

MINUTES OF DECEMBER 8, 2025

The regular meeting of the Sussex County Board of Adjustment was held on Monday, December 8, 2025, at 6:00 p.m. in the County Council Chamber, Sussex County Administration Office Building, Georgetown, Delaware.

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. with Chairman John Williamson presiding. The Board members present were Mr. Shawn Lovenguth, Dr. Lauren Hitchens, Mr. Nathan Kingree, and Mr. John Williamson. Also, in attendance were Mr. James Sharp, Esquire – Assistant County Attorney, and staff members Ms. Jennifer Norwood – Planning and Zoning Manager and Ms. Ann Lepore – Recording Secretary.

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Mr. Williamson.

Motion by Mr. Lovenguth, seconded by Mr. Kingree and carried unanimously to approve the agenda. Motion carried 4 – 0.

The vote by roll call: Dr. Hitchens – yea, Mr. Kingree – yea, Mr. Lovenguth – yea and Mr. Williamson – yea

Motion by Mr. Kingree, seconded by Dr. Hitchens and carried unanimously to approve the Minutes for the October 6, 2025, meeting. Motion carried 4 – 0.

The vote by roll call: Mr. Lovenguth – yea, Dr. Hitchens – yea, Mr. Kingree – yea and Mr. Williamson – yea.

Motion by Dr. Hitchens seconded by Mr. Lovenguth and carried to approve the Findings of Facts for the October 6, 2025, meeting. Motion carried 4 – 0.

The vote by roll call: Mr. Kingree – yea, Mr. Lovenguth – yea, Dr. Hitchens – yea, and Mr. Williamson – yea

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Case No. 13138 – Steve Joseph Baird, Jr. seeks a special use exception to operate a rifle or pistol range (Sections 115-23 and 115-210 of the Sussex County Zoning Code). The property is located on the southwest side of Staytonville Road, approximately 330 ft. southeast of Gum Branch Lane. 911 Address: 16344 Staytonville Road, Lincoln. Zoning District: AR-1. Tax Parcel: 230-25.00-4.05

Ms. Norwood presented the case and stated that the Office of Planning and Zoning received zero letters of support, zero letters of opposition, and zero mail returns.

The Applicant is requesting a renewal of a special use exception to operate a rifle / pistol range.

Steve Joseph Baird, Jr., was sworn in to give testimony about the Application.

Mr. Baird testified that he was approved by the Board in 2020 for a five year term to operate a private pistol range; that he is looking to renew for a five year term to continue to operate the said business; that the range is used to hold private conceal carry classes; that the range is only open on Saturday and Sundays from approximately 2 PM to 4 PM; that he has no intention of having longer hours; that the only weapons being fired are his .22 caliber pistols that he provides to the members of the class after completing an 8 hour classroom session followed by laser training pistols; that there are only two people firing at once with a range safety officer; that classes can vary in size from two people to twenty people; that his uncle and cousin own the property to the rear of him and it is all hunting property; that the rear property consists of 438 acres; that his brother-in-law and sister-in-law live next door and there have been no complaints about any of the operation; that they shut down the shooting operation from September to January to respect the hunters behind his property; that the range is over 100 yards from the dwelling; that the dirt berm is approximately seven feet in height currently and he plans to raise it to 9 feet; that the range is 30 yards long; that he does not allow rifles at the range; that there has been no objection from DNREC to the range; that there is about 100-150 feet of trees behind the berm; that the range will be 100 yards from the dwelling and some trees have been removed for the construction of the range; that, if the property were ever sold, a soil analysis would be performed before any soil could be removed from the property; that shots will be fired towards the rear of the lot; that he will provide classroom instruction in his garage as well; that there is no standing water or runoff issues on the property; and that he is okay with the conditions as previously set by the Board.

The Board found that no one appeared in support or opposition to the Application.

Mr. Williamson closed the public hearing.

Dr. Hitchens moved to approve the application for Case No. 13138 for the requested special use exception pending final written decision, because the use will not substantially adversely affect the uses of neighboring and adjacent properties. The approval is subject to the following conditions:

1. The special use exception is valid for a 5-year period;
2. The berm is to be built to a height of 10 ft. tall;
3. There is to be no shooting after 6:00 pm; and
4. The range must meet all federal, state, and local regulations.

