

**SUMNER COUNTY ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
MINUTES
6:00 P.M.
NOVEMBER 8, 2007**

SUMNER COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
COMMITTEE MEETING ROOM # 112
355 N. BELVEDERE DRIVE
GALLATIN, TN 37066

MEMBERS PRESENT:
MARK MCKEE JR., CHAIRMAN
JAMES COLE
ALTON PERDUE
MIKE WILLIAMS, ALTERNATE

MEMBERS ABSENT:
BRUCE RAINEY, VICE CHAIRMAN
SANDY WEBSTER

OTHERS PRESENT:
GARY L. HAMMOCK, BUILDING COMMISSIONER
LISA WILLIAMS, ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT

MOTION FOR APPROVAL OF OCTOBER MINUTES BY MR. COLE, SECONDED BY MR. PERDUE. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

1. PHILIP PROCTOR WAS REQUESTING A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO OPERATE A WATER PURIFICATION BUSINESS LOCATED WITHIN A PROPOSED NEW STRUCTURE, APPROXIMATELY 24 X 30 FEET, WITH THREE (3) EMPLOYEES. THERE WILL BE NO SIGNS AND NO ON SITE RETAIL SALES, ONLY OCCASIONAL DELIVERIES. SUBJECT PROPERTY IS LOCATED AT 200 HESTER ROAD, PORTLAND, TN., IS ON TAX MAP 51, PARCEL 23. LOT SIZE IS APPROXIMATELY 4.75 ACRES AND IS ZONED AGRICULTURAL.

THIS WAS A PUBLIC HEARING AND WAS ADVERTISED IN THE GALLATIN NEWS EXAMINER ON OCTOBER 28, 2007. THE ADJOINING PROPERTY OWNERS WERE NOTIFIED BY CERTIFIED MAIL.

MR. PROCTOR CAME FORWARD TO EXPLAIN HIS REQUEST. MR. PROCTOR STATED THAT THERE WOULD BE NO SIGNS, NO ON SITE RETAIL SALES, NO NOISE, AND NO ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT TO THIS BUSINESS. MR. PROCTOR STATED THAT HE TAKES WHITE HOUSE WATER THEN IT GOES THROUGH AN IONIZED PROCESS, WHICH BASICALLY RAISES THE PH OF THE WATER, THAN HE DELIVERS THIS WATER ON HIS ROUTE. AT THIS POINT, MR. PROCTOR STATED THAT HE WAS DISTRIBUTING THE WATER, BUT IS WORKING TOWARD DOING THE IONIZED PROCESS HIMSELF. HE HAS TO GET THE CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT BEFORE APPLYING TO THE STATE FOR THIS APPROVAL TO IONIZE THE WATER.

CHAIRMAN MCKEE OPENED THE FLOOR FOR A PUBLIC HEARING.

WAYNE BANDY WAS PRESENT TO SPEAK ON BEHALF OF HIS GRANDMOTHER, WHO OWNS 70 ACRES THAT ADJOINS MR. PROCTOR'S PROPERTY. MR. BANDY STATED THAT HER CONCERNS ARE THAT EVEN IF YOU START SMALL THE BUSINESS WILL GROW. MR. BANDY ALSO STATED THAT HIS GRANDMOTHER DID NOT FEEL A RESIDENTIAL AREA IS THE PLACE FOR A BUSINESS. HER FEAR IS ALSO AS THE BUSINESS GROWS SO WILL THE TRAFFIC, NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES, AND THIS WILL BRING PROPERTY VALUES DOWN. MR. BANDY STATED THAT HIS GRANDMOTHER DID NOT WANT THIS NEXT TO HER PROPERTY.

CHAIRMAN MCKEE CLOSED THE PUBLIC HEARING.

MR. PROCTOR CAME BACK WITH A REBUTTAL, BY SAYING THE RESTRICTION ON THIS BUSINESS IS THAT THERE WILL NEVER BE MORE THAN THREE (3) EMPLOYEES. MR. PROCTOR STATED HE NEVER ANTICIPATES THIS TO BE A BIG BUSINESS, AND HE DID NOT SEE WHERE TRAFFIC WOULD BE AN ISSUE. MR. PROCTOR STATED THAT THERE WOULD NOT BE ANY RETAIL SALES OUT OF THE BUILDING AT ALL.

