



BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

AGENDAS & MINUTES

MINUTES OF JULY 16, 2012

The regular meeting of the Sussex County Board of Adjustment was held on Monday, July 16, 2012, at 7:00 p.m. in the County Council Chambers, County Administrative Office Building, Georgetown, Delaware.

The meeting was called to order at 7:05 p.m. with Chairman Callaway presiding. The Board members present were; Mr. Dale Callaway, Mr. John Mills, Mr. Brent Workman, Mr. Jeff Hudson, and Mr. Norman Rickard, with James Sharp – Assistant County Attorney, and staff members Mrs. Susan Isaacs – Chief Zoning Inspector, and Mrs. Jennifer Norwood – Recording Secretary.

Motion by Mr. Mills, seconded by Mr. Workman, and carried unanimously to approve the Revised Agenda as circulated. Motion carried 5 – 0.

Motion by Mr. Mills, seconded by Mr. Hudson, and carried unanimously to approve the Minutes of June 18, 2012 as circulated. Motion carried 5 – 0.

Motion by Mr. Mills, seconded by Mr. Rickard, and carried unanimously to approve the Finding of Facts for June 18, 2012. Motion carried 5 – 0.

Mr. Sharp read a statement explaining how the Board of Adjustment meeting is conducted and the procedures for hearing the cases.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Case No. 11006 – Billie R. Leigh & Elizabeth A. Leigh – east of Route 54 (Lighthouse Road), southeast corner of Oyster Bay Lane and Salty Way Drive, being Lot 131 within Keenwik West development. (Tax Map I.D. 5-33-19.07-96.00)

A variance from the side yard setback requirement for a corner lot.

Mrs. Isaacs presented the case. Megan Hudson, Attorney, presented on behalf of the Applicants requesting a 4.3-foot variance from the required 15-foot corner side yard setback requirement for an existing dwelling. Mrs. Hudson stated that the dwelling was built in 1973; that in 2006 a permit was issued to relocate the dwelling to its present location and to construct a sunroom; that the Certificate of Compliance was issued in 2007; that the Applicants purchased the property on May 18, 2012; that a survey completed for settlement showed the encroachment into the setback area; that the lot is narrow in size; that the difficulty was not created by the

Applicants; that the property cannot otherwise be developed; that the variance will enable reasonable use of the property; that the variance will not alter the character of the neighborhood; and that it is the minimum variance to afford relief.

Mr. Sharp advised Ms. Hudson that there is a need to have the Applicant present at the hearings for confirmation of the testimony.

Minutes
July 16, 2012
Page 2

The Board found that no parties appeared in support of or in opposition to the application.

Motion by Mr. Rickard, seconded by Mr. Workman, and carried unanimously to **leave the record open to allow the Applicant to appear and confirm testimony.**
Motion carried 5 – 0.

The vote by roll call; Mr. Mills – yea, Mr. Hudson – yea, Mr. Rickard – yea, Mr. Workman – yea, and Mr. Callaway – yea.

Case No. 11007 – David Seidl – east of Route 1 (Coastal Highway) south of York Beach Road, being Lot 37 within King’s Grant Condominium. (Tax Map I.D. 1-34-22.00-5.00)

A variance from the side yard setback requirement.

Mrs. Isaacs presented the case. David Seidl was sworn in and testified requesting a 10-foot variance from the required 10-foot side yard setback requirement for a proposed addition and a proposed deck. Mr. Seidl testified that the Applicant was approved for a variance in 2002; that in 2004 his child became ill and is permanently disabled; that his child needs a wheelchair to navigate through his home; that the dwelling consists of three (3) floors; that an elevator is needed to accommodate his son’s needs; that the proposed elevator will be constructed within the interior of the dwelling and will provide his son with access to all three levels of the dwelling; that the placement of the elevator shaft requires the removal of a bathroom and major changes to the layout of the dwelling; that the layout of the dwelling will have to be changed to allow for wider hallways and doorways so that his son can move around the dwelling in his wheelchair; that the proposed additions will recreate lost floor space due to the construction of the elevator; that the proposed construction will maintain the architectural consistency within the development; that they have obtained approval from the Department of Natural Resources & Environmental Control (DNREC) for the proposed addition; that the dwelling will be compliant with the American with Disabilities Act; that the Homeowner’s Association is reviewing the proposed plan; that the Homeowner’s Association is currently waiting for a change in their restrictions before approving the plan; that he will provide the Planning & Zoning Office with a copy of his DNREC approval; and that he is aware of the Fair Housing Act and will seek that avenue if necessary. The Applicant submitted schematics of the proposed addition with his Application.