Motion by Dr. Hitchens, seconded by Mr. Lovenguth, carried that the **special use exception be approved with conditions for the reasons stated**. Motion carried 4-0.

The vote by roll call: Mr. Kingree – yea, Mr. Lovenguth – yea, Dr. Hitchens – yea and Mr. Williamson – yea

Case No. 13139 – Thomas W. Belk, III seeks a variance from the average front yard setback requirements for a proposed structure (Section 115-25 and 115-182 of the Sussex County Zoning Code). The property is located on the northwest side of Seagrass Court. 911 Address: 29748 Seagrass Court, Dagsboro. Zoning District: AR-1. Tax Map: 134-7.00-105.01

Ms. Norwood presented the case and stated that the Office of Planning and Zoning received zero letters of support, zero letters of opposition, and zero mail returns.

The Applicant is requesting the following variance:

- A 7.96 ft. variance from the 27.96 ft. average front yard setback requirement for a proposed dwelling.

Thomas W. Belk, III, was sworn in to give testimony about the Application.

Mr. Belk testified that he is the third generation owner of this property and wants the variance in order to place a new home with the size of the lot; that, due to the available buildable area, the home needed to be longer than it could be wide; that the home will meet the side yard setback requirements; that the request for the variance along the front is due to the water which his property sits in the rear; that the area in the back has the potential to flood during storms and the farther the structure can be from the rear, the better it is; that the property is adjacent to Indian River; that a neighboring property was recently granted a similar variance of a 20 foot front yard setback; that the lot size and shape make it difficult to comply with standard setbacks; that the property cannot otherwise be developed; that the lot size and shape make it difficult to comply with standard without creating unnecessary hardships especially since the flood zone is in the rear and makes it difficult to build back there; that granting the variance will allow for a front yard setback that is consistent with neighboring properties; that the exceptional practical difficulty was not created by the Applicant; that his lot was bought this way and it was the last lot in the area so he could not do anything else; that the variance will not affect the public interest and will not alter the character of the neighborhood as many other homes are situated as such; that the variance requested is the minimum variance; that the proposed structure aligns with the existing development; that he is asking for the minimum needed for a house that will conform with the neighborhood; that half of the property is within a flood zone; that he cannot use the rear yard due to the flood zone designation; that the neighborhood was previously serviced by a dirt road with fishing shacks; that there are bulkheads in the rear of the property that prevents him from building back there as he would need to put pilings in to elevate the home and to do so he would need 11-12 feet and the bulk heads are in the way; that the prior house on the property was built prior to World War II and was a small fishing shack; that the HVAC unit will be located within the building envelope; that there is a 1-2 foot gap between the edge of paving of Seagrass Court and the front property line; that there is no well or septic system on the property; that there is no mandatory homeowners association governing the community; that the homeowners association does not have additional setback requirements; and that there will be no projections from the house into the side yard setback area.

The Board asked if the Applicant would be able to build his house with a front yard setback of 22 feet rather than 20 feet as proposed and the Applicant indicated that he could.

The Board found that no one appeared in support of or in opposition to the Application.

Mr. Williamson closed the public hearing.

Mr. Lovenguth moved to approve the application for Case No. 13139 for a variance of 5.96 ft. rather than the requested 7.96 feet, pending final written decision, and for the following reasons:

1. The property has unique physical conditions;
2. That, due to such physical circumstances and conditions, there is no possibility that the property can be developed in strict conformity with the Sussex County Zoning Code;
3. The variance, as modified, is necessary to enable reasonable use of the property;
4. The exceptional practical difficulty has not been created by the Applicant;
5. The variance, as modified, will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood;
6. The variance, as modified, will not substantially or permanently impair the appropriate use or development of adjacent property;
7. The variance, as modified, will not be detrimental to the public welfare;
8. The variance, as modified, represents the least modification of the regulation at issue; and
9. The variance, as modified, represents the minimum variance necessary to afford relief.

Motion by Mr. Lovenguth, seconded by Mr. Kingree, carried that the **variance, as modified, be approved for the reasons stated.** Motion carried 4 - 0.

