

**MINUTES  
BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT  
REGULAR MEETING  
March 26, 2015  
6:00 P.M.**

**1. (AGENDA) CONVENE MEETING.**

Chairman Gillespie called the Board of Adjustment to order in regular session at 6:04 p.m.,.

**PRESENT**

William Gillespie (Chairman)  
Warren Robinson (Vice Chairman)  
Doug Faircloth  
Harry LeBoeuf

**ABSENT**

Vacant Position

**STAFF**

Eric Davis, Planning Official  
Teresa Gaillard, Growth Management Director  
Vicki Yaun, Secretary

**VISITORS**

Renee Goodrich  
Justin Thomas  
Rick Sublette  
David Dayner

The data reflected within these proceedings constitute an extrapolation of information elicited from notes, recording tapes, VCR tapes and observations. Comments reflected herein are sometimes paraphrased, condensed and have been edited to reflect essential subject matter covered during the meeting. Parties interested in receiving a verbatim account of the proceedings are responsible for coordinating with the Administrative Services Department and providing their own representative and equipment to produce a verbatim account of the proceedings pursuant to Crestview Policy 91-1, Duplication of Public Records, Chapters 119 and 283, Florida Statutes and Attorney General opinions in force at time of enactment of Policy 91-1.

**2. APPROVE Minutes of May 10, 2012.**

A motion was made by Robinson and seconded by Faircloth to approve the minutes of August 27, 2013 as published. Vote: 4 yeas; 0 nays; 0 absent, Motion carried.

**3. CONSIDER** a request for a special exception to allow a church accessory use building in a residential area, located in Section 05, Township 3 North, Range 23 West, (05-3N-23-0010-000N-0030) at 406 Adams Drive, Crestview, FL 32536. Zoning of the property is Single Family Dwelling District (R-1A); Future Land Use Category is Low Density Residential (LDR). Requested by Gregory L. Parks, Agent for the Property Owner. BOA Request 14-01.

Mr. Gillespie opened the meeting and presented the agenda item. He then called on the staff to recite for the record the advertisement of the public notice and read into the record the application together with any additional information submitted by the applicant.

The Planning Official stated that pursuant to Section 102-36, the Crestview Code of Ordinances, legal notice was published in the Crestview News Bulletin, a newspaper of general circulation, on March 11, 2015.

The Planning Official advised that the application consisted of Form 34, which is the special exception request which he read into record the application information stating that the owner is Gregory L. Parks, the address is 11 North B Street, Pensacola, FL 32502. The applicant is requesting a special exception to allow a church accessory use building in a residential area. The legal description of the property is Lots 3-6, Block N of the Adams Powell Subdivision, PIN # (05-3N-23-0010-000N-0030.) Method of tax assessment is Ad valorem. It is not a trailer park and is signed by Gregory L. Parks on February 22, 2014.

The Planning Official also stated that a letter was submitted from Mr. Harry LeBoeuf, Member of the church, with the application which stated:

"Our lady of Victory Catholic Church at 550 Adams Drive, purchased the house across the street at 406 Adams Drive, to be used as a meeting, educational, bible study and small group gathering place. The house was purchased to supplement, not replace, the existing structures currently used for these purposes. This addition will help to accommodate our growing membership. Parking for this house will not impact the neighborhood as it is located across the street from our existing parking area. For additional information or to ask questions please contact me." Signed: Harry LeBoeuf.

They have also submitted the warranty deed, site plan and paid invoice on March 14, 2014 stating criteria to be met as prescribed in Section 102-129 (c) (2) (b), of the Crestview Code of Ordinances.

The Growth Management Director stated that this request only concerns Lot 3 of the properties that they own. That is the PIN number for the property we are reviewing.

The Chairman asked staff to provide any deficiencies to the Board which staff has determined to exist in the application.

The Planning Official stated that there were no deficiencies in the application submittal.

The Chairman read into the record the Staff Report.

## **STAFF REPORT**

### **I. ISSUE**

Gregory L. Parks, Agent for the Diocese of Pensacola-Tallahassee (Our Lady of Victory Church), owner of property, located in Section 05, Township 3 North, Range 23 West, (Parcel I.D. # 05-3N-23-0010-000N-0030) at 406 Adams Drive, Crestview, FL 32536, has made application for a special exception to allow a church accessory use building to be used for meetings, education, bible study and small group gatherings, in a residential area. Zoning of the property is Single Family Residential (R-1A); Future Land Use category is Low Density Residential (LDR). BOA Request 14-01.

