

The Morehead City Board of Adjustment conducted a hybrid meeting on Thursday, December 10, 2020, in the Municipal Building Auditorium, 202 South 8th Street, Morehead City, NC, at 5:30 p.m. and also broadcast as a live video conference through Zoom. The following people were present:

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Chuck Sewell, Bill Stompf, Sarah West, Terry Senich, Taylor Ricketts, Bobby Schultz, and Judson Walton.

J. Brasfield participated via Zoom technology.

STAFF PRESENT: Planning Director Sandi Watkins, Zoning Enforcement Officer Jeannie Drake, Code Enforcement Officer Barb Lynch, Secretary Annie Bunnell, and City Attorney Derek Taylor.

OTHERS PRESENT: Chase Cullipher of The Cullipher Group, P.A., Tom Cullison, Guerry Stirling Willis, Joe Nasat, Attorney Russell Alexander, and Robert Jameson.

OTHERS PARTICIPATING VIA ZOOM: Melva Kearney, Katrina Smith, Christoph Hintze, and Elise Clouser with the Carteret News-Times.

Chairman Chuck Sewell called the meeting to order.

Board Secretary Annie Bunnell explained that the meeting was being held partially electronically through Zoom technology where participants who requested the link were able to view the meeting live and speak if necessary.

The roll was called and J. Hunt Brasfield was on-call via Zoom in case there were any conflicts of interest, but due to COVID concerns, he was not present. Gina Sanderson called in her absence. Judson Walton made **MOTION**, seconded by Terry Senich, to excuse the called-in absence. The motion carried unanimously.

MINUTES: *October 22, 2020*

Chairman Chuck Sewell called for changes or amendments to the minutes. Terry Senich made **MOTION**, seconded by Sarah West, to adopt the minutes as submitted and dispense with the reading. The motion carried unanimously.

BUSINESS:

A) Request submitted by Guerry Stirling Willis, on behalf of the Unitarian Coastal Fellowship Church, to establish a special-use permit under Article 11 of the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) for a church located at 2900 Bridges Street, zoned R10 (Single-Family Residential) District, a variance from Article 20 of the UDO to allow for a reduction of parking requirements from thirty-six (36) to twenty-three (23) parking spaces, and a variance from Article 14-9 of the UDO to allow for a reduction of the west side setback from fifty feet (50') to sixteen feet (16'), the north side setback from fifty feet (50') to eleven feet (11'), and the east side setback (front) from forty-five feet (45') to thirty-seven feet (37').

There were no objections from either side to the five members seated. Voting members were: Chuck Sewell, Bill Stompf, Sarah West, Terry Senich, and Judson Walton.

Those wishing to give testimony were sworn in (Jeannie Drake, Guerry Willis, Tom Cullison, Joe Nasat, Russell Alexander, Robert Jameson, and Chase Cullipher).

Bill Stompf made **MOTION**, seconded by Judson Walton, to open the public hearing. The motion carried unanimously.

Zoning Enforcement Officer Jeannie Drake introduced the case. Guerry Stirling Willis, on behalf of the Unitarian Coastal Fellowship Church, submitted a request to establish a special-use permit under Article 11 of the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) for a church located at 2900 Bridges Street, zoned R10 (Single-Family Residential) District, a variance from Article 20 of the UDO to allow for a reduction of parking requirements from thirty-six (36) to twenty-three (23) parking spaces, and a variance from Article 14-9 of the UDO to allow for a reduction of the west side setback from fifty feet (50') to sixteen feet (16'), the north side setback from fifty feet (50') to eleven feet (11'), and the east side setback (front) from forty-five feet (45') to thirty-seven feet (37').

A zoning map of the area was shown. The property is zoned R10; surrounding properties are zoned R10 to the west, Highway Commercial Conditional-Use (CH-CU) across Bridges Street to the south and across Church Street to the east, and R10 across Church Street to the northeast and north.

An aerial view of the property was shown followed by photographs of the surrounding area. The existing buildings at 2900 Bridges Street were shown; a single-family dwelling to the west as well as the light at Barbour Road; Morehead Plaza shopping center across Bridges Street to the south; Lowe's Foods to the southeast; the Salvation Army building to the east across Church Street; a single-family dwelling across Church Street to the east; a single-family dwelling directly behind the church to the north; and up Church Street to the north showing single-family properties.