The Board found that 2 parties appeared in support of the application.

The Board found that no parties appeared in opposition to the application.

Mrs. Isaacs read a letter of opposition into the record.

Minutes
July 16, 2012
Page 3

Mr. Mills stated that he would move that the Board recommend approval of Variance Application No. 11007 for the requested variance based on the record made at the public hearing and for the following reasons:

1. The Applicant's child's disability and need for the elevator creates a uniqueness;
2. The difficulty was not created by the Applicant;
3. The variance will enable reasonable use of the property;
4. The variance will not alter the character of the neighborhood; and
5. The variance sought is the minimum variance to afford relief.

Motion by Mr. Mills, seconded by Mr. Rickard, and carried unanimously that the variance be **granted for the reasons stated**. Motion carried 5 – 0.

The vote by roll call; Mr. Hudson – yea, Mr. Workman – yea, Mr. Rickard – yea, Mr. Mills – yea, and Mr. Callaway – yea.

Case No. 11008 – Cape Henlopen School District – east of Route 24 (John J. Williams Highway). (Tax Map I.D. 2-34-12.00-107.00)

A special use exception to place a manufactured home type structure as a classroom for a period of five (5) years.

Mrs. Isaacs presented the case. Brian Bassett was sworn in and testified on behalf of the Applicant. Mr. Bassett testified that the Applicant is requesting a special use exception to place two (2) manufactured home type structures for classrooms; that he is the Director of Administrative Services for the Applicant; that the school was built in 2003; that they have reached capacity; that the school district is the fastest growing district in the State; that all available space within the school has been converted to classrooms; that the enrollment for last year and the upcoming school year has increased significantly; that the units are for temporary use; that the school will be able to fill at least one (1) unit with the enrollment of students this fall; that additional classrooms cannot be built until a planned referendum is approved; that the five (5) year term for use of these units will allow the Applicant time to pass the referendum and build the school; that the proposed units will be placed near the existing units; that the units cannot be seen from the highway; and that the model year of the units is unknown but that the Applicant has requested the newest units available.

The Board found that no parties appeared in support of or in opposition to the application.

Mr. Rickard stated that he would move that the Board recommend approval of Special Use Exception No. 11008 for the requested special use exception based on the record made at the public hearing because the use does not substantially affect adversely the uses of the adjacent and neighboring properties.

Minutes
July 16, 2012
Page 4

Motion by Mr. Rickard, seconded by Mr. Workman, and carried unanimously that the Special Use Exception be **granted for the reasons stated**. Motion carried 5 – 0.

The vote by roll call; Mr. Hudson – yea, Mr. Rickard – yea, Mr. Workman – yea, Mr. Mills – yea, and Mr. Callaway – yea.

Case No. 11009 – W. Ralph Brumbley – northeast of Route 1 (Coastal Highway) east of Dave's Shortcut Road. (Tax Map I.D. 2-35-7.00-44.00)

A special use exception to operate a daycare facility.

Mrs. Isaacs presented the case. W. Ralph Brumbley was sworn in and testified requesting a special use exception to operate a daycare facility. Mr. Brumbley testified that the property has had previous approval for a daycare facility; that the daycare facility existed from 1999 to 2009; that he has found a new tenant for the property; that the facility will care for approximately 25-children; that the hours of operation will be from 8:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m., Monday through Saturday; that there is adequate parking available; that the facility will meet all State requirements; and that he owns the adjacent properties.

The Board found that no parties appeared in support of or in opposition to the application.

Mr. Mills stated that he would move that the Board recommend approval of Special Use Exception Application No. 11009 for the requested special use exception based on the record made at the public hearing because the use does not substantially affect adversely the uses of the adjacent and neighboring properties.

Motion by Mr. Mills, seconded by Mr. Hudson, and carried unanimously that the Special Use Exception be **granted for the reasons stated**. Motion carried 5 – 0.

The vote by roll call; Mr. Rickard – yea, Mr. Workman – yea, Mr. Mills – yea, Mr. Hudson – yea, and Mr. Callaway – yea.