THERE WAS DISCUSSION.

MR. BANDY ASKED THE BOARD MEMBERS IF HE (MR. PROCTOR) COULD EXPAND THIS BUSINESS AT A LATER DATE WITHOUT COMING BACK AND ASKING THIS BODY FOR APPROVAL.

CHAIRMAN MCKEE RESPONDED TO MR. BANDY BY SAYING HE (MR. PROCTOR) WOULD HAVE TO COME BACK BEFORE THIS BODY TO EXPAND THIS BUSINESS.

MR. HAMMOCK ASKED MR. PROCTOR IF THE STORAGE CONTAINER WOULD BE REMOVED. MR. PROCTOR RESPONDED TO MR. HAMMOCK BY SAYING THIS CONTAINER WOULD BE MOVED AS QUICKLY AS POSSIBLE WHEN THEY START DOING SITE PREPARATION FOR THE BUILDING.

MOTION FOR APPROVAL BY MR. COLE FOR A PERIOD OF ONE YEAR AND AT THAT TIME HE WOULD HAVE TO COME BACK TO THIS BODY, SECONDED BY MR. PERDUE. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

2. SAM ALBERT WAS REQUESTING A VARIANCE TO BUILD A PRIVATE STORAGE BUILDING ON A NON-BUILDABLE RESIDENTIAL LOT. THIS IS A NON-BUILDABLE LOT DUE TO LACK OF SOIL SUITABLE FOR A SEPTIC SYSTEM, (SEE ATTACHED). THE STORAGE BUILDING WILL BE USED TO STORE A TRACTOR, BOAT, TRUCK, YARD EQUIPMENT AND TOOLS. SUBJECT PROPERTY IS LOCATED AT 1140 BLEDSOE DRIVE, CASTALIAN SPRINGS, TN., IS ON TAX MAP 128, PARCEL 12.06. LOT SIZE IS APPROXIMATELY 3.14 ACRES AND IS ZONED R1A.

THIS WAS A PUBLIC HEARING AND WAS ADVERTISED IN THE GALLATIN NEWS EXAMINER ON OCTOBER 26, 2007. THE ADJOINING PROPERTY OWNERS WERE NOTIFIED BY CERTIFIED MAIL.

MR. ALBERT CAME FORWARD TO EXPLAIN HIS REQUEST. MR. ALBERT STATED THAT HE ALSO OWNED THE HOUSE ACROSS THE STREET FROM SUBJECT PROPERTY. HE STATED HE PURCHASED THE SUBJECT PROPERTY (WHICH IS ACROSS THE STREET FROM HIS HOME) DUE TO LIMITED PARKING AND STORAGE AT HIS HOME. MR. ALBERT STATED THAT HE REMOVED TREES, BUSHOGGED, PLANTED FLOWERS BEDS AT ROAD AND APPLIED FOR PERMIT ON SUBJECT PROPERTY. AT PERMIT APPLICATION TIME, THE BUILDING COMMISSIONER INFORMED MR. ALBERT THAT THE ONLY BUILDING THAT COULD BE BUILT ON THIS PROPERTY WITHOUT A PERMIT WOULD BE A BARN. HE STATED THAT HE MOVED THE EXISTING CONTAINER ON THE PROPERTY AND STARTED BUILDING A BARN TYPE SHED. AFTER CONSTRUCTION OF BARN HAD BEGUN CODES CAME OUT AND POSTED A STOP WORK ORDER. MR. ALBERT STATED THAT HE WENT TO THE BUILDING COMMISSIONERS OFFICE AND WAS ASKED WHAT WAS TO BE STORED IN THE PROPOSED BARN, AND I REPLIED TRUCKS, BOATS. AT THIS POINT THEY TOLD ME THAT THAT DID NOT QUALIFY FOR A BARN DUE TO WHAT I PROPOSED TO BE STORING IN THE BARN.

THE BUILDING COMMISSIONER TOLD ME IN ORDER TO GET A BUILDING PERMIT THAT I WAS TO EITHER GET THE PROPERTY PLATTED AND PERKED OR OBTAIN A VARIANCE FROM THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEAL.