### **II. REFERENCES REVIEWED AND APPLIED**

The following policies, directives, regulations, and laws were used in the evaluation of Request 14-01:

A. City Policy and Procedural Guide for Processing Nonconforming Uses, Special Exceptions and Appeal of Administrative Decisions, current edition.

B. Chapter 102 Land Use Regulations; Sections 102-129(c)(2)b, "Districts and Boundaries – R-1A and R-1 (Single Family Dwelling Districts)"; and 102-36 through 102-36.1, "Board of Adjustment Rules of Procedure", of the Crestview Code of Ordinances, current edition.

C. Chapter 119.01, et.seq, Florida Statutes, "Public Records Act."

D. Crestview Comprehensive Plan, current edition.

E. Form 34, Application for Special Exception, Nonconforming Uses and Appeal of Administrative Decisions with supporting documents consisting of (1) letter of request and (2) notice of public hearing.

### **III. OBJECTIVE FINDING OF FACT**

A. Staff has reviewed BOA Application 14-01 for technical completeness and finds that the application and supporting data is sufficient to process the request.

B. Staff has reviewed the Site Plan for the parcel as requested for the proposed church accessory use. Staff finds that the submitted site plan accurately depicts the property to the best of staff's knowledge.

C. As required, notice was published on March 11, 2015 in the Crestview News Bulletin.

#### **IV. STAFF OPINION**

Pursuant to Sections 102-129 (2)(b), of the Crestview Code of Ordinances, the following opinion is provided:

1. The applicant submitted the application with a letter and site plan stating the criteria to be met as prescribed in Sections 102-129 (2)(b), of the Crestview Code of Ordinances, signed by Gregory L. Parks, Agent for the Diocese of Pensacola-Tallahassee, owner of the property, for the purpose of obtaining the special exception.

2. Staff has examined the information provided by the applicant with the governing criteria and concludes that:

- a. After reviewing the submittal it is technically complete.
- b. After reviewing the site plan of the property and records of the Okaloosa County Property Appraisers office, the subject property is located at 406 Adams Drive and is in a Single Family Residential Zoning District (R-1A) with Low Density Future Land Use Category (LDR). The property consists of 0.26 ± acres and has a single family structure on it. To the East of the property is Our Lady of Victory Catholic Church and is zoned Residential (R-1A). To the south is vacant property owned by the Diocese and is zoned Residential (R-1A). To the west and north of the property is a single family residence and is zoned Residential (R-1A).

As the proposed church accessory use building is located in a residential area, and the City Code does allow church accessory use buildings in residential areas, the proposed use would not be detrimental to the surrounding properties.

Therefore, staff recommends approval by special exception.

\_\_\_\_\_ End of Staff Report \_\_\_\_\_

The Chairman called upon the applicant to make any statements and present any additional testimony, information, or supporting documents.

Ms. Renee Goodrich, staff representative for the applicant, addressed the Board and stated; the property at 406 Adams Drive has been named the Martha and Mary House of Prayer. It is being used for Bible study 5 times a week, Senior meetings once a month, the Young adult group meets once month, and has a library for parishioners. The American Heritage girls troop camped out there this last month and occasionally it is used as a guest house for traveling missionaries. This has been the use for the past year and a half and is not subject to change.

The Chairman then called upon the staff to make any statements and present any additional testimony, information, or supporting documents.

The Planning Official presented a power point presentation to the Board. Prints of the slides were provided in the Board's meeting packet. The parcel map slide in the presentation showed the subject

property as well as the surrounding properties including the other vacant lots owned by the applicant that are vacant. He also reviewed the zoning and future land use of the property in question.

The Chairman asked for comments from the audience in favor of granting the variance.

There were no comments from the audience in favor of granting the variance.

The Chairman asked for comments from the audience against the of granting the variance.

Mr. David Dayner, 1412 Lloyd Street North, asked to see the the first slide of the presentation again. He reflected his property and that he had lived there about eleven years. Mr. Dayner stated: I see what they are doing over there and have no problem with what I've seen so far. They have night meetings and park in the church parking lot. My concern is regarding the other two lots that they own but is not part of the special exception. The church staff member stated the girls camped out at the house but they did not, they camped out on the two vacant lots and there were about ten tents and maybe twenty to thirty people there. There hasn't been any problems yet but he is concerned about what they plan to do on those properties as far as camping, having a bunch of people there and you have residences like mine right there. Why not use the property the church is on for the camp out. That area is wooded and has lots of grassed area. Why do they have to put the tents next to the residential area? Once again, my concern is mainly, what they will be doing on the vacant lots, not the use of the property they are asking the Board for the special exception.

