

MINUTES OF OCTOBER 3, 2022

The regular meeting of the Sussex County Board of Adjustment was held on Monday, October 3, 2022, at 6:00 p.m. in the County Council Chamber, Sussex County Administration Office Building, Georgetown, Delaware. The teleconference system was tested during the meeting by staff to confirm connectivity.

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. with Chairman Jeffrey Chorman presiding. The Board members present were: Dr. Kevin Carson, Mr. Jeffrey Chorman, Mr. John T. Hastings, Mr. Jordan Warfel, 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. Chorman.

Motion by Mr. Warfel, seconded by Mr. Hastings, and carried unanimously to approve the agenda. Motion carried 5 – 0.

The vote by roll call; Mr. Williamson – yea, Dr. Carson – yea, Mr. Hastings – yea, Mr. Warfel – yea, and Mr. Chorman – yea.

Motion by Mr. Williamson, seconded by Dr. Carson and carried unanimously to approve the Minutes for the August 15, 2022, meeting. Motion carried 5 – 0.

The vote by roll call; Mr. Warfel – yea, Mr. Hastings – yea, Dr. Carson – yea, Mr. Williamson – yea, and Mr. Chorman – yea.

Motion by Mr. Hastings, seconded by Mr. Warfel and carried unanimously to approve the Findings of Facts for the August 15, 2022, meeting. Motion carried 5 – 0.

The vote by roll call; Dr. Carson – yea, Mr. Williamson – yea, Mr. Warfel – yea, Mr. Hastings – yea, and Mr. Chorman – yea

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. 12743– David and Lisa Moore seek variances from the side yard and rear yard setback requirements for a proposed commercial dog kennel and its runs, cages or kennels (Section 115-20 of the Sussex County Zoning Code). The property is a through lot located on the northeast side of Springwood Drive within the Lakewood Estates Subdivision. 911 Address: 11025 Iron Hill Road, Delmar. Zoning District: AR-1. Tax Parcel: 532-14.00-6.03

Ms. Norwood presented the case and stated that the Office of Planning and Zoning received two (2) letters in support and zero correspondence in opposition to the Application and zero mail

returns. The Applicants are requesting variances of 36.9 ft. from the 200 ft. setback requirement for a dog kennel on the east side, 90.4 ft. from the 200 ft. setback requirement on the east side for a dog run, 85.9 ft. from the 200 ft. setback requirement on the east side for a dog run, 101.7 ft. from the 200 ft. setback requirement on the north side for a dog kennel, 117.5 ft. from the 200 ft. setback requirement on the north side for a dog run, 69.1 ft. from the 200 ft. setback requirement for a dog run on the north side, 11.6 ft. from the 200 ft. setback requirement on the west side for a dog kennel, and 9.7 ft. from the 20 ft. rear yard setback requirement for an existing detached garage. Ms. Norwood noted that the garage was built in 1993 and CO'd in 1995 and could be resolved administratively and without being addressed by the Board of Adjustment.

Mr. David Hutt, Esquire, stated that he is representing David and Lisa Moore who are both the Applicants and owners of the property; that the property is located at 11025 Iron Hill Road, Delmar; that the Moores would like to operate a commercial dog kennel on their property and require a number of variances in order to do so; that the property is outlined in yellow on the screen; that the property consists of a little more than 7.2 acres; that the property is located on the north side of Iron Hill Road; that Iron Hill Road is located between Route 13 and Old Stage Road; that along Route 13 on the western side is Thermo King and the Metal Shop, both of which are across from the entrance to Iron Hill Road; that a little farther south is the Delmar Race Track; that on the eastern side of Route 13 is Bailey's, West Auto, and Oakwood Homes; that Iron Hill Road is made up of wooded areas, agricultural areas, single-family homes, and a small manufactured home community; that, on the other end of Iron Hill Road, there are two (2) commercial businesses, Central Turf and Irrigation Supply and General Refrigeration; that there is a mixture of zoning for the area and the previous uses fall in line with the zoning; that there is AR-1, GR, Commercial, and Industrial zoning in the area; that the Moores purchased the property in 2019; that the prior owner of the property used it as an equestrian facility; that the home and other improvements sit back from Iron Hill Road; that the Application submitted sought seven (7) variance requests for the building at the rear of the property; that submitted with the Application was a copy of the deed, the site plan, tax maps and aerial imagery; that the property is zoned AR-1 which is the most prevalent zoning district in Sussex County; that typically special use exceptions are request for commercial dog kennels in addition to variances but this property meets the acreage requirement under § 115-20 and is a permitted use without a special use exception; that the variances are required for the kennels and runs because they do not comply with the 200 ft. setback requirement; that the barn at the rear of the property is where the dogs would be kept; that the only time the dogs would be out of the barn would be for walks and relief purposes; that the former track or pasture area, which is adjacent to the barn, would be used for the walking of the dogs; that, when looking at the site plan, it highlights the various variance ranges that are being requested and are required; that the property is unique due to its shape and the varying width; that with the shape and width of the property there is no way to locate the runs and kennels 200 ft. off the property line; that there is a very narrow window for the placement of the runs and kennels that would comply based on the size of the property but that does not take into account the location of the well and septic; that the variances are necessary to enable the reasonable use of a commercial dog kennel on this property; that the variances were not created by the Applicants as they bought the property as it is and did not create the lot nor its shape; that the requests are to use the existing structure on the