The vote by roll call: Dr. Hitchens – yea, Mr. Kingree – yea, Mr. Lovenguth – yea and Mr. Williamson – yea

Case No. 13140 – Craig Forster seeks a variance from the maximum fence height within the front yard setback requirement for a proposed structure (Section 115-34, 115-182 and 115-185 of the Sussex County Zoning Code). The property is located on the corner of the southeast side of Andrew Avenue and the east side of Dodd Avenue. 911 Address: 21206 Second Street, Rehoboth Beach. Zoning District: MR. Tax Parcel: 334-20.13-159.00

Ms. Norwood presented the case and stated that the Office of Planning and Zoning received eleven letters of support, zero letters of opposition, and zero mail returns.

The Applicant is requesting the following variance:

- A 3.5 ft. variance from the maximum allowable height requirement for a fence.

Craig Forster was sworn in to give testimony about the Application.

Mr. Forster testified that he received variances for his dwelling 2.5 years ago; that he is trying to erect a 7 ft. tall fence along the whole length of the property in order to provide privacy from the cars driving by and people walking through the neighborhood; that the property borders three streets; that there is limited privacy due to the roads; that he wants to increase the fence height from the minimum height of 3.5 feet to 7 feet along the south side of the home as he has an outside shower on that side and it is open to the streets on three sides of the home; that the property is located on a dead end street so there is only one neighbor next to them and there is already a 7 foot fence between their properties; that this fence placement is more so to prevent oncoming cars from the streets to be able to see into the yard; that the current fence around the property is about 20 years old and is beginning to fall apart and is falling into disrepair; that the one neighbor has a current fence up also and both fences would be a couple of inches apart; that there is about a 13 foot gap between the property line and the edge of paving on 2nd Street; that many of the neighbors have fences similar to the proposal; that he is just looking to add some privacy to his yard; that the fence poses no visibility concerns for drivers on the streets; that he has received compliments about his dwelling; that the fence will be a vinyl fence; and that the fence will be approximately 20-21 feet from the road.

The Board found that no one appeared in support of or in opposition to the Application.

Mr. Williamson closed the public hearing.

Mr. Lovenguth moved to approve the application for Case No. 13140 for the requested variance, pending final written decision, for the following reasons:

1. The property has unique physical conditions as it is a corner lot with three road frontages;
2. That, due to such physical circumstances and conditions, there is no possibility that the property can be developed in strict conformity with the Sussex County Zoning Code;
3. The variance is necessary to enable reasonable use of the property;
4. The exceptional practical difficulty has not been created by the Applicant;
5. The fence is adjacent to an existing fence and will be similar to other fences in the neighborhood;
6. The variance will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood;
7. The variance will not substantially or permanently impair the appropriate use or development of adjacent property;
8. The variance will not be detrimental to the public welfare;
9. The variance represents the least modification of the regulation at issue; and
10. The variance represents the minimum variance necessary to afford relief.

Motion by Mr. Lovenguth, seconded by Mr. Kingree, carried that **the variance be approved**

for the reasons stated. Motion carried 4 - 0.

The vote by roll call: Dr. Hitchens – yea, Mr. Kingree – yea, Mr. Lovenguth – yea and Mr. Williamson – yea

Case No. 13141 – MATR, LLC seeks a special use exception to place a telecommunications tower and a variance from the maximum height requirement for a proposed structure (Section 115-25(D) and 115-210 of the Sussex County Zoning Code). The property is located on the northwest side of Hastings Farm Road. 911 Address: N/A. Zoning District: AR-1. Tax Parcel: 231-9.00-5.00

Ms. Norwood presented the case and stated that the Office of Planning and Zoning received zero letters of support, zero letters of opposition, and four mail returns.

The Applicant is requesting the following:

- A special use exception to place a telecommunications tower; and
- A 4 ft. variance from the maximum allowable height requirement for a tower of 150 feet.

John Tracey, Esq., presented the Application on behalf of the Applicant.