Case No. 11010 – Anthony G. Fasano, III – east of Road 638 (Cedar Corners Road) approximately 950 feet south of Route 40 (Redden Road). (Tax Map I.D. 4-30-17.00-51.00)

A special use exception to place a manufactured home as a medical hardship for a period of two (2) years.

Mrs. Isaacs presented the case. Anthony Fasano, III was sworn in and testified requesting a special use exception to place a manufactured home on a medical hardship basis; that the unit was approved in 2006 for a medical hardship for his mother-in-law; that his mother-in-law passed away in March 2012; that he would like to use the unit for his sister-in-law who suffers

Minutes

July 16, 2012

Page 5

from mental illness. The Applicant submitted a statement from a physician confirming the existence of the medical hardship.

Mrs. Isaacs stated that the Applicant has had continued approval of the Special Use Exception since 2006 and complied with the County's requirements.

The Board found that 4-parties appeared in support of the application.

The Board found that no parties appeared in opposition to the application.

Mr. Mills stated that he would move that the Board recommend approval of Special Use Exception Application No. 11010 for the requested special use exception based on the record made at the public hearing because the use does not substantially affect adversely the uses of the adjacent and neighboring properties.

Motion by Mr. Mills, seconded by Mr. Hudson, and carried unanimously that the Special Use Exception be **granted for the reasons stated for a period of two (2) years**.
Motion carried 5 – 0.

The vote by roll call; Mr. Rickard – yea, Mr. Workman – yea, Mr. Mills – yea, Mr. Hudson – yea, and Mr. Callaway – yea.

Case No. 11011 – Susan S. Spencer – southwest of Road 363 (Double Bridges Road) south of Wooded Way. (Tax Map I.D. 1-34-19.00-71.02)

A variance from the minimum lot width requirement.

Mrs. Isaacs presented the case. Susan and Richard Spencer and Maxwell Morris, Surveyor, were sworn in and testified. The Applicants requested a 65-foot variance from the required 150-foot lot width requirement for a parcel. Mr. Morris testified that he is a surveyor; that the Applicants own Tracts B & C as shown on a survey attached to the Application; that the Applicants want to sell the Tracts B & C but the existing dwelling on Tract C encroaches onto Tract B; that the Applicants propose to revise the lot lines between Tracts B & C so that the dwelling no longer encroaches onto Tract B; that the proposed revised lot lines will result in an even exchange of land between the two tracts; that the original subdivision was created in 1993;

that the Applicants purchased the property in 1998; that the dwelling existed in its current location when the Applicants purchased it; that the Conservation District requires that the lots maintain a lot width of 150 feet; that the minimum lot width requirement prevents the lot lines from being redesigned so that the dwelling would no longer encroach onto Track B; that the property is unique in shape due to the angled property lines; that the proposed revised property lines will create a more normal shape for Track C; that the variance will enable reasonable use of the property; that it was not created by the Applicant; that the variance will not alter the character

Minutes

July 16, 2012

Page 6

of the neighborhood; and that it is the minimum variance to afford relief. Mrs. Spencer testified that public sewer is available to the properties.

The Board found that 2-parties appeared in support of the application.

The Board found that no parties appeared in opposition to the application.

Motion by Mr. Rickard, seconded by Mr. Workman, and carried unanimously that the case be taken under advisement. Motion carried 5 – 0.

The vote by roll call; Mr. Mills – yea, Mr. Hudson – yea, Mr. Rickard – yea, Mr. Workman – yea, and Mr. Callaway – yea.

At the conclusion of the public hearings, the Chairman referred back to this case. Mr. Mills stated that he would move that the Board recommend approval of Variance Application No. 11011 for the requested variance based on the record made at the public hearing and for the following reasons:

1. The property is unique in shape;
2. The property cannot be developed in strict conformity with the Sussex County zoning ordinance;
3. The variance will enable reasonable use of the property;
4. The difficulty was not created by the Applicant;
5. The variance will not alter the character of the neighborhood; and
6. The variance sought is the minimum variance to afford relief.

Motion by Mr. Mills, seconded by Mr. Rickard, and carried unanimously that the variance be **granted for the reasons stated**. Motion carried 5 – 0.

The vote by roll call; Mr. Workman – yea, Mr. Hudson – yea, Mr. Rickard – yea, Mr. Mills – yea, and Mr. Callaway – yea.

Case No. 11012 – C. James Coffey – east of Route 1 (Coastal Highway) north of Sugar Hill Drive, being Lot 33 within Sea Del Estates development. (Tax Map I.D. 1-34-9.00-375.00)

A variance from the rear yard setback requirement.