The proposed site plan was shown. Ms. Drake discussed the requirements under Article 14-9 - Churches. Ms. Drake explained that there are three existing buildings on the property; a sanctuary, a building used for offices, and a shed. The church would like to demolish and rebuild the sanctuary, leaving the building used for offices and the shed in their current locations. The front setback requirement of twenty-five feet (25'), plus the front setback for R10 of twenty feet (20'), equals a total front setback requirement of forty-five feet (45'). This setback will be met. A variance from Article 14-9 is requested for a reduction of the west side setback from fifty feet (50') to sixteen feet (16'), the north side setback from fifty feet (50') to eleven feet (11') and the east side setback (Church Street front) from forty-five feet (45') to thirty-seven feet (37').

Parking requirements for churches were reviewed. Whenever a building not having off-street parking facilities in an amount herein specified is increased in floor area by more than fifty percent, parking spaces shall be provided and maintained for the building and any addition thereto; therefore, parking was calculated for both the proposed sanctuary and the existing offices. One space for each six (6) seats in the proposed one hundred thirty-four (134) seat sanctuary equals twenty-three (23) spaces. The office space requires one space for each two hundred fifty (250) square feet of gross floor area which equals thirteen (13) spaces for a total of thirty-six (36) spaces. A variance from Article 20 is requested to allow for a reduction of parking requirements from thirty-six (36) to twenty-three (23) parking spaces.

Regarding the special-use criteria of Article 4-8.3: The application was submitted indicating the correct section of the ordinance and that section does allow a "church" with a special-use permit. The

proposed development does not affect adversely the general plans for the physical development of the town as embodied in these regulations or in any plan or portion thereof adopted by the Planning Board and/or the Council. The property is located in Neighborhood Three (3) of the CAMA Land Use Plan and is classified as General Commercial. Land Use Plan section 4.2.7 Areas of Local Concern, Policy three (3) seems to promote the request: "Morehead City will continue to promote a variety of land uses which complement the residential, commercial, institutional, recreational and industrial needs of the community." Policy nine (9) also seems to promote the request: "Neighborhood-oriented commercial development will be encouraged only in areas where such use is compatible with existing surrounding and anticipated residential areas and where the street system is adequate to accommodate commercial vehicular traffic." The request does not appear to conflict with any of the Neighborhood Three (3) policy statements.

The proposed use will not be contrary to the purposes stated in the regulations. The proposal has not been found to be contrary to the purposes outlined in the UDO. Items D, E, F, and H will be addressed by the applicant.

The UDO requires the proposed use be placed on a lot of sufficient size to satisfy space requirements of the use, standards set forth for the use be met, minimum area, setback and other locational requirements of the district and parking requirements be met. Standards set forth for the use cannot be met without the requested variances. Any approval granted for the special use should be contingent upon both the setback and parking variances being granted. Landscaping requirements will be met per the submitted site plan.

The public hearing was properly advertised, and notices were mailed to property owners within one hundred feet (100') of the site. The property was posted per the statutory requirements. Staff has received four (4) inquiries concerning the public hearing sign. Ms. Drake requested the written report be accepted into evidence.

Chairman Sewell clarified with Ms. Drake that items D, E, F, and H would only be met contingent on the parking and setback variances being granted, to which Ms. Drake replied that was correct. Attorney Taylor asked Ms. Drake if the Town would like to propose any other conditions on the approval of the Special-Use Permit, to which Ms. Drake replied no.

Attorney Russell Alexander spoke on behalf of the Unitarian Coastal Fellowship Church to summarize the request. Attorney Alexander stated that site engineer Chase Cullipher was present, as well as design professional Robert James who would later be called to give testimony. Attorney Alexander stated that the Special-Use Permit is justified given that the existing use of the property has been a church as far back as 1956 and is harmonious with other uses in the vicinity. Attorney Alexander called Tom Cullison to the podium to present testimony concerning the congregation and background of the Unitarian Church.