The Chairman advised that we are here just to discuss the property requesting the special exception and not the others.

Mr. Dayner asked if the exception is granted, what would be allowed on the other lots.

Board member Faircloth stated if they decided to change the use of those two vacant lots they would have to come back to the Board for an adjustment.

Mr. Dayner asked if they could use them for anything they want like camping?

Board member Faircloth stated they have been using it ever since they have owned it, even if they didn't own it they would still use those two lots they do own and the Board doesn't have any authority over that.

Mr. Dayner further asked what else could be there? Can they put in a parking lot?

Board member Faircloth stated, not without obtaining permits.

The Board Secretary stated we are not discussing the vacant lots at all. They are not part of this request. Those other lots are still just as they have always been. If they want to do something with those lots, they would have to reapply to the Board for another special exception, and it would be heard at a separate meeting. We are not discussing any changes on the vacant lots.

Mr. Dayner stated fair enough but maybe you can give me some advice.

The Board Secretary advised his option would be to go to the church and talk to them. If that is not satisfactory, then come to the City's Planning and Zoning Department.

Mr. Fred Sublette, 2198 Pearl Street North, advised that when he bought his house a couple of years ago it was residential and that the church owned the property across the street. He also stated: I had no problem moving into my house with all the other residential around me. Now I find out the church also owns the two vacant lots. I don't understand why a special exception is needed for that. If they need a special exception for that, then they are not going to use it as a residence. I would prefer where I live to be a residence and not an infiltration unit for other things to come in, possibly in the future. They might

sell that, once they get an exception, and decide to tear that down and build something else. From what I understand they can do that and I don't want to see that happen in my residential neighborhood.

Board member Faircloth stated that this request is not against City Ordinance. Allowing church use in a residential area fits in with the City's plan. My advice to you, if that doesn't suit you, is to go to the City Council and ask them to change the Ordinance.

The Board Secretary stated we are not here to change the zoning on this property, we are only discussing a special exception to the church to use it for accessory meetings and such. It is still zoned residential.

The Board Chairman stated that where the church is located, is zoned residential.

Mr. Sublette advised that he understands that and he knew the church was there when he moved in.

The Growth Management Director stated City Code Sec. 129 (2)(c) allows accessory use of a church in a residential area. The special exception for accessory use of an existing building is allowed. So lot 3 will be used as an accessory use of the main church. There have been no building plans submitted, all we are approving is the special exception.

Mr. Sublette stated that this is the camel's nose under the tent for that kind of thing to happen. Everybody knows that, at least the people that live around there, who are my neighbors.

The Board Secretary advised that if they chose to demolish that structure and rebuild they would come to the Planning and Zoning Department and apply for rezoning if they were going to put commercial in there or build. They would be required to go through all the proper meeting for approval, that would be advertised and you would all be notified so you could present your opinions of the request.

Mr. Fred Sublette stated that is what we are doing now, speaking against them getting the special exception. Once you get a special exception it sets a precedence.

The Growth Management Director stated the only thing the exception is for is the accessory use of that existing structure. It is strictly the accessory use of that structure. If they tore that structure down then there is no longer the exception.

The Planning Official advised that if they tore that structure down, there is not enough property to build a new church building. The code requires a minimum of one acre of property to build anything new in a residential zone. They are only getting a special exception for this structure. If they tear it down, it cannot be built back.

Mr. Sublette stated that they could build a parking lot on the two vacant properties which is close to my house and all those other houses.

The Planning Official advised they would have to go through this entire process again to be able to touch those other two properties.

Mr. Sublette stated we are under the assumption that this has been voted on and our opinions doesn't even matter.

The Board Secretary stated there has been no vote on this since there wasn't a quorum for the last meeting so there has been no discussion.

Mr. Sublette stated we had a previous meeting so everyone has known about it and we are under that assumption.

The Board Secretary stated there was not a quorum and that two of the members were not there at the previous meeting. There is only one member here that attended the previous meeting. The Board members, are not allowed to discuss these items outside of the meetings. That would be a violation of the Sunshine Law.