Mrs. Isaacs presented the case. Charles James Coffey of Miken Builders, was sworn in and testified requesting a 0.2-foot variance from the required 10-foot rear yard setback requirement for an existing dwelling and a 2.9-foot variance from the required 10-foot rear yard setback requirement for an existing chimney. Mr. Coffey testified that renovations were made to the dwelling in 2010; that the renovations were completed on a portion of the dwelling which is

Minutes

July 16, 2012

Page 7

not located in the setback area; that the existing dwelling and chimney were built in 1981 by Hickman Builders; that the original survey completed at that time showed no encroachments; and that a second survey of the Property completed after the completion of the additions showed the encroachments.

The Board found that 4-parties appeared in support of the application.

The Board found that no parties appeared in opposition to the application.

Mr. Hudson stated that he would move that the Board recommend approval of Variance Application No. 11012 for the requested variances based on the record made at the public hearing and for the following reasons:

1. The property is unique in shape and the original survey showed no encroachments;
2. The variance will not alter the character of the neighborhood;
3. The difficulty was not created by the Applicant; and
4. The variance is the minimum variance to afford relief.

Motion by Mr. Hudson, seconded by Mr. Rickard, and carried unanimously that the variance be **granted for the reasons stated**. Motion carried 5 – 0.

The vote by roll call; Mr. Mills – yea, Mr. Workman – yea, Mr. Rickard – yea, Mr. Hudson – yea, and Mr. Callaway – yea.

Case No. 11013 – Gary A. Purkey – south of Route 54 (Lighthouse Road) northeast of Swann Drive, being Lot 50 within Swann Keys development. (Tax Map I.D. 5-33-13.13-4.00)

A variance from the front yard, side yard, and rear yard setback requirements.

Mrs. Isaacs presented the case. Gary Purkey and Gil Fleming were sworn in testified requesting a 2.8-foot variance from the required 10-foot front yard setback requirement, a 1.2-foot variance from the required 10-foot side yard setback requirements on both sides of lot, a 1-foot variance from the required 10-foot rear yard setback requirement for a proposed manufactured home, and a 4.2-foot variance from the required 10-foot side yard setback requirement for a proposed air conditioning unit. Mr. Purkey testified that the proposed unit will

measure 16 feet by 52 feet; that the narrow lot is unique in size and will only allow a 10-foot wide unit on the lot; that the proposed unit is the minimum size that could be placed on the lot; that the location of the cul-de-sac also creates a uniqueness to the lot; that the proposed unit will not alter the character of the neighborhood as the proposed unit is similar to the majority of homes in the development; that the variance will enable reasonable use of the property; and that it is the minimum variance to afford relief.

Minutes
July 16, 2012
Page 8

The Board found that 4-parties appeared in support of the application.

The Board found that no parties appeared in opposition of the application.

Mrs. Isaacs read 1-letter of opposition into the record.

Mr. Mills stated that he would move that the Board recommend approval of Variance Application No. 11013 for the requested variance based on the record made at the public hearing and for the following reasons:

1. The narrow lot and cul-de-sac create a uniqueness to the lot;
2. The property cannot be otherwise developed;
3. The variance will enable reasonable use of the property;
4. The difficulty was not created by the Applicant;
5. The variance will not alter the character of the neighborhood; and
6. The variance is the minimum variance to afford relief.

Motion by Mr. Mills, seconded by Mr. Rickard, and carried unanimously that the variance be **granted for the reasons stated**. Motion carried 5 – 0.

The vote by roll call; Mr. Workman – yea, Mr. Hudson – yea, Mr. Mills – yea, Mr. Rickard – yea, and Mr. Callaway – yea.

Case No. 11014 – Suzanne L. Mundorf – east of Road 334 (Dagsboro Road) 525 feet east of Coffin Lane. (Tax Map I.D. 2-33-5.00-186.12)

A special use exception to retain a manufactured home for storage.

Mrs. Isaacs presented the case. Suzanne Mundorf and Billie Jo Coffin were sworn in and testified requesting a special use exception to retain a manufactured home for storage. Ms. Mundorf testified that the unit was originally approved for a medical hardship case for her son; that her son moved out of the unit in May 2012; that she would like to use the unit for storage; that the unit has been used to store her son's belongings; that the unit has been remodeled over the years; that she also would like to retain the unit if her son were to have to move back in the unit; that she purchased the land and this unit in 1984; that a new roof was installed on the unit;

that currently the unit is no longer hooked up to electric or sewer; that the kitchen has been removed; that the unit has been used for the hardship since 1996; and that they have kept the use in good standing with the County. Ms. Coffin testified that the unit is handicap accessible and they have installed a handicap accessible bathroom.

