant is proposing a conversion from a single-family dwelling to a low-intensity commercial use. The dwelling unit was constructed prior to setback requirements.

Staff Position:

The subject site is currently non-conforming for both residential and commercial uses due to property setbacks. This setback reduction would allow the developer/applicant the ability to convert the residential structure to a commercial business.

Staff Analysis:

The Board may grant a variance for an unnecessary hardship if it makes and explains in writing all of the following findings. The fact that property may be utilized more profitably, if a variance is granted, may not be considered grounds. The subject site is currently non-conforming for both residential and commercial uses due to property setbacks. This setback reduction would allow the developer/applicant the ability to convert the residential structure to a commercial business.

1. **There are extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property.**

Staff Analysis. According to Spartanburg County Assessor records, the existing single-family residential building was constructed in 1951, prior to the adoption of the Unified Land Management Ordinance.

2. These conditions do not generally apply to other property in the vicinity

Staff Analysis. The conditions do apply to other properties in the general vicinity. Many adjacent parcels contain structures that were built prior to the existence of setback requirements and encroach into the required fifty-foot front setback. However, in order to utilize this structure as a commercial property and bring it into compliance, the applicant would be required to move the entire structure.

3. Because of these conditions, the application of the ordinance to the particular piece of property would effectively prohibit or unreasonably restrict the utilization of the property.

Staff Analysis. The current structure sits halfway into the required front setback, and therefore, cannot be converted to commercial use in its current state without a variance.

4. The authorization of a variance will not be of substantial detriment to adjacent property or to the public good, and the character of the area will not be harmed by the granting of the variance.

Staff Analysis. This portion of Boiling Springs Road is primarily residential and transitions to some commercial some distance north and south of the project location.

Attachments:

1. Aerial Map from GIS
2. Variance Application
3. Site plan
4. Frontal view of project site

Variance Request 2

Staff Report

Sugar N' Honey Wax Lounge			
Meeting Date: July 27, 2021			
Address	1381 Boiling Springs Road	Ordinance	ULMO
Factual Dates	Variance Application Received	06/29/2021	
	Deadline for Variance	06/29/2021	
	Public Notice	07/11/2021	
	Adjoining Property Owner Notification	07/08/2021	

	Variance Signs Posted on Property	07/09/2021
Applicant	Erik Horton	
Applicant Status	Engineer	
Map Number	7-04-00-001.00	
Acreage	1.30 acres	
Staff	Laurie Oakman	

Request:

- The applicant is requesting to reduce the total left side setback required in Section 2.02-1 Dimensional Standards, Table 3b – Commercial & All Other Uses - Setbacks and Other Requirements of the Unified Land Management Ordinance.

Type	Required Setback	Proposed Setback	Variance
Left Side Setback	15 Feet	13 Feet	2 Feet

Background Information:

The subject site is currently vacant and was previously occupied as a single family residence. The structure is approximately 1,130 square feet and was built in 1951. The applicant is proposing a conversion from a single-family dwelling to a low-intensity commercial use. The dwelling unit was constructed prior to setback requirements.

Staff Position:

The subject site is currently non-conforming for both residential and commercial uses due to property setbacks. However, if the structure were to remain residential, the existing structure would meet the side setback requirement of five (5) feet. The requested setback reduction would allow the developer/applicant the ability to convert the residential structure to a commercial business.

Staff Analysis:

The Board may grant a variance for an unnecessary hardship if it makes and explains in writing all of the following findings. The fact that property may be utilized more profitably, if a variance is granted, may not be considered grounds for a variance.

- There are extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property.**

Staff Analysis. According to Spartanburg County Assessor records, the existing single-family residential building was constructed in 1951, prior to the adoption of the Unified Land Management Ordinance.

2. These conditions do not generally apply to other property in the vicinity.

Staff Analysis. The conditions do apply to other properties in the general vicinity. Many adjacent parcels contain structures that were built prior to the existence of setback requirements.

3. Because of these conditions, the application of the ordinance to the particular piece of property would effectively prohibit or unreasonably restrict the utilization of the property.

Staff Analysis. The strict application of the ordinance would disallow the applicant's utilization of the existing residential structure for commercial use. The current structure does not meet the required side setback and, therefore, cannot be converted into a commercial use without a variance.

4. The authorization of a variance will not be of substantial detriment to adjacent property or to the public good, and the character of the area will not be harmed by the granting of the variance.

Staff Analysis. The encroachment currently exists along the adjoining residential property. A Class 1 bufferyard will be required in order to convert the property to a low intensity commercial use. This portion of Boiling Springs Road is primarily residential and transitions to some commercial some distance north and south of the project location.

Attachments:

- 1. Aerial Map from GIS**
- 2. Variance Application**
- 3. Site plan**
- 4. Frontal view of project site**

Leigh MacDonald presented the Board with an aerial image and pointed out nearby commercial and adjacent residential properties. Ms. MacDonald presented the site plan and the existing structure clearly located in the setback.

Ms. MacDonald said the applicant was seeking a reduction in the required front setback of 50' to 24.5' and a reduction in the side setback of 15' to 13'. She said that the structure would meet the side setback if it were to remain residential.

Ms. MacDonald stated that the building was erected before the latest ordinances were effective and that the structure would be unable to convert from residential to commercial use without approval of the variance requests.

Tom Davies asked how close the commercial properties were to the referenced parcel. Ms. MacDonald referred to the aerial image and directed the Board's attention to an auto body shop located across the road in addition to other commercial sites nearby. Mr. Davies remarked that this was a transitional area and several residential properties were converting from residential to

commercial.

Jack Gowan said that the structure was in compliance when it was built in 1951 and during that time the area changed, as well as the county ordinances.

Chairman Gowan opened the public hearing. He asked if anyone was present to speak in favor of the variance.

Ray Rogers was sworn in. Mr. Rogers said he was standing in for the current architect who was on vacation. Mr. Rogers said that there was a large amount of work completed on the site and that the covid-19 pandemic had already caused significant delays. He stated that the side setback would be minimal and the driveway going to the rear of the property would be closed.

Mr. Rogers said that the side setback buffer would be in compliance and that the landscape would incorporate additional trees. The existing concrete would be removed for a more favorable approach. He thanked the Board for their time and expressed that the applicant had the best of intentions to comply with the ordinance and convert the property from residential to commercial.

Chairman Gowan asked if anyone else was present to speak in favor the variance. Hearing none, he asked if anyone was present to speak in opposition. Hearing none, he closed the public hearing.

The Board discussed the request among themselves.

Mike Padgett made a motion to approve the variance request for a reduction in the front setback to 24.5' from 50' based on the determination that the request meets all the criteria for granting a variance as set forth in Section 5.02-2(2) of the ULMO and the SC Local Government Comprehensive Planning Enabling Act (SC Code of Laws, Title 6, Chapter 29) as expressed in the Staff Report. Tom Davies seconded the motion. The motion carried with a vote of 6 to 0.

Mike Padgett made a motion to approve the variance request for a reduction in the side setback to 13' from 15' based on the determination that the request meets all the criteria for granting a variance as set forth in Section 5.02-2(2) of the ULMO and the SC Local Government Comprehensive Planning Enabling Act (SC Code of Laws, Title 6, Chapter 29) as expressed in the Staff Report. Tom Davies seconded the motion. The motion carried with a vote of 6 to 0.

4. Other Business - None

5. Adjourn

There being no other business, Mike Padgett made a motion to adjourn. Angela Geter seconded the motion. The motion carried with a vote of 6 to 0.