property and integrate the improvements of the property into the operation of the dog kennel; that the proposed variances will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood; that there will be nothing new added to the property; that the structures on the property sit back away from the road and to a person driving by you would not know that there is anything different taking place on the property; that the zoning surrounding this property is of mixed use; that there are letters of support from the neighbors that surround the property; that the property owners consulted with their neighbors prior to moving forward with their plan; that the support letter from the Krepps indicates a natural audio buffer which is the landscaping that is positioned between their property and the Moores; that these are the minimum variances requested and the Applicants planned to use the existing structures on the property that were installed by the prior owners; that the last variance listed is for the garage at the rear of the property which was on the property when his clients purchased the property; that this structure was permitted but was picked up on the survey when preparing for the variance application; that there is a bit of water laying on the property to the rear which he is unsure if it is a type of wetlands but the water would limit the ability to develop it further; that the red barn is a proposed kennel but the building is already constructed; that the garage is to the rear of the barn or proposed kennel; that the red barn and the pasture area will be used for the kennel operations; that the variances requested are for all areas in relation to the kennel operations that require a variance; that the Zoning Code states 200 ft. are needed from the property lines to kennels, runs and cages; that the proposed fenced in areas within the track are new; that they cannot place the proposed fenced in areas in any other location and keep the same amount of functionality; that he previously spoke about the limitations due to the width of the property and, if they changed locations of structures, they would still need alternative variances; that their proposal is the most efficient and effective plan for their operation; that, when the property was laid out as an equestrian facility, it was designed for the horses to leave the barn directly into the pasture area; that they used that same plan and premise for their proposed operation; that the property becomes narrower as you go towards Iron Hill Road; that the property is 420 feet at its widest point and is only 340 feet wide at the front property line; that to build a kennel and the associated runs in the small area allowed is not feasible even though this is a 7 acre lot; that it is an existing horse barn that will be used as a commercial dog kennel; and that the property is serviced by well and septic.

Mr. David Moore and Ms. Lisa Moore were sworn in to give testimony about the Application.

Mr. Moore testified that he is one of the owners of the property in question; that he affirms what Mr. Hutt stated is true and accurate; that there will be approximately 10-12 dogs on site; that this will not be a breeding facility but a long-term storage kennel; that there will be minimal traffic to and from their property; that the lands behind them were a borrow pit from when the highway was created and would not be able to be developed; that they would be by appointment only; that they would allow drop off at 6:30 or 7:00 am; that pick up would be as late as 6:30 or 7:00 pm; that there will be no additional employees outside of their family; that the red barn was used for equestrian purposes prior to their ownership; that the horse barn was existing when they purchased the property and they are converting it to a dog kennel; and that the septic and well are located in the widest portion of the property.

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

Mr. Chorman closed the public hearing.

Mr. Hastings moved to approve Case No. 12743 for the requested variances, pending final written decision, for the following reasons:

1. The property has unique conditions due to its width;
2. That, due to the physical conditions, the property cannot be developed in strict conformity with Sussex County Zoning Code and the variances are necessary to enable the reasonable use of the property;
3. The exceptional practical difficulty was not created by the Applicants; and
4. The variances will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood nor substantially or permanently impair the appropriate use or development of adjacent property nor be detrimental to the public welfare.