Mr. Tracey stated that he was representing the Applicant to request a special use exception for a new telecommunications monopole and associated equipment shelter; that the tower will be 154 feet tall, which includes the 4 foot lightning rod; that the tower is located on a 19 acre parcel currently zoned AR-1; that the site is mostly cleared as the Middleford Speedway is located on that parcel and has been an active racing operation for years; that the tower will meet all setback, fencing, and lighting requirements as per Sussex County Code; that the tower itself will meet the height requirement but, because they have to add the lightning rod, the tower will exceed the height limit and that requires the Applicant to apply for this variance; that the need for cell service in that area is in demand and, if the tower is added, the cell coverage in a vehicle and outside shows a drastic increase over what is there currently; that there is a need for seamless coverage; that 80% of 911 calls come from cell phones; that the RF reports demonstrate a gap in coverage in this area; that the Applicant searched for other tall structures within 2 miles of the site and found 2 other structures; that the Applicant was already on one of those structures and the other structure was not structurally sound for the Applicant's equipment; that the tower will meet all FCC emissions standards; that, using worst-case assumptions, the tower will generate less than 5.35% of the maximum permitted emissions allowed under federal regulations; that the tower will comply with all FAA regulations; that the tower is not required to be lit per FAA regulations but will be lit per Sussex County Code; that the tower will be fenced and screened; that the tower will be designed to house 2 other providers; that the tower will be located in the lower left hand corner of the lot and a new 30 foot wide gravel drive will be constructed leading to the tower; that the tower will not create any adverse impacts on the properties surrounding it; that the tower will not create any noise or smells and there will be only be one visit in and out every four

to six weeks for maintenance purposes; that the backup generator will be located within the equipment shed on the property and the noise level for that will be minimal; that the construction phase will most likely be about several weeks from start to finish as this is a simple build; that the property is unique as the tower will only occupy a small part of the property consisting of 3,000 square feet, more or less; that it is difficult for the Applicant to find a suitable property with a willing landlord; that a reduction in the height of the tower negatively affects coverage; that the need for the variance is created by demand; that the lightning rod is a safety feature; that the variance requested is the minimum variance to afford relief; that the tower will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood; that the property cannot otherwise be developed; and that the lightning rod is likely not visible.

Luke Kamp and Bryan Gredis were sworn in to testify about the Application. Both men affirmed the statements made by Mr. Tracey as true and correct.

The Board found that no one appeared in support of or in opposition to the Application.

Mr. Williamson closed the public hearing.

Dr. Hitchens moved to approve the application for Case No. 13141 for the requested variance and special use exception, pending final written decision, for the following reasons:

1. The proposed tower will not substantially affect adversely the uses of neighboring and adjacent properties;
2. The situation is unique because the lightning rod is needed as a safety feature;
3. That, due to such physical circumstances and conditions, there is no possibility that the property can be developed in strict conformity with the Sussex County Zoning Code;
4. The variance is necessary to enable reasonable use of the property;
5. The exceptional practical difficulty has not been created by the Applicant;
6. The variance will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood;
7. The variance will not substantially or permanently impair the appropriate use or development of adjacent property;
8. The variance will not be detrimental to the public welfare;
9. The variance represents the least modification of the regulation at issue;
10. The variance represents the minimum variance necessary to afford relief; and
11. The proposed tower meets the standards set forth in Section 115-194.2 of the Sussex County Zoning Code.

Motion by Dr. Hitchens, seconded by Mr. Kingree, carried that **the variance and special use exception be approved for the reasons stated.** Motion carried 4-0.

The vote by roll call: Mr. Lovenguth – yea, Mr. Kingree – yea, Dr. Hitchens – yea and Mr. Williamson – yea

Case No. 13142 – Kelly Brady seeks a variance from the rear yard setback requirement for a proposed structure (Section 115-25 and 115-183(E) of the Sussex County Zoning Code). The property is located on the northwest side of Turtle Dove Drive. 911 Address: 19 Turtle Dove Drive, Rehoboth Beach. Zoning District: AR-1. Tax Map: 334-6.00-1087.00

Ms. Norwood presented the case and stated that the Office of Planning and Zoning received two letters of support, zero letters of opposition, and zero mail returns.

The Applicant is requesting the following variance:

- 10 ft. variance from the 20 ft. rear yard setback requirement for a proposed pole building;

Kelly Brady was sworn in to give testimony about the Application.

Mr. Sharp stated that the Applicant was before the Board earlier in the year for a similar application but that application was denied (BOA Case No. 13104 from August 8, 2025); that the previous application was for a variance from the side and rear yard setback requirements for the proposed pole building; that the new application is a variance for the rear yard setback to place a new pole building; that, in order for the Board to hear this case, it needs to be proven that there has been a substantial change in the conditions affecting the property or that there has been a substantial change in the proposal from the last application.