MR. ALBERT READ ALOUD THE CONCERNS OF THE ADJOINING PROPERTY OWNERS THAT WERE VOICED AT A MEETING ON 11/4/07 REGARDING HIS PROPOSED BARN/GARAGE AND HIS REPLY TO THEIR CONCERNS. THEY HAD CONCERNS ABOUT SURFACE RUN OFF, SIZE AND APPEARANCE OF BUILDING, OUTSIDE STORAGE, WILDLIFE HABITAT AND THE STORAGE CONTAINER.

MR. ALBERT'S RESPONSES WERE THE FOLLOWING TO THE NEIGHBORS CONCERNS AT THE MEETING HELD ON 11/4/07; HE WOULD MAINTAIN 50% OF PROPERTY IN NATURAL STATE, BUILDING WILL BE 20' X 28', NOTHING STORED OUTSIDE GARAGE BUT ONE SERVICEABLE BOAT AND ONE SERVICEABLE VEHICLE, ONE OUTSIDE LIGHT WILL BE MOTION CONTROL, IF THERE IS ANY VANDALISM I WOULD LIKE TO TURN THE LIGHT ON DUST TO DAWN, AND THE STORAGE CONTAINER WILL BE REMOVED UPON COMPLETION OF CONSTRUCTION OF BUILDING. MR. ALBERT STATED THAT HE RECEIVED NO COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM THE NEIGHBORS SINCE THAT MEETING.

CHAIRMAN MCKEE OPENED THE FLOOR FOR THE PUBLIC HEARING.

FOR THE RECORD, THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT RECEIVED A LETTER VOICING THEIR SUPPORT FOR MR. ALBERT TO ADD A STORAGE BUILDING FROM DON AND MARTHA DRAYTON.

JEANETTE CLARK CAME FORWARD TO EXPRESS HER CONCERNS FOR THE PROPOSED STORAGE BUILDING AND HOW IT WILL LOOK. SHE STATED THAT HER RESTRICTIONS STATE THAT A MOBILE HOME CAN NOT BE LOCATED ON THE LOT AND THIS HAS TO BE USED AS A RESIDENTIAL LOT ONLY. SHE WONDERED ABOUT THE GARDEN HOSE THAT IS CURRENTLY THERE AND STRETCHES ALL THE WAY ACROSS THE ROAD AND WONDERED IF THAT WOULD STAY THERE PERMANENTLY.

CHAIRMAN MCKEE STATED THAT SINCE THIS LOT WILL NOT PERK THAT WOULD ELIMINATE THE CHANCES FOR A HOME TO EVER BE BUILT ON THIS PARCEL.

GERI WEIDNER CAME FORWARD TO OPPOSE THE REQUESTED VARIANCE. MS. WEIDNER GAVE THE BOARD MEMBERS PICTURES OF THE LOT AND WHAT IS ON THERE CURRENTLY.

CHAIRMAN MCKEE RESPONDED TO MS. WEIDNER'S PICTURES BY SAYING THAT MR. ALBERT DID NEED TO CLEAN THE PLACE UP SOME.

MR. HAMMOCK TOLD THIS BOARD THAT ACCESSORY STRUCTURES ARE ALLOWED IN THIS ZONING DISTRICT.

MR. WILLIAMS ASKED MR. HAMMOCK WHAT THE EXTERIOR OF MOST OF THE STORAGE BUILDINGS WERE.

MR. HAMMOCK RESPONDED TO MR. WILLIAMS BY SAYING MOST OF THE EXTERIOR OF THE STORAGE BUILDINGS IN THIS AREA WERE VINYL, AND THE CARPORTS ARE METAL. MR. HAMMOCK STATED THAT MR. ALBERT WAS ASKING FOR A METAL TYPE STRUCTURE, WHICH IS NOT TYPICAL OF THE EXISTING STORAGE BUILDINGS IN THIS AREA.

SHERYL SHELTON CAME FORWARD TO OPPOSE THIS VARIANCE. MRS. SHELTON STATED SHE HATED THAT THEY (ADJOINING PROPERTY OWNERS) HAD TO OPPOSE THIS VARIANCE IN ORDER TO PROTECT THEIR INVESTMENTS. MS. SHELTON POSED ONE QUESTION "WILL GRANTING THIS VARIANCE BENEFIT, IMPROVE OR IS IT AN ASSET ENVIRONMENTALLY, ESTHETICALLY OR ECONOMICALLY TO THE SURROUNDING PROPERTIES AND NEIGHBORHOOD OR BE DETRIMENTAL.