The Board found that 1-party appeared in support of the application.

Minutes
July 16, 2012
Page 9

The Board found that no parties appeared in opposition to the application.

Mr. Mills stated that he would move that the Board recommend approval of Special Use Exception Application No. 11014 for the requested special use exception based on the record made at the public hearing because the use does not substantially affect adversely the uses of the adjacent and neighboring properties.

Motion by Mr. Mills, seconded by Mr. Rickard, and carried unanimously that the special use exception be **granted for the reasons stated**. Motion carried 5 – 0.

The vote by roll call; Mr. Hudson – yea, Mr. Workman – yea, Mr. Rickard – yea, Mr. Mills – yea, and Mr. Callaway – yea.

Motion by Mr. Mills, seconded by Mr. Rickard and carried unanimously that the Old Business be heard before Other Business. Motion carried 5 – 0.

OLD BUSINESS

Case No. 11000 – Robert W. Steffens – east of Road 350 (Railway Road) southwest of Oak Street, being Lot 10 within Banks Acres development. (Tax Map I.D. 1-34-12.00-123.00)

A variance from the side yard, front yard, and rear yard setback requirements.

Mrs. Isaacs presented the case that was left open on July 2, 2012 to allow the Applicant to appear and confirm testimony. Robert Steffens was sworn in with Manaen Robinson, Attorney. Mr. Steffens testified that he listened to the audio of Mr. Robinson's presentation before the Board on July 2, 2012, and Mr. Steffens affirmed the presentation as true and correct. Mr. Steffens testified that this property is his primary residence; that the variance is necessary to enable reasonable use of the property; that the structures would have to be torn down in order to comply with the setback requirements; that the difficulty was not created by the Applicant; that the structures existed in their current location when he purchased the Property; that the variances will not alter the character of the neighborhood; and that the variances requested are the minimum variances to afford relief.

The Board found that no parties appeared in support of or in opposition to the application.

Mr. Rickard stated that he would move that the Board recommend approval of Variance Application No. 11000 for the requested variances based on the record made at the public hearing and for the following reasons;

1. The difficulty was not created by the Applicant;
2. The variances will not alter the character of the neighborhood;

Minutes
July 16, 2012
Page 10

3. The variances are the minimum variances to afford relief; and
4. The Property is unique.

Motion by Mr. Rickard, seconded by Mr. Workman, and carried unanimously that the variance be **granted for the reasons stated**. Motion carried 5 – 0.

The vote by roll call; Mr. Mills – yea, Mr. Hudson – yea, Mr. Rickard – yea, Mr. Workman – yea, and Mr. Callaway – yea.

Case No. 11001 – Michael N. Hamilton & Susan M. Hamilton – north of Road 353 (Burbage Road) south of Bowman Lane, being Lot 11 within Sherwood Acres development. (Tax Map I.D. 1-34-15.00-64.01)

A variance from the side yard setback requirement.

Mrs. Isaacs presented the case that was left open on July 2, 2012 to allow the Applicant to appear and confirm testimony. Michael Hamilton was sworn in with Manaen Robinson, Attorney. Mr. Hamilton affirmed the presentation of Manaen Robinson made on July 2, 2012 and Mr. Hamilton testified that the difficulty was not created by the Applicant; that the structures would have to be torn down to comply; that the variance will enable reasonable use of the property; that the Applicants will suffer a hardship if the Application is denied; that the variance will not alter the character of the neighborhood; and that the proposed variance is the minimum variance to afford relief. The Applicants submitted 2-letters in support of the application.

The Board found that 5-parties appeared in support of the application.

The Board found that no parties appeared in opposition to the application.

Mrs. Isaacs stated that the Applicant submitted 2-letters of support to the application.

Mr. Mills stated that he would move that the Board recommend approval of Variance Application No. 11001 for the requested variance based on the record made at the public hearing and for the following reasons;

1. The variance will enable reasonable use of the property;

2. The difficulty was not created by the Applicant;
3. The variance will not alter the character of the neighborhood; and
4. The variance is the minimum variance to afford relief.