Board Member Faircloth advised that we are dealing with what is now, current. You are dealing with what could be. If anything else other than what we settle tonight occurs on that piece of property, you will once again have the opportunity to come and speak against it. And at that time it maybe a whole different set of board members. If they are going to tear it down they have to go to the City before the tear down or build. So if you see another sign on that property that there is going to be a meeting to discuss it.

Mr. Sublette stated he did not even know that the church had people going in and using it and I have been there going on two years. Nobody told me anything. They sent me a letter last year but he didn't receive a letter this year.

The Board Secretary stated that she personally, sent out, seventeen, certified, return receipt letters to all of the same people as last year with the exception of the one who had sold their property, so it went to the new owner. It is a measured radius that we mail to. Some letters were not returned and some were returned undelivered.

Mr. Sublette asked if his came back; where upon he stated, I am a hermit, I hardly ever leave except to go to my parents and I never received it.

The Board Secretary reviewed the file and determined that the letter was sent but it came back undelivered. After viewing the envelope, she determined that the mail sorting machine ripped up the address label but did not receive it back in time to resend the letter. She apologized that he didn't receive it but verified it was mailed on March 4th and she showed that the label was scraped off. She told him she was glad his neighbors told him because we do not try to hide the times of the meetings. We did have signs up on both sides of the property notifying when the meeting would take place. We are here for all the citizens.

Mr. Justin Thomas, 2202 Pearl Street North, stated they have been using the house for meetings for about a year and a half, why pursue a special exception when they are already using it. They can use the building for what they have been doing and continue to use it. There is no point for this at all. I can see if they had not been using it and needed the special exception to use it, but that is not the case. I feel this is null and void right here because of that. There is nothing saying that if got disapproved today or got approved today that anything is going to change. He is opposed to the approving of this, just because of the clear fact that they are already doing what they want to do in that building. He doesn't mind them having the campouts and having the girls and boys, their living with nature, that doesn't bother me. My house butts up to that vacant property and I know we are not here about that but if that is part of what they do with that corner lot and they use the other lots, then I am fine with what they are doing now. There's no reason why we need this special exception pushed through. If it is for tax purposes, I don't feel that is a good enough reason anyway. We all should be paying our taxes, we don't need to take any shortcuts, Let's just do the right thing. What does the special exception allow them to do, that they are not already doing?

The Board Secretary reviewed the history of this request. One year ago this was brought before the Board so they could legally start using the building. Through no fault of their own, we did not have a quorum and could not vote on it at that time. It has taken us this long to bring it back to the Board. The reason they must have a special exception is it is required by the City Code. It has nothing to do with taxes, our code requires, if a church wants to use a building in a residential area, we must do a special exception. If this special exception gets voted on today, they will be told they cannot use that building for church functions at all.

Mr. Thomas stated; so this past year and a half this has been in limbo?

The Board Secretary advised that she doesn't believe that anyone here knew they were already using the building.

Mr. Thomas asked if upon denial, would any of us know if they continued to use the building as quietly as they have been, which is very polite of them.

The Board Secretary stated if a neighbor was to complain that the church is using that building, we would inspect and observe. If we found they were actually using the building we would notify the leaders of the church that they are in violation and inform them to stop. Action could be taken.

The Planning Official advised that the Church applying for their Business Tax Receipt for the location is the reason we told them they must have a special exception. If this is denied, they cannot get a Business Tax Receipt for that location and if they continue to use the location, the Code Enforcement Board can turn off the water and sewer to the building. We can enforce the code if they are using it illegally. They have to have special exception to be able to get the Business Tax Receipt or use the building for church use.

Mr. Thomas asked as far as the Business Tax Receipt, what all does that entail?

The Planning Official advised that it used to be called a business license. All commercial entities, churches included, must have a business tax receipt for their location. So the Church has one for the main property across the street. When they added this property, they needed to acquire one for this location. That means the Fire Department comes to inspect every year for safety. As a commercial use they must have fire extinguishers, exit lights and all the other requirements necessary for an assembly hall. In most cases it will have to be handicap compliant and go through the whole process of making it accessible to the public. That is the process we have gone through. This special exception brings them into the legality with the Business Tax Receipt so that it can be inspected and the Fire Department can do their job and the Building Official can do his as well and make sure everything is safe.