Motion by Mr. Hastings, seconded by Mr. Warfel, carried unanimously that the **variances be granted for the reasons stated**. Motion carried 5-0.

The vote by roll call; Dr. Carson – yea, Mr. Williamson – yea, Mr. Warfel – yea, Mr. Hastings – yea, and Mr. Chorman – yea.

Case No. 12744– Tida Keedy and Richard Weibling seek variances from the side yard setback and separation distance requirements for proposed and existing structures (Sections 115-25, 115-172, and 115-183 of the Sussex County Zoning Code). The property is located on the southeast side of Center Avenue within the Sea Air Village Manufactured Home Park. 911 Address: 19923 Center Avenue, Rehoboth Beach. Zoning District: AR-1. Tax Parcel: 334-13.00-310.00-31384

Ms. Norwood presented the case and stated that the Office of Planning and Zoning received no correspondence in support of or in opposition to the Application and thirteen (13) mail returns. The Applicant is requesting variances of 9.4 ft. from the 20 ft. separation requirement between the proposed shed and existing manufactured home on Lot D59, 6.5 ft. from the 20 ft. separation distance requirement between the proposed shed and existing manufactured home on Lot E60, 13 ft. from the 20 ft. separation distance requirement between the existing manufactured home and shed on Lot E60, 5 ft. from the 5 ft. side yard setback requirement on the southwest side for an existing landing and steps, 4.4 ft. from the 20 ft. separation distance requirement between the existing deck and existing manufactured home on Lot D59, and 7.2 ft. from the 20 ft. separation distance requirement between the existing deck and existing landing on Lot D59.

Mr. Richard Weibling and Ms. Tida Keedy were sworn in to give testimony about the Application.

Mr. Weibling testified that he resides in Sea Air Village; that he has watched previous cases that have been before the Board of Adjustment for his neighborhood; that he has a trailer on a very narrow lot; that he tore down his 8' x 10' metal shed; that he could not place a 1' x 1' shed on his property without needing a variance because there is no room; that he went through the process with Sea Air Village and received approval for his request; that he obtained a survey; that no matter where he places it and no matter the size he will need the additional approval of a variance; that he was originally going to place a cheap metal shed back in its place but, when you are paying almost \$1,000.00, putting a \$299.00 shed back in its place does not seem to work out; that he wants to place a 10' x 10' wooden shed to place his stuff and have a workshop; that his neighbors have no problem with his proposed shed; that he has lived there for 20 years and Ms. Keedy has lived there for 25 years; that they love their neighbors; that his old shed used to go straight across the back from the rear of the trailer to the property line; that the new shed will be placed more into the yard because the neighbor behind them placed a shed on the property line; that, for him to have the necessary clearance, he has to place his shed further into the property by 3 ft. or more; that he has done everything legally required that he needs to do to place the shed and now he is before the Board; that he wants a shed and for it to be nice; that the neighbor whose shed is on the property line did not acquire a permit for his shed; that he is doing this by the book and obtaining the necessary approvals; that, if he placed his shed where it was previously, he would not meet the separation distance requirement for accessory structures; that he has lost 30 ft. into his property and he is not complaining about it; that he does not want problems anymore; that, if the neighbor's shed was not there, he would be able to move his shed another 3 ft. back; that he placed the shed in the proposed location to minimize the need for variances between the sheds; that he is trying to minimize any potential issues between him and the neighbor to the rear; that the park is happy with him but he still needs approval from the Board; that he is going place a block foundation with 7 ft. walls to an A frame; that he has built 11 sheds similar to this with his father; that the home was placed by a prior owner; that the steps are made of concrete; that the deck is not a deck but rather a platform; that the steps with landing were there when they purchased the property; that there have been no complaints; that he has obtained a permit to rebuild the platform that was on the property; that it was constructed of 2' x 6' boards with 1' x 6' boards across it to cover a concrete pad; that when he came in to get permits they talked at length about the platform but it was mainly about the height of the railing; that there was a step off the platform but it is not needed; that he can make the platform comply to be no more than 6 inches above grade; that he wants to hide the crappy concrete that has been deteriorating; that there are two (2) steps and a landing; that he wants to only do this process once and would like to get the property into compliance; that the park has approved his request; that he increased the size of the shed to accommodate a shop bench on the left side of the shed; that the park has limited shed size to 10' x 10'; that a 10' x 10' shed is the minimum size to accomplish his needs and use of the structure; that he lives in a singlewide trailer; that he has 14 containers in his living room and a tiny shed that is packed to the doors with some of his stuff; that they have two (2) bedrooms but can barely get into the second bedroom; that he needs space to store their stuff; that singlewide manufactured homes are not designed for storage of people that have lives; that Ms. Keedy likes to decorate; that he would like to get all of the decorations and such out of his living room; that the shed he currently has is very tiny and will be removed when he gets the new shed; that his current shed is either a 3' x 3' or 4' x 4' that was given to them by a neighbor; that their