Tom Cullison of 127 Hawkins Lane in Swansboro spoke and explained background information about the church location. Mr. Cullison said that co-chairpersons Guerry Stirling Willis and Joe Nasat of the Unitarian Church Board of Trustees, as well as members of the design and building team were present to represent the Church. In 2018, the Church applied to the Board for a Special-Use Permit at their former location on Evans Street and for a parking area on Arendell Street. The requests were both approved by the Board, but the structure sustained significant damage during Hurricane Florence and the church withdrew the offer to purchase. The existing church at 2900 Bridges Street was purchased by the Unitarian Coastal Fellowship Church on February 12, 2019, and at that time was leased to the Impact Church. The sanctuary was deeded in 1956 and the Sunday school building was built at a later date. They have always been used as a church. The adjacent parcel at 204

Church Street was originally the parsonage for the church, with both appearing to be on the same lot on the original deed. The property was divided sometime after 1999. On April 11, 2019, the Church decided to move ahead with the Sunday school building renovation. In 2019, permits for roofing, mechanical, and renovations were issued. A fire alarm permit was finalized in July of 2020. The Church also wanted to renovate the existing sanctuary but after talking with others, replacing the building was the better option. There were existing structural and electrical problems, and the building was below grade which made it susceptible to flooding. The Board of Trustees voted to replace the structure due to those issues, rather than renovating the existing building and he believes the new structure will provide a nice aesthetic to the neighborhood. Mr. Cullison testified that the congregation is currently around one hundred (100) members with about twenty (20) others that participate in activities. An average is about fifty-four (54) attendees per week.

Attorney Alexander called upon Chase Cullipher of The Cullipher Group, P.A. to address the special-use criteria. Mr. Cullipher spoke and said he was the Vice President of The Cullipher Group located at 151-A Highway 24, Morehead City. He testified that he was a land surveyor and engineer and graduated in 2006 with a bachelor's degree in civil engineering and began doing site design and permitting at his first job for Raleigh and Cary, North Carolina. In 2009, Mr. Cullipher joined another engineering firm that specialized in greenway trails. Six (6) years ago Mr. Cullipher moved back to Carteret County and currently specializes in site development planning. Attorney Alexander asked Mr. Cullipher how many times he had appeared before the board, to which Mr. Cullipher replied approximately a dozen times. Attorney Alexander then asked that the Board accept Mr. Cullipher as an expert in the field.

Mr. Cullipher stated that the church reached out to his firm requesting engineering and site planning services. There were originally two different options. Due to costs, the Church has chosen to proceed with the site plan that was included in the Board's Agenda packets. The proposed site plan will raise up the sanctuary while keeping it around the same square footage as the existing structure and will maximize the parking area. Mr. Cullipher testified that the existing facility has a gravel parking area with no clear ingress and egress which will be improved as part of this request. Mr. Cullipher submitted several exhibits into evidence which highlighted a small rectangle of buildable area where the structure could be rebuilt if no variances were approved.

Mr. Cullipher explained that a variance has also been requested from setbacks and from parking. Parking spaces for the sanctuary have been met at twenty-three (23) spaces, but there is also an office which requires additional spaces. The office is typically accessed by one office person during each weekday. Setback variances will also be necessary on three property lines: north, east, and west in order to build in the desired location. Setbacks on the southern property line located along Bridges Street will be met.

Sarah West asked Mr. Cullipher if the proposed ingress and egress improvements will require new curb cuts. Mr. Cullipher replied that the entrance from Bridges Street will line up with the existing curb cut, which was done purposefully to avoid the need to request a new curb cut from the Department of Transportation as well as to maintain the same traffic pattern for the general public. The entrance from Church Street has been relocated and traffic will only be allowed entrance from Bridges Street and must exit onto Church Street. Ms. West asked Mr. Cullipher if the exit onto Church Street will be lined up with the entrance to the Salvation Army property, to which Mr. Cullipher replied he was not sure. Ms. West asked Mr. Cullipher if he could speak to the elevation of the property. Mr. Cullipher said that the site had been surveyed by Simmons Surveying in Havelock, and that they have the property at eighteen-to-twenty (18-20) feet above sea level. Mr. Cullipher said that it is roughly twenty-one (21) feet close to Bridges Street; however, there is a low spot to the west of the sanctuary building and when it rains, the stormwater is trapped there and can only go toward the sanctuary. The

proposed new sanctuary will be elevated to prevent flooding. Attorney Alexander requested that the Board accept the exhibits provided by Mr. Cullipher into evidence.

Mr. Cullison and Attorney Alexander addressed the special-use criteria:

D) The proposed use will not affect adversely the health and safety of residents and workers in the town. Mr. Cullison said that the proposed use will continue to be used in the same way it has been for more than fifty (50) years, and no complaints have been received during that time. Attorney Alexander also stated that the use is allowed by the ordinance with a Special-Use Permit from this Board.