DEBBY DERRYBERRY CAME FORWARD TO SPEAK AGAINST THIS REQUEST. THIS PROPOSED USE OF THIS LOT DOES NOT INTEGRATE WITH THE EXISTING HOMES.

RHONDA FULKERSON CAME FORWARD TO SPEAK AGAINST THIS VARIANCE FOR FEAR THIS PROPOSED BUILDING MAY CAUSE MORE WATER TO STAND IN HER YARD FROM DITCH RUN OFF, AND WAS OPPOSED TO THE SECURITY LIGHT THIS IS PROPOSED, ETC. WHEN WILL THE STORAGE CONTAINER AND STEEL LEAN-TO THAT ARE CURRENTLY ON THE PROPERTY BE REMOVED? ON THE PROPOSED STRUCTURE WHICH DIRECTION WILL THE GARAGE DOOR FACE? HOW WILL THE SECURITY LIGHTS OUTSIDE THE PROPOSED BUILDING BE OPERATED? THE QUESTIONS FOR THE NOVEMBER 8, 2007 ZONING BOARD MEETING CONCERNING THE SAM ALBERT ISSUE WAS MADE PART OF THE MINUTES.

DAN FULKERSON CAME FORWARD TO ASK THE BOARD THAT WE BE PROVIDED A SITE PLAN FOR THIS DEVELOPMENT. IF THIS VARIANCE IS GRANTED WILL THERE BE OTHER VARIANCES GRANTED?

RON HONEYCUTT CAME FORWARD TO SPEAK IN OPPOSITION TO THE REQUEST. MR. HONEYCUTT REQUESTED THAT THIS LAND REMAIN RESIDENTIAL AND NOT BE UTILIZED AS A SHOP AND FOR PERSONAL BUSINESS USE. HE ASKED THE BOARD NOT TO SET A PRECEDENT FOR THIS AREA.

MR. WILLIAMS STATED THAT SEVERAL TIMES THIS HAS BEEN MENTIONED THAT YOU WOULD USE THIS IN YOUR BUSINESS.

MR. ALBERT RESPONDED TO MR. WILLIAMS THAT THIS PROPOSED BUILDING WILL NEVER BE USED FOR A BUSINESS.

MR. WILLIAMS ASKED MR. ALBERT IF THIS WOULD STRICTLY BE A RESIDENTIAL STORAGE?

MR. ALBERT RESPONDED TO MR. WILLIAMS' QUESTION BY SAYING "YES SIR".

LES BUMBALOW CAME FORWARD TO OPPOSE THIS REQUEST. THIS LOT IS CLASSIFIED AS "NON-BUILDABLE" IF THIS IS CHANGED WILL THE OWNERS BE ABLE TO CONSTRUCT WHATEVER THEY WISH IF THIS VARIANCE IS LIFTED? IF THIS PROPERTY IS CLASSIFIED AS RESIDENTIAL DOES IT HAVE TO HAVE A DWELLING ON THE PROPERTY AND WHAT IS THE TIME FRAME IN WHICH CONSTRUCTION IS TO BEGIN? MR. BUMBALOW STATED THAT MR. ALBERT HAS STATED TO ME THAT HE HAS NO INTENTION OF EVER BUILDING A HOUSE ON THIS PROPERTY. WHAT ARE THE HOMEOWNERS OPTIONS IF MR. ALBERT STARTS TO DO COMMERCIAL WORK ON THIS PROPERTY RELATED TO HIS BUSINESS IN NASHVILLE? ALSO WILL THERE BE LARGE TYPE OF EQUIPMENT, MACHINERY AND MATERIALS STORED ON THIS PROPERTY, OTHER THAN THE NORMAL ITEMS THAT ARE NEEDED FOR THE HOME?

JOYCE BUMBALOW CAME FORWARD TO SPEAK AGAINST THIS VARIANCE. SHE WAS TOLD WHEN WE BOUGHT OUR PROPERTY THEY TOLD US THAT NOTHING WOULD EVER BE BUILT ON SUBJECT PROPERTY BECAUSE IT WAS RESIDENTIAL AND WOULD NOT PERK. MRS. BUMBALOW QUESTIONED WHAT TYPE OF SCREENING AND BUFFERS WOULD THERE BE.