Ms. Brady testified that she is asking for a 10 foot variance off the back property line and she no longer needs the side yard variance; that the reason for the need of the rear yard variance is because there are utilities in their front yard, the well in the back yard, and the placement of the pool; that these things limit the actual placement of the pole building with the exception of the back corner with the variance; that there are approximately 12 properties in the neighborhood with utilities in the front yard and this is one of those properties; that the pole building will measure 35 feet by 50 feet with a 14 foot lean-to; that the need for the this variance is as follows; that the placement of the well and pool in the rear of the property with other utilities being in the front limiting the usable space creates a uniqueness; that the property cannot otherwise be developed; that the pole barn they are requesting to build is square in shape, meaning it is the same size from front to back as it is side to side; that, as a result, shifting the structures orientation or position of the lot does not resolve the setback or spacing issues due to the uniform dimensions, unique constraints of the lot, including existing features and required clearances leave no alternative placement that will comply without a variance as well; that the exceptional practical difficulty was not created by the Applicant; that the exceptional practical difficulty in developing the property as proposed is due to the way the lot was laid out and developed prior to my ownership; that the existing conditions, including the placement of utilities, the well and other structures were already established and limit available options for the placement of the pole building; that the variance will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood; that the

homeowners association allows for pole barns and many neighbors have them; that some pole buildings in the neighborhood are larger than the one at issue; that the pole building behind the field is approximately 50 feet by 60 feet; that the Applicant is requesting a reasonably sized structure that is smaller than several of the others in the neighborhood; that the property backs up to a large open field providing ample buffer space and ensuring that the pole barn will not negatively impact neighboring views, privacy, or property use; that the variance requested is the minimum variance; that, after reevaluating the original plans, the Applicant reran its numbers and is no longer requesting any variance on the side yard setback; that the only variance sought is a 10-foot reduction in the rear; that, given that the property backs up to a large open field with no nearby homes, this adjustment would not impact views, privacy, or use of property; that they staked out the entire property to find the least variance necessary and the main reason for needing this is to be able to store their boat, golf cart, and pickup truck; that this is not her full-time residence and the beach air is not good for the vehicles while they are not being utilized; that, in order to fit the boat into the pole building due to the placement of other structures and the driveway, this is the least variance they could ask for; that they can barely fit her truck in the other garage; that the proposed location of the pole building is the farthest location from the rear property line without going over the well; that the pool was placed by a prior owner and is longer rather than wide; that the yard is fenced in; that the shed is dilapidated and will be removed; that she is willing to go 12 feet off the rear property line but prefers 10 feet; and that she would like to use it to put stuff away.

Lieutenant Colonel Anthony Scafidi was sworn in to testify in support of the Application.

Lt. Col. Scafidi testified that he is the Applicant's next door neighbor and has no issue with the structure going in the proposed placement; that the structure will not impede his view or be obstructive in any way; that this pole building will keep with the aesthetics of the development; that by putting the boat into the pole building is more appealing to look at than the boat in the middle of the yard; that his well is located in the front yard; that he has owned his lot for 15 years; that there is an easement between the lots; that there are others in the neighborhood with similar pole buildings; and that he believes the pole building will make the yard look better.

The Board found that one person appeared in support of the Application and no one appeared in opposition to the Application.

Mr. Williamson closed the public hearing.

Mr. Sharp stated that the first threshold question is whether the application is substantially different from the prior one or if there has been substantial changes to the property; that, in past cases where an applicant has been denied and they come back with a request for a lesser variance, the Board has in the past determined that such a change is a substantial change in what they are seeking from prior approval; that, regarding the question of substantial change in the conditions of the property, there was not much testimony to that effect so the issue before the Board is whether you believe that the Application is substantially different from the prior one; that, if the Board finds as such, the Board

can look at the merits that this application; and whether the Applicant has met the standards for granting a variance.

Mr. Kingree, seconded by Dr. Hitchens, carried that the Application is substantially different from prior BOA Case No. 13104. Motion carried 3-1.