singlewide trailer is 14' x 60'; and that their trailer is not built for the stuff of two (2) people.

Ms. Norwood stated that no variances are needed for the steps and landing on the northeast side.

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

Mr. Chorman closed the public hearing.

Mr. Williamson moved to approve Case No. 12744 for the requested variances, pending final written decision, for the following reasons:

1. The property has unique conditions;
2. That, due to the physical conditions, the property cannot be developed in strict conformity with Sussex County Zoning Code and the variances are necessary to enable the reasonable use of the property;
3. The exceptional practical difficulty was not created by the Applicants;
4. The variances will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood nor substantially or permanently impair the appropriate use or development of adjacent property nor be detrimental to the public welfare; and
5. The variances represent the minimum variances necessary to afford relief.

Motion by Mr. Williamson, seconded by Dr. Carson, carried unanimously that the **variances be granted for the reasons stated**. Motion carried 5-0.

The vote by roll call; Mr. Warfel – yea, Mr. Hastings – yea, Dr. Carson – yea, Mr. Williamson – yea, and Mr. Chorman – yea.

Case No. 12745– Michael and Diane Schiappa seek variances from the separation distance requirements and the maximum lot coverage requirement within a manufactured home park (Sections 115-42 and 115-172 of the Sussex County Zoning Code). The property is located on the north side of Brant Road. 911 Address: 38144 Brant Road, Ocean View. Zoning District: GR. Tax Parcel: 134-9.00-94.01

Ms. Norwood presented the case and stated that the Office of Planning and Zoning received one (1) letter in support of, none in opposition to the Application and zero mail returns. The Applicants are requesting variances of 1.4 ft. from the 20 ft. separation distance requirement between the proposed deck and existing manufactured home on Lot 256, 1.7 ft. from the 20 ft. separation distance requirement between the proposed deck and existing manufactured home on Lot 256, and 165 sq. ft. over the maximum allowable lot coverage of 35%.

Mr. Michael Schiappa and Ms. Diane Schiappa were sworn in to give testimony about the Application.

Mr. Schiappa testified that they are seeking a variance of 2 ft. from the 20 ft. separation distance requirement and a 5% variance of the 35% maximum lot coverage requirement in a manufactured home park in order to construct a deck; that the deck will measure 8 feet by 38 feet; that 8 feet wide decks are normal in the neighborhood; that the lots are very narrow; that the trailer park was built in the 1960s and homes were not as large as they are now; that they want to construct a deck for further use and enjoyment of the property; that they cannot construct an 8 ft. wide deck without the variance; that the manufactured home was on the lot when they purchased it; that the size of deck they are requesting is of typical size; that, if the variances are not granted, they will not build the deck because a 6 ft. wide deck is not practical; that they have the approval of Bay Shore; that the steps are prefab and will be turned to meet up with the walkway; that the home is the original when they purchased it; that the neighbors on each side of them are okay with it; that the deck will not be covered; that they have plans in the future to enclose the deck as shown in some pictures submitted; that the room would be a 3 seasons room but for the time being it would be a deck; that he calculated the lot coverage by adding the size of the structures and subtracting it from the lot size; that the owner told him he usually requests a 7% variance for lot coverage when installing decks of this size but he is confident that they only need 5%; that the steps will be facing the street not parallel to the road; that the steps are hollow concrete and his plan was to turn them on to the sidewalk; that he would place the steps in a manner similar to pictures submitted; that the steps will be in the front along Brant Road; and that they are looking to enclose a portion of the deck in the future and still have a deck remaining.