E) The proposed use will not be detrimental to the use or development of adjacent properties or other neighborhood uses. Mr. Cullison said that the buildings have been used for a church since before zoning laws were enacted. He has shared the Church's plans with neighbors and has received no negative feedback. The Church will replace landscaping buffers and will prevent illuminating neighboring homes. Attorney Alexander testified that the church sits on a developed residential block and the use is harmonious with the immediate vicinity.

F) The proposed use will not be adversely affected by existing uses. Mr. Cullison stated that the existing use is the same for which they plan to use it. Attorney Alexander testified that it has been continuously used as a church for more than fifty (50) years.

H) The proposed use will not constitute a nuisance or hazard because of the number of persons who will attend or use such facility, of the vehicular movement, or noise or fumes or of the type of physical activity. Mr. Cullison said that, again, the proposed use is to continue as a church. There have been no complaints about previous congregations or the Unitarian Church. The traffic will be improved by moving the parking area away from the neighbors. Attorney Alexander said that Mr. Cullison had addressed the number of attendees in the church congregation as fifty to one-hundred (50-100) depending on the week. The proposed plan allows for one-hundred twenty-four (124) congregants. Attorney Alexander also said that a letter had been received from the Salvation Army allowing overflow parking on their property which is adjacent to the subject property. Attorney Alexander asked the Board to accept the letter into evidence. There were no objections from the Board and the letter was entered into evidence.

Attorney Alexander addressed the parking variance criteria:

1) Unnecessary hardship would result from the strict application of the ordinance. It shall not be necessary to demonstrate that, in the absence of the variance, no reasonable use can be made of the property. Attorney Alexander stated that, due to the size of the property, thirty-six (36) parking spaces are not physically possible. There are also shape issues not created by the Unitarian Church, but created when the property was subdivided to separate the church from the parsonage. Prior to the subdivision, the size was closer to a whole acre, and the required parking spaces would likely have been able to fit.

2) The hardship results from conditions that are peculiar to the property, such as location, size, or topography. Hardships resulting from personal circumstances, as well as hardships resulting from conditions that are common to the neighborhood or the general public, may not be the basis for granting a variance. The Church would be very limited as to what could be built there in the absence of the requested variances due to the small and odd shape of the property.

3) *The hardship did not result from actions taken by the applicant or the property owner. The act of purchasing property with knowledge that circumstances exist that may justify the granting of the variance shall not be regarded as a self-created hardship.* There are limitations on this lot which were imposed when subdivided. The Church purchased the property long after the subdivision of the church and parsonage.

4) *The requested variance is consistent with the spirit, purpose, and intent of the ordinance, such that public safety is secured, and substantial justice is achieved.* Attorney Alexander spoke to the section in the UDO that describes the intent, which indicates that the Town's Planners realized there were nonconforming uses created during times when fewer standards were in place and that the regulations must be flexible. The purpose of the UDO is to promote harmonious development. The church along Bridges Street is located along a commercial section of Town, and it makes sense to have a structure of this nature as a transition between the commercial area and the residential neighborhood behind the church. Justice will be achieved because the Unitarian Church must be treated fairly; they purchased the property with a building that they are unable to use. If the Church does not receive the requested variances, the property would no longer fit their purpose as it would be too small. Allowing the parking space requirements to be combined with the adjacent property would fit in with the intent of the ordinance. The church's peak hours are Sundays and evenings when the Salvation Army is closed, and again, the Salvation Army has given the Church written permission to use the spaces.

Attorney Alexander addressed the setback variance criteria:

1) *Unnecessary hardship would result from the strict application of the ordinance. It shall not be necessary to demonstrate that, in the absence of the variance, no reasonable use can be made of the property.* Attorney Alexander testified that there is insufficient acreage to do what the church needs to do to build a new sanctuary building, retain the Sunday school and office building, and meet the required setbacks. The existing sanctuary is below grade and floods which has caused water damage as well as other structural and electrical issues.

2) *The hardship results from conditions that are peculiar to the property, such as location, size, or topography. Hardships resulting from personal circumstances, as well as hardships resulting from conditions that are common to the neighborhood or the general public, may not be the basis for granting a variance.* Attorney Alexander testified that Mr. Cullipher's exhibit was clear in that the Church would be very limited as to what could be built there in the absence of the requested variances. The use is non-conforming but has always been a church. The parcel has been modified and is now only about half the size it once was and oddly shaped.