The vote by roll call: Mr. Lovenguth – yea, Dr. Hitchens – yea, Mr. Kingree – yea and Mr. Williamson – nay

Mr. Lovenguth moved to approve the application for Case No. 13141 for the requested variance, with modification, pending final written decision, for the following reasons:

1. The property has unique physical conditions due to the pool and well;
2. That, due to such physical circumstances and conditions, there is no possibility that the property can be developed in strict conformity with the Sussex County Zoning Code;
3. The variance, as modified, is necessary to enable reasonable use of the property;
4. The exceptional practical difficulty has not been created by the Applicant;
5. The variance, as modified, will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood;
6. The variance, as modified, will not substantially or permanently impair the appropriate use or development of adjacent property;
7. The variance, as modified, will not be detrimental to the public welfare;
8. The variance, as modified, represents the least modification of the regulation at issue;
9. The variance, as modified, represents the minimum variance necessary to afford relief; and
10. The Board approve a variance of 8 feet from the 20 feet rear yard setback requirement since the Applicant testified that she could place the pole building 12 feet from the rear yard property line.

Motion by Mr. Lovenguth, seconded by Dr. Hitchens, carried that **the variance, with modification, be approved for the reasons stated.** Motion carried 3-1.

The vote by roll call: Mr. Kingree – yea, Dr. Hitchens – yea, Mr. Lovenguth – yea and Mr. Williamson – nay

Case No. 13143 – Schell Brothers, LLC seeks variances from the landscape buffer requirement in the Combined Highway Corridor Overlay Zone (CHCOZ) and from the fence height requirement for a proposed fence (Sections 115-34, 115-194.1, and 115-185 of the Sussex County Zoning Code). The property is located on the east side of Coastal Highway. 911 Address: 28415, 28423, 28431, 28439, 28447 & 28455 Coastal Highway, Bethany Beach. Zoning District: MR. Tax Map: 134-5.00-4.00

Ms. Norwood presented the case and stated that the Office of Planning and Zoning received zero letters of support, zero letters of opposition, and one mail return.

The Applicant is requesting the following variances:

- A 3.5 ft. variance from the 3.5 ft. maximum height requirement for a fence; and
- A variance to reduce plantings in CHCOZ buffer.

Jon Horner, Esquire, presented the Application on behalf of the Applicant.

Mr. Horner stated that the property is unique as it is oddly shaped and is located adjacent to Route 1; that there is a water main in the area where the landscape buffer area begins; that the Applicant is unable to meet the landscape buffer requirement; that the Sussex Shores Water Company required that trees be removed due to easement rights; that the easement restricts the plantings; that the property cannot be developed in conformity with the Sussex County Zoning Code; that the exceptional practical difficulty was not created by the Applicant; that the variances will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood; that the fences are greater than 3.5 feet tall in the area; that the variances requested are the minimum variances necessary to afford relief; that, to accomplish the shielding goal, the Applicant proposes a mixture of trees and fences; that the trees will typically grow to 10 to 15 feet tall; that the mixture of trees and fencing will mimic the benefits of the landscape buffer requirements; that the fence can be placed in the easement area since there are no roots involved; that the fencing will provide sound dampening from the sounds of traffic along Route 1; that the fencing will be consistent with other fencing along Route 1; that fencing will be recessed so that the fencing does not block visibility from Route 1; that vehicles will access the property through right-in and right-out accesses; and that the fence will be outside the all-clear zone required by DelDOT.

Tim Green was sworn in to testify about the Application.

Mr. Green affirmed the statements made by Mr. Horner as true and correct.

The Board found that no one appeared in support of or in opposition to the Application.

Mr. Williamson closed the public hearing.

Mr. Kingree moved to approve the application for Case No. 13143 for the requested variances, pending final written decision, for the following reasons:

1. The property has unique physical conditions;
2. The property cannot otherwise be developed in strict conformity with the Sussex County Zoning Code;
3. The exceptional practical difficulty is not being created by the Applicant;
4. The variances will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood;

5. The variances will not substantially or permanently impair the uses or development of adjacent property; and
6. The variances sought are the minimum variances necessary to afford relief.

Motion by Mr. Kingree, seconded by Dr. Hitchens, carried that **the variances be approved for the reasons stated**. Motion carried 4 - 0.

The vote by roll call: Mr. Lovenguth – yea, Dr. Hitchens – yea, Mr. Kingree – yea and Mr. Williamson – yea

ADDITIONAL BUSINESS

Meeting adjourned at 8:03 p.m.