ROBERT WEIDNER CAME FORWARD TO SPEAK AGAINST THIS VARIANCE. MR. WEIDNER WAS CONCERNED ABOUT THE REMOVAL OF TREES AND BRUSH WOULD OVER BURDEN THE EXISTING DITCH AND CREATE FLOODING OF HIS PROPERTY. THE STRUCTURE MR. ALBERT PROPOSES TO BUILD IS A COMMERCIAL TYPE BUILDING AND WILL NOT BLEND IN WITH THE EXISTING RESIDENTIAL SURROUNDINGS. THIS STRUCTURE WILL AFFECT THE PROPERTY VALUES IN THE AREA.

CHARLES WHITLER CAME FORWARD TO SPEAK. HE WOULD NOT OPPOSE A STRUCTURE THAT WOULD SATISFY THE NEIGHBORS. MR. WHITLER STATED THAT HE FELT THAT HE WOULD DO A GOOD JOB WITH WHAT EVER HE BUILDS, BECAUSE OF WHAT A GOOD JOB HE HAS DONE ON HIS HOME WHICH IS LOCATED ACROSS THE STREET FROM THIS PROPOSED STRUCTURES.

BENNIE SHELTON CAME FORWARD TO SPEAK. MR. SHELTON ADDRESSED HIS CONCERNS ABOUT WATER RUN OFF. HE ALSO PRESENTED THIS BODY WITH A BLEDSOE CREEK WATERSHED PEAK TABLE THAT DOES NOT TAKE IN THE WHOLE THREE (3) ACRES IT ONLY COVERS 1.5 ACRE WHICH HE (MR. ALBERT) PROPOSES TO CLEAR OFF. MR. ALBERT WILL HAVE TO APPLY FOR A PERMIT FROM THE STATE. IF SURFACE WATER RUN OFF DAMAGES ADJOINING PROPERTY OWNERS MUST THEY AFFORD THAT COST? WATER RUNS OFF THIS SITE, WHICH IS JUST AN INHERITED CONDITION OF THIS SITE. MR. SHELTON ASKED IF THEY COULD HAVE TWO MINUTES IF THERE ARE ANY QUESTIONS WE WOULD LIKE TO ASK. MR. SHELTON STATED THAT HE WOULD LIKE TO SEE THIS WORK IF HE COULD BUILD A BUILDING THAT WOULD PLEASE EVERYONE.

THERE WAS DISCUSSION.

MR. ALBERT STATED THAT HE LIVED ACROSS THE STREET AND WOULD NOT PUT ANYTHING ON THIS SUBJECT PROPERTY THAT WOULD DETERIORATE MY PROPERTY. THE GARDEN HOSE ON SUBJECT PROPERTY IS WHERE I AM PUMPING WATER OUT OF THE LAKE TO GROW SOME VEGETATION. THERE WILL NEVER BE A BUSINESS ON SUBJECT PROPERTY. MR. ALBERT STATED THAT HE WOULD PUT UP A VEGETATION BUFFER, BUT WILL NOT GUARANTEE THAT THIS WILL TOTALLY SHIELD THE BUILDING FROM THE ROAD. THE RUN OFF HAS BEEN RUNNING OFF THIS PROPERTY FROM DAY ONE.

CHAIRMAN MCKEE CLOSED THE PUBLIC HEARING.

CHARLES WHITLER STATED THAT THERE WAS A BAD WATER RUN OFF WHERE THE FULKERSON'S LIVE NOW, SO I PUT IN A TILE AND LET THIS WATER RUN INTO THE LAKE. AN UNNAMED PERSON FROM THE AUDIENCE STATED THAT THE TILE MR. WHITLER WAS REFERRING TO IS NOT THERE ANY MORE. UNNAMED LADY ASKED WOULD THAT NOT BE THE COUNTY'S PLACE TO TAKE CARE OF THE WATER RUN OFF?