3) *The hardship did not result from actions taken by the applicant or the property owner. The act of purchasing property with knowledge that circumstances exist that may justify the granting of the variance shall not be regarded as a self-created hardship.* Again, the property was subdivided by prior owners and not the fault of the Unitarian Church.

4) *The requested variance is consistent with the spirit, purpose, and intent of the ordinance, such that public safety is secured, and substantial justice is achieved.* By granting these variances, we make sure that the preexisting use is maintained on this property. The proposed building will be aesthetically much nicer and will include new landscaping and buffers. The proposed new sanctuary building will be brought back to be even with the Sunday school building for a symmetrical look and

nice flow. The parking area will also be upgraded from the existing gravel; overall, a nicer look for the community. Without the setback variances, the Church will be unable to direct the parking away from the residential areas. Justice will be served by granting the variances.

Attorney Taylor asked Attorney Alexander if Mr. Jameson had any testimony to present. Attorney Alexander stated that Mr. Jameson was on the Smithson design team and brought a rendering of the proposed church building. The rendering was presented to the Board and there was no objection as it was asked to be entered into evidence.

Attorney Alexander concluded the testimony by summarizing the Church's position. He stated that the Board had received testimony from Mr. Cullison that the building had been continually used as a church since 1956, and that the large contiguous parcel that previously included the parsonage was later subdivided. He said that between having to observe a fifty-foot (50') setback on the west and north sides, along with the oblong shape of the property, made it undesirable for development. The proposed new sanctuary will be similar in size, and will be symmetrical and even with the existing Sunday school building and connected via a breezeway. The new building will add curb appeal to this area of town with the addition of new landscaping and paved parking. Attorney Alexander stated that, in the absence of the variances, the church would only be allowed to build upon a small rectangular area and would not be able to move the parking area away from the residences. The proposed plan takes the parking area and puts it up front along the main thoroughfare with existing traffic and commercial uses. This will reduce the impact of fumes or traffic to the residential neighborhood behind the church.

Sarah West asked Mr. Cullison if the usual Sunday attendance was around fifty (50) people. Mr. Cullison said that he had taken an average of attendance for the year 2019 and the attendance was around fifty-four (54) people per week. Ms. West then asked Mr. Cullison if there was street parking on Church Street. Mr. Cullison testified that there was no available parking on Church Street, but between the twenty-three (23) spots the Church was able to create and the twenty-five (25) spots in the Salvation Army parking lot, they would provide more than enough places for the weekly attendees.

Sarah West stated the church's membership may grow, and she felt that the exit onto Church Street would be easier to cross if it were to line up with the entrance to the Salvation Army. Ms. West stated that many churches in the downtown area have requested a crosswalk. Mr. Cullison stated that Church Street is not a busy street, but that if it becomes an issue, he would look into also requesting a crosswalk. Attorney Alexander stated that was a good point to consider as the plans have not been finalized and could still be altered.

Chairman Sewell asked the Town if there were any conditions that the Town would like placed on the request. Ms. Drake replied no, but that the variances would need approval before the Board would be able to grant the Special-Use Permit.

With no other questions for the applicant or speakers on the request, Chairman Sewell called for a motion to close the public hearing.

Bill Stompf made **MOTION**, seconded by Terry Senich, to close the public hearing. The motion carried unanimously.

The Board entered into deliberations on each of the parking variance criteria addressed by the applicant. Bill Stompf stated that he felt an unnecessary hardship would result from the strict application of the ordinance due to the fact it would be impossible to fit the required number of parking spaces to construct a new sanctuary. Chairman Sewell agreed based on the amount of physical land and that the applicants are attempting to make the best possible use of it. All members agreed that a hardship would be created in the absence of a variance.

Bill Stompf stated that for item two (2), the hardship would result from conditions that are peculiar to the property, such as location, size, or topography and were not self-created. He stated that the lot is a peculiar shape, and that the desire to move parking away from the residences has also been reflected in the submittal. Chairman Sewell agreed, and said that the parking area moved away from the residences was thoughtfully designed. All Board members agreed that the property's peculiar shape has created a hardship for the Church.