Ms. Schiappa testified that they purchased the home in 2015; and that where the steps currently are would be turned into a 3 seasons room and the other portion remains a deck.

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

Mr. Chorman closed the public hearing.

Mr. Warfel moved to approve Case No. 12745 for the requested variances, pending final written decision, for the following reasons:

1. The property has unique conditions due to the exceptionally small buildable area;
2. That, due to the physical conditions, the property cannot be developed in strict conformity with Sussex County Zoning Code and the variances are necessary to enable the reasonable use of the property;
3. The exceptional practical difficulty was not created by the Applicants;
4. The variances will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood nor substantially or permanently impair the appropriate use or development of adjacent property nor be detrimental to the public welfare; and
5. The variances represent the minimum variances necessary to afford relief.

Motion by Mr. Warfel, seconded by Mr. Hastings, carried unanimously that the **variances be**

granted for the reasons stated. Motion carried 5-0.

The vote by roll call; Mr. Williamson – yea, Dr. Carson – yea, Mr. Hastings – yea, Mr. Warfel – yea, and Mr. Chorman – yea.

Case No. 12746– Chad A. Rubin seeks a special use exception and a variance to the maximum square footage for a proposed garage / studio apartment (Sections 115-23, 115-25, and 115-210 of the Sussex County Zoning Code). The property is a corner lot located on the corner of Old Landing Road and Dry Brooke Drive. 911 Address: 35526 Dry Brook Drive, Rehoboth Beach. Zoning District: AR-1. Tax Parcel: 334-12.00-191.00

Mr. Phillips presented the case and stated that the Office of Planning and Zoning received five (5) letters in support of and zero letters in opposition to the Application and zero mail returns. The Applicant is requesting a special use exception and variance of 208 sq. ft. from the 800 sq. ft. maximum square footage for a garage / studio apartment.

Ms. Mackenzie Peet stated that she is here representing Mr. Chad Rubin; that Mr. Rubin is requesting a special use exception for an existing garage studio apartment and a variance of 208 sq. ft. from the 800 sq. ft. allowance for a garage studio apartment; that he wishes to make improvements to his property by constructing a single-family home on the property and this would allow him to do so; that the property is 25,690 sq. ft. more or less and is located 35526 Dry Brooke Drive in Rehoboth and Tax Map 334-12.00-191.00; that the property is a corner lot located at the intersection of Old Landing Road and Dry Brooke Drive; that the property is located adjacent to the subdivision known as Cedar Valley; that the property is also located nearby to the subdivisions of Redden Ridge, Arnell Creek, Breezewood, and the Landing; that this property is located nearby a more dense area of development; that there is a bed and breakfast with accessory structures across from the property also; that, as you travel Old Landing Road towards the highway, the uses intensify with stores from Atlantic Liquors to Walmart; that they submitted with the application as Exhibit A were the property description and deed; that Exhibit B is a survey submitted by Foresight and identifies the existing garage / studio apartment as constructed by the previous owner; that Exhibit C includes relevant sections of the building code; that Exhibit D includes a number of aerial maps; that Exhibit E includes the plans from the original owner of what was constructed; that Exhibit F includes a copy of the building permit and the certificate of occupancy for the structure; that Section 115-4 of the Sussex County Zoning Code defines a garage studio apartment as a building or use designed and used as a single apartment unit containing not more than 800 square feet of total floor area and accessory to the single-family dwelling; that the definition goes on to say that garage / studio apartments do not include duplexes, tourist homes, servant quarters, or guest homes; that the last sentence states that prior to use, a garage / studio apartment shall obtain a special use exception under the provisions of Article XXVII, Board of Adjustment, and all necessary state and local permits; that, within the zoning district in question, garage / studio apartments can be permitted administratively; that the only reason her client is before the Board is because the structure is in excess of the 800 sq. ft. limitation and cannot be granted administratively; that Section 115-209 of the Code authorizes the Board of Adjustment to