MR. HAMMOCK STATED THAT BEFORE HE CAN ISSUE A BUILDING PERMIT, MR. ALBERT WILL HAVE TO GO TO THE ENGINEERING OFFICE FOR A LAND DISTURBANCE PERMIT. THE LAW SAYS YOU CAN NOT DISCHARGE MORE WATER THAN IS EXISTING CURRENTLY. THE DITCHES WILL HAVE TO BE ADDRESSED BY THE SUMNER COUNTY HIGHWAY COMMITTEE.

THERE WAS DISCUSSION.

MR. WILLIAMS ASKED MR. ALBERT IF HE WAS GOING TO CLEAN UP THIS LOT.
MR. ALBERT STATED THAT HE WAS GOING TO CLEAN UP THE LOT.

MR. WILLIAMS ASKED WHAT SIDE THE ENTRANCE OF THE GARAGE WOULD BE.
MR. ALBERT STATED THAT THE DOOR WOULD OPEN ON THE SOUTH SIDE WHICH WOULD NOT BE FACING THE ROAD.

MR. WILLIAMS STATED THAT MR. ALBERT HAD MENTIONED HE WOULD NOT BE USING ANY CONCRETE ON THIS SITE.
MR. ALBERT STATED THAT HE WOULD NOT BE USING ANY CONCRETE SINCE WATER RUNS OFF FASTER ON CONCRETE.

MR. WILLIAMS ASKED MR. ALBERT IF SCREENING WOULD BE A PROBLEM.
MR. ALBERT RESPONDED TO MR. WILLIAMS BY SAYING NO SIR.

MR. WILLIAMS ASKED MR. ALBERT WOULD HE CONSIDER BUILDING THIS GARAGE BRICK TO GRADE.
MR. ALBERT STATED THAT HE WOULD NOT HAVE A PROBLEM WITH BRICK TO GRADE. IF WE ARE TAKING ABOUT BRICK THERE WOULD HAVE TO BE FOOTERS.

MR. WILLIAMS ASKED MR. HAMMOCK SINCE YOU WOULD HAVE TO ISSUE A BUILDING PERMIT WOULD THIS GARAGE BE INSPECTED?
MR. HAMMOCK STATED THAT SINCE THIS WOULD BE AN ACCESSORY STRUCTURE WE WOULD ISSUE A BUILDING PERMIT AND WE WOULD CHECK THE SETBACKS ONLY. IF THIS BODY DECLARED THAT YOU WANT MORE INSPECTIONS THIS WOULD HAVE TO BE PART OF THE MINUTES AND WE WOULD BE GLAD TO DO MORE INSPECTIONS.

MR. HAMMOCK EXPLAINED THAT A BUILDING PERMIT IS GOOD FOR ONE YEAR, BUT YOU HAVE TO START SOMETHING WITHIN THE FIRST SIX MONTHS

MR. WILLIAMS EXPLAINED THAT IF THIS WERE IN HIS NEIGHBORHOOD HE WOULD LIKE TO SEE IT BUILT BRICK TO GRADE WHICH WOULD MAKE IT LOOK MORE RESIDENTIAL AND LESS INDUSTRIAL.

MR. ALBERT STATED THAT HE WOULD NOT JUNK THE NEIGHBORHOOD, AND NEVER INTENDED TO DEVALUE THE NEIGHBORS PROPERTY.

CHAIRMAN MCKEE ASKED MR. ALBERT IF HE WAS GOING TO CLEAN THE PROPERTY UP AND MAKE IT PRESENTABLE.
MR. ALBERT REPLIED TO CHAIRMAN MCKEE STATED HE WOULD CLEAN UP THE PROPERTY.

THERE WAS DISCUSSION.

MOTION FOR APPROVAL BY MR. PERDUE, MR. WILLIAMS ADDED THAT THERE NEEDS TO BE SOME CONDITIONS SUCH AS THE GARAGE WOULD NEED TO BE BUILT BRICK TO GRADE, THE NOTES HE PROVIDED THIS BODY FROM THE NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING HELD ON 11/4/07 WILL BE PART OF THIS MOTION, AND THE BUILDING PERMIT IS GOOD FOR ONE YEAR AND WHEN THE GARAGE IS BUILT AT THE END OF ONE YEAR PROPERTY MUST BE CLEANED UP, SECONDED BY MR. WILLIAMS. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:25 P.M.