Motion by Mr. Mills, seconded by Mr. Hudson, and carried unanimously that the variance be **granted for the reasons stated**. Motion carried 5 – 0.

Minutes
July 16, 2012
Page 11

The vote by roll call; Mr. Rickard – yea, Mr. Workman – yea, Mr. Hudson – yea, Mr. Mills – yea, and Mr. Callaway – yea.

Case No. 11003 – Mike & Wanda Stough – northeast of Route 1 (Coastal Highway) northeast of Colonial Lane, being Lot 20 within Colonial East a Mobile Home Park. (Tax Map I.D. 3-34-6.00-335.00 Unit 52900)

A variance from the separation requirement between units in a mobile home park.

The Board discussed this case which has been tabled since July 2, 2012.

Mr. Rickard stated that he would move that the Board recommend approval of Variance Application No. 11003 for the requested variance based on the record made at the public hearing and for the following reasons:

1. The Property is unique;
2. The variance will enable reasonable use of the property;
3. The variance will not alter the character of the neighborhood;
4. The variance is the minimum variance to afford relief.

Motion by Mr. Rickard, seconded by Mr. Hudson, and carried unanimously that the variance be **granted for the reasons stated**. Motion carried 5 – 0.

The vote by roll call; Mr. Mills – yea, Mr. Hudson – yea, Mr. Workman – yea, Mr. Rickard – yea, and Mr. Callaway – yea.

Case No. 11004 – Susan Pratzner – west of Route 1 (Coastal Highway) east of Sarah Road, being Lot H-92 within Whispering Pines a Mobile Home Park. (Tax Map I.D. 3-34-5.00-155-.00 Unit 19038)

A variance from the separation requirement between units in a mobile home park.

The Board discussed this case which has been tabled since July 2, 2012.

Mr. Hudson stated that he would move that the Board recommend approval of Variance Application No. 11004 for the requested variance based on the record made at the public hearing and for the following reasons:

1. The property is unique in size;
2. The difficulty was not created by the Applicant;
3. The variance will not alter the character of the neighborhood; and
4. The variance is the minimum variance to afford relief.

Minutes
July 16, 2012
Page 12

Motion by Mr. Hudson, seconded by Mr. Rickard, and carried unanimously that the variance be **granted for the reasons stated and that the builder be sent a letter from Counsel**. Motion carried 5 – 0.

The vote by roll call; Mr. Mills – yea, Mr. Rickard – yea, Mr. Workman – yea, Mr. Hudson – yea, and Mr. Callaway – yea.

OTHER BUSINESS

REORGANIZATION

Mr. Callaway appointed Mrs. Isaacs as Acting Chairman for the purpose of holding an Election of Officers.

Mrs. Isaacs opened nominations for Chairman.

Motion by Mr. Rickard and seconded by Mr. Hudson, to nominate Mr. Callaway as Chairman.

Motion by Mr. Mills and seconded by Mr. Rickard that the nominations for Chairman be closed.

Motion was adopted to nominate Mr. Callaway as Chairman with 5 – 0 vote.

Vote for Mr. Callaway, as Chairman, by roll call:

Mr. Rickard - yea
Mr. Workman - yea
Mr. Hudson - yea
Mr. Mills - yea
Mr. Callaway - yea

Mrs. Isaacs opened nominations for Vice-Chairman.

Motion by Mr. Workman and seconded by Mr. Rickard to nominate Mr. Mills for Vice-Chairman.

Motion by Mr. Hudson and seconded by Mr. Rickard that the nominations for Vice-Chairman be closed.

Motion was adopted to nominate Mr. Mills as Vice-Chairman with 5 – 0 vote.

Vote for Mr. Mills, as Chairman, by roll call:

Minutes
July 16, 2012
Page 13

Mr. Rickard - yea
Mr. Workman - yea
Mr. Hudson - yea
Mr. Mills - yea
Mr. Callaway - yea

The meeting was turned over to Mr. Callaway, the re-elected Chairman.

Motion was made by Mr. Mills and seconded by Mr. Rickard to appoint Mrs. Isaacs as Secretary to the Board with 5 – 0 vote.

Vote for Mrs. Isaacs, as Secretary to the Board, by roll call:

Mr. Rickard - yea
Mr. Workman - yea
Mr. Hudson - yea
Mr. Mills - yea
Mr. Callaway - yea

Meeting Adjourned 9:05 p.m.