Mr. Thomas stated he has talked with his family and is fine having the church across the street and church use on the corner lot being used occasionally for church purposes but as far as making it legal, I'm not necessarily ok with that. I would like to have residential use only and have neighbors. We moved into a neighborhood in July 2013 knowing it was a residential area. Yes, we knew there was a church the next block over and we were fine with that. But as far as the neighborhood and it growing as a neighborhood, as a family residences in the area, with Crestview getting larger and building more restaurants and facilities, the value of the property is going up. I'd like to have neighborhoods in the area. That is a nice home there. Maybe the church could give it to a family in need and give them a head start. That would be something I would like to see happen, for them to put it to use as a home and for them to find property elsewhere, not residential area, and have that used for church purposes. Maybe clear land behind the existing church and build there, It's already approved for church use. I would like to see it as a family home instead of making it a permanent church location for meeting, We were told the vacant land was for residential use only. Mr. Thomas stated he works at Hurlbert Field but liked Crestview because it was quieter and out in the country. I grew up this way and would like to have my child grow up like that. I oppose the ruling to approve this. I hope you will take my viewpoint into consideration.

Mr. Dayner advised that we stated last year they applied for the exception and didn't have a quorum but they were using the building before the first meeting. He agrees with Mr. Thomas and opposes it as well.

The Chairman called upon the applicant to make any further comments or rebuttal to comments, testimony, information or documents submitted in support of denying the application.

There were no comments from the applicant.

The Chairman called upon the staff to make further comments or rebuttal as well to comments, testimony, information and documents submitted.

There were no comments from the staff.

The Chairman closed the public hearing and opened the meeting to discussion by the Board.

An Audience member asked that the information regarding the Business Tax Receipt be repeated.

The Planning Official advised that churches, like any other business, are required to get a Business Tax Receipt from the City. We keep track of this and at the beginning of every fiscal year the Fire Department is required to make an inspection at every business for safety checks, i.e.; fire extinguishers, exit lights, exit signs. Every business in town is required to have one. Churches are included in this because they are public places; any place that is used by the public.

Mr. Dayner verified that the church is considered a business.

The Planning Official advised that it is considered a church. The church has to have a business tax receipt.

Mr. Dayner stated He doesn't have to have one.

Board Member Faircloth stated your home is not a public place.

The Chairman called if there is anymore discussion from the audience.

The Chairman called upon the Board for any questions or comments.

Chairman Gillespie: "Is there action by the Board on this?"

Board Member Faircloth: "I make a motion we approve it."

Chairman Gillespie: "Is there a second?"

Board Member Robinson: "I'm going to admitted I'm a little perplexed about this because they have already been performing these activities and I am more concerned about the residential area. It seems like the church already has property they could be using for the activities that they want to perform as well as construct another facility on their current property or the other property across from the residential area. So, I must admit I am opposed to this event."

Board Member Faircloth: "Well the reason he made the motion to approve it is because the staff has done all the required work and there is nothing to be found in any of the codes or ordinances to prevent it."

Board Member Robinson: "No its not."

Board Member Faircloth: "It's based solely on each one of these people who knew they were moving in near church property when they bought their house. And to use this gentleman back here, his reasoning, they should have thought about what could have happened after they bought their property."

Mrs. Thomas, 2202 Pearl Street, North: "We were never informed that they owned the property. Do you think we would have bought that house?"

Board Member Faircloth: "If they went to the property appraiser's office to see who owned the property around the property you were thinking of purchasing."

Mrs. Thomas: "We were told it was residential. That we were told that someone could build a home on it?"

Board Member Faircloth: "But the Property Appraiser's office could have told you who owned it."

Board Member Robinson: "The church didn't always own that property did it? So it was a residential area, it was a home."

Board Member Faircloth: "No, I'm talking about they moved in contiguous to church owned property, these two vacant lots."

Board Member Robinson: "Ok, so we're not talking about that. We're talking about"

Board Member Faircloth: "No, listen to me."

Board Member. Robinson: "Well we're not talking about those other two properties."

Mr. Sublette: "I didn't do that, I've been there eleven years so I didn't move in contiguous to that."

Mr. Thomas: "And I didn't."

Board Member Faircloth: "I know we are not discussing that."

Mr. Thomas: "Previously that was a home."

Board Member Faircloth: "What I'm saying is they're or at least one of them is saying he's worried about what can happen from here forward. Well, when they bought their property they should have looked at what could happen with that church owned property behind them and so, you talk about building on property they already owned, they could have built a big house right in the middle of those two vacant lots or a building.

Mr. Sublette: "A house."