hear and decide application for variances and special use exceptions; that Section 115-211 goes on to say that for the Board to grant a variance that five (5) factors must be met; that the factors to be considered uniqueness, physical circumstance, without variance the property cannot be developed, that the hardship is not created by the Applicant, and that it is the minimum variance requested to afford relief; that the existing garage / studio apartment on the property creates a unique circumstance as it is located in the center rear yard of the property and is the only dwelling on the property; that the existing structure creates a practical difficulty for the Applicant to construct a single family dwelling on the property; that the nature of the zoning for the area is residential; that the existing and proposed structures are within the character of the neighborhood; that permitting the garage / studio apartment with additional square footage will not hinder the ability of neighboring properties to be developed; that this structure has been on the property since 2016 without issue; that there are letters of no objection from neighboring properties; that the Applicant cannot construct his dwelling until the existing is deemed as an accessory structure; that the current structure cannot accommodate the Applicant's family and guests due to the size limitation making the designation of an accessory dwelling unit all the more important; that the previous owner built the structure in 2016; that the intentions based off the permit was that the previous owner was going to construct a single family dwelling on that lot as well but that never came to fruition; that the variance will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood; that the variance will not substantially or permanently impair the appropriate use of the property; that the variance will not be detrimental to the public welfare; that the existing structure is located within an agricultural and residential area; that garage / studio apartments are granted through administrative approval indicating that they are within the character of the neighborhood; that they have enough space on the lot to construct the single family dwelling and keep the structure with the garage studio apartment; that there are letters of support from the neighboring property owners; that the variance is the minimum request to afford relief as the structure is already existing; that the garage studio apartment has one (1) parking space which is a requirement; that the property is functioned by public water and sewer; that the shed and HVAC on the property are within compliance; that the property owners plan to reside in the existing structure while building their new home; that they may rent out the apartment in the future or retain it for storage and their growing family; that the alternative option would be to convert the existing structures living space to a guest house but there is an economic cost to the removal of the cooking ability; that the property owners need to retain the ability to cook for their intended use now and in the future; that, on the rendering submitted, the crossed out section would not be included; that they will be remaining within the building envelope; that the realtor surveyed the neighboring properties for support and opposition but the one property behind them was unable to be reached; that driving by the property you can clearly see that it is a garage with an apartment above it on the lot, not a dwelling as it appears on the aerial maps; and that the lot is well manicured with a nice fence.

Mr. Chad A. Rubin was sworn in to testify about his application.

Mr. Rubin testified that the statements made by Ms. Peet are true and correct; that they did not look at putting any additional walls up to reduce the square footage; that 44 sq. ft. of the current living space is stairs that go to the second floor; that the way the apartment is laid out makes it difficult

to reduce the square footage; that the apartment is one large room with a door to the outdoor deck on the farthest side from the stairs; that there really is no place to put a wall to reduce the square footage; that they will be using the same builder as the existing structure to keep the look of the property consistent; that the previous owner of the property told them that the neighbors to the rear are not full-time residents; that they have not seen or met the neighbors to the rear of them; that it is a three (3) car garage with an apartment above it; and that the property to the south of theirs has a four (4) car garage with an apartment above it.

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

Mr. Chorman closed the public hearing.

Dr. Carson moved to approve Case No. 12746 for the requested variance and special use exception, pending final written decision, for the following reasons:

1. The property has unique conditions due to the exceptionally small buildable area;
2. That, due to the physical conditions, the property cannot be developed in strict conformity with Sussex County Zoning Code and the variance is necessary to enable the reasonable use of the property;
3. The variance will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood nor substantially or permanently impair the appropriate use or development of adjacent property nor be detrimental to the public welfare; and
4. The variance represents the minimum variance necessary to afford relief.

Motion by Dr. Carson, seconded by Mr. Hastings, carried that the **variance and special use exception be granted for the reasons stated.** Motion carries 5-0.

The vote by roll call; Mr. Williamson – yea, Mr. Warfel – yea, Mr. Hastings – yea, Dr. Carson – yea, and Mr. Chorman – nay.

ADDITIONAL BUSINESS

2023 Board of Adjustment Meeting Schedule

The Board discussed the 2023 Board of Adjustment meeting schedule.

Meeting adjourned at 7:39 p.m.