For item three (3), Bill Stompf stated that he felt it was clear that the hardship did not result from actions taken by the applicant, but as a result of a prior owner having had the property subdivided. Chairman Sewell agreed, stating that the applicant is making the best of working with what they have. All Board members agreed the hardship was not created by the applicant.

For item four (4), the requested variance is consistent with the spirit, purpose, and intent of the ordinance, such that public safety is secured, and substantial justice is achieved. Bill Stompf stated he felt this was true as the UDO allows flexibility for property owners to work with the Town as referenced by Attorney Alexander's testimony. Chairman Sewell stated that he agreed that the applicants had presented a viable plan to meet the parking needs of the church. All Board members agreed that the variance will meet the intent of the UDO and provide justice for the Church.

Bill Stompf made **MOTION**, seconded by Terry Senich, to grant a variance from parking requirements to allow for a reduction of parking spaces from thirty-six (36) to twenty-three (23). The motion carried unanimously.

The Board entered into deliberations on each of the setback variance criteria addressed by the applicant. Bill Stompf stated that he felt unnecessary hardship would result from the strict application of the ordinance as it would be practically impossible to construct a new facility within the setback requirements without a variance. All Board members agreed that a hardship exists.

For item two (2), Bill Stompf stated that he agreed the hardship results from conditions that are peculiar to the property, such as location, size, or topography due to the odd shape of the property following the subdivision. Chairman Sewell said it will be an improvement to the property. Judson Walton stated that they wish to rebuild an elevated structure to prevent flooding currently taking place in the existing structure. All Board members agreed that the hardship resulted in conditions unique to the property.

For item three (3), Bill Stompf stated that, as mentioned on the parking variance, the hardship did not result from actions taken by the applicant because it was subdivided by a previous owner. The proposed new layout gives the property a better flow. Chairman Sewell said that the applicants are making the best use of the property given the limitations. All Board members agreed that the hardship did not result from actions taken by the applicant.

For item four (4), the requested variance is consistent with the spirit, purpose, and intent of the ordinance, such that public safety is secured, and substantial justice is achieved. Bill Stompf stated that he felt the variance would be in compliance with the UDO. All Board members agreed.

Terry Senich made **MOTION**, seconded by Judson Walton, to grant the variances from setback requirements to allow for a reduction of the west side setback from fifty feet (50') to sixteen feet (16'), the north side setback from fifty feet (50') to eleven feet (11'), and the east side setback (front) from forty-five feet (45') to thirty-seven feet (37'). The motion carried unanimously.

The Board entered into deliberations on each of the special-use criteria addressed by the applicant. All members agreed that the proposed use will not affect adversely the health and safety of residents and workers in the town.

Chairman Sewell stated that for item (E), the proposed use will not be detrimental to the use or development of adjacent properties or other neighborhood uses because the property is located in a residential neighborhood and will continue to be the same use that has always been located on the property. There would be no change for the adjacent properties. All Board members agreed.

For item (F), all the proposed use will not be affected adversely by the existing uses as it would remain a church and continue to hold church activities. Chairman Sewell said the property had been a church as long as he could remember. All Board members agreed.

The proposed use will not constitute a nuisance or hazard because of the number of persons who will attend or use such facility, of the vehicular movement, or noise or fumes or of the type of physical activity. All Board members agreed that item (H) had been met.

CONSIDERATION AND DETERMINATION OF CASE HEARD:

All Board Members agreed on the following:

- D) The proposed use will not affect adversely the health and safety of residents and workers in the town;
- E) The proposed use will not be detrimental to the use or development of adjacent properties or other neighborhood uses;
- F) The proposed use will not be affected adversely by the existing uses; and
- H) The proposed use will not constitute a nuisance or hazard because of the number of persons who will attend or use such facility, of the vehicular movement, or noise or fumes or of the type of physical activity.

Bill Stompf made **MOTION**, seconded by Terry Senich, to grant the Special-Use Permit for a church. The motion carried unanimously.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

The Order from the October 22, 2020, meeting agenda item was presented by Staff. Chairman Chuck Sewell called for changes or amendments to the ORDER.

Terry Senich made **MOTION**, seconded by Bill Stompf, to approve the Horne Storage Special-Use Permit ORDER as submitted. The motion carried unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS:

There was no new business discussed.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further requests or comments, the meeting was adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

Annie Bunnell, Secretary