Mrs. Thomas: "We were told they couldn't do anything like that. That is was residential. They were given the property but they can't touch it or do anything or build anything because it's residential, that it's not going to affect our property. I wouldn't have bought a house knowing that three properties that they could have built a parking lot, sell it or Chinese restaurant or whatever they wanted to do. I wouldn't raise my family, I wasted that money, I wouldn't buy my first home knowing they owned that property."

Board Member Faircloth: "Why couldn't they build a rectory on it?"

Mrs. Thomas: "Why would I not want them too?"

Board Member Faircloth: "I said, Why couldn't they build a rectory on it?"

Mrs. Thomas: "Why couldn't they? I'm hoping they don't. I live right there."

Board Member Faircloth: "That's right."

Mrs. Thomas: "That's my property, that's my property line. I grew up in church, I love church, I go to church now. I have nothing against church. It's nothing against them. *Sentence not understood.* Do stuff on that side. I bought that house knowing that's a residential area, that's where my kids are going to grow. Not that on a Sunday there going to be a church fellowship in my back yard every time I look outside with 30 kids. So when I work nights and get home at midnight, I'm pregnant, and shouldn't be having to

chase the puppies to keep them from barking at midnight so my neighbors don't complain cause there's kids in my backyard."

Board Member Gillespie: We failed to get a second. I have not seconded it, Mr. Robinson has not seconded it so the motion has failed. Correct?"

The Board Secretary: "Yes Sir."

The Planning Official: "If there is no second then the motion has failed, but we do have to have a motion either to approve it or not."

The Board Secretary: "And Mr. Faircloth made the motion to approve."

The Planning Official: "With no second."

Board Member Gillespie: "With no second, all those in favor say Aye."

The Board Secretary: " You can't vote if there is no second."

Board Member Faircloth: "I thought he was asking us to vote on the motion."

The Board Secretary: " No, you made the motion, a second was asked for and not received so the motion dies."

Board Member Faircloth: "So there's no vote."

The Planning Official: "If there is no vote and unless Mr. Gillespie is going to pass the gavel and second it, then there's no second. So then in this case we have to have a motion to deny the special exception."

Board Member Robinson: "I motion that we deny the special exception."

Board Member Gillespie: Gillespie passed the gavel. "And I second."

Board Member Gillespie: Gillespie received the gavel back. "All those in favor?"

Board Member Gillespie and Board Member Robinson both voted Aye.

Board Member Gillespie: "Opposed?"

Board Member Faircloth: "Nay."

The Growth Management Director: "So we are still two to one."

The Board Secretary: "And that is a majority."

The Growth Management Director: "Affirmed."

**Finding of Fact:**

**GENERAL**

The Crestview Board of Adjustment considered Application Number 14-01, a request for a special exception to allow a church accessory use building in a residential neighborhood. The property is owned by the Diocese of Pensacola-Tallahassee and is located in Section 05, Township 3 North, Range 23 West, (Parcel I.D. 05-3N-23-0010-000N-0030) and is located at 406 Adams Drive. Zoning of the property is

Single Family Dwelling Zoning District (R-1A) with a Low Density Residential Future Land Use category (LDR); BOA Request Number 14-01.

The applicant seeks a special exception to allow a church accessory use building in a residential neighborhood. Due public notice of the hearing was given by publication in the Crestview News Bulletin, a newspaper of general circulation on March 11, 2015. The Board having considered the application, testimony and exhibits of the applicant, a site visit to the land at issue by the staff and a subsequent report of the staff and all other relevant testimony pursuant to Chapter 102 of the City Code, orders:

Application Number 14-01 is denied.

**THIS ORDER WAS ADOPTED** upon motion by Robinson, seconded by Gillespie, to deny Application Number 14-01; vote: 2 yeas, 1 nays Faircloth, abstained 1 LeBoeuf, motion passed on this 26 day of March, 2015.

ATTEST

\_\_\_\_\_  
Vicki Yaun  
Board Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
William Gillespie  
CHAIRMAN

**4. OTHER BUSINESS** It was a consensus of the Board to wait on nominations of officers until all the new members are present.

The Growth Management Director advised the next meeting will be on April 23, 2015 to vote on this month's meeting minutes and new officers.

**5. ADJOURN** Motion made by **Robinson** and seconded by **Gillespie** to adjourn the meeting. Vote: 4 yeas, 0 nays, 1 absent (Mullins), motion carried.

Chairman Gillespie adjourned the meeting at 6:55 p.m.