MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS OF HENRICO COUNTY, HELD IN THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING IN THE GOVERNMENT CENTER AT PARHAM AND HUNGARY SPRING ROADS, ON THURSDAY SEPTEMBER 23, 2021 AT 9:00 A.M., NOTICE HAVING BEEN PUBLISHED IN THE *RICHMOND TIMES-DISPATCH* SEPTEMBER 7, 2021 AND SEPTEMBER 13, 2021.

Members Present: Terone B. Green, Chair

Walter L. Johnson, Jr., Vice-Chair

Gentry Bell Terrell A. Pollard James W. Reid, Jr.

Also Present: Benjamin Blankinship, Secretary

Paul M. Gidley, County Planner R. Miguel Madrigal, County Planner Kuronda Powell, Account Clerk

Mr. Green - Welcome to the Thursday, September 23, 2021 Board of Zoning Appeals meeting. For those of you who are able to, please stand and join us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

[Recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance]

I will turn over the rest of the instructions to Mr. Blankinship who will now read our new rules. But one thing that you need to recognize is that once your case is heard, we vote. And once we vote that doesn't necessarily require you to stay around because in prior years individuals had to wait till the end and we voted as of law. We changed that. And we typically will take a 5-minute break at 10:00 a.m.

Mr. Blankinship - All right. Good morning, Mr. Chair, members of the Board. Good morning also to those of you who are in the room with us today. There're also two remote options for participating in this meeting. There's a livestream on the Planning Department webpage, and we are hosting a video conference using Webex. I'd like to welcome everyone who is joining us remotely. If you wish to observe the meeting, but you do not intend to speak, welcome and thank you for joining us.

For those of you on Webex, if you wish to speak, we need to know that in advance so we can connect you at the appropriate time. So if you are an applicant or if you have questions or comments on one of the cases, please press the chat button now. It's located in the bottom-right corner of the screen. And when the chat window opens, please

select Kristin Smith from the list of participants and let her know your name and which case you're interested in.

The chat feature is only the thing used to identify speakers, so please do not type questions or comments into a chat, but please do send a chat to Kristin Smith now so we can organize the queue.

So acting as secretary I will call each case. We will ask everyone in the room to stand and be sworn in. There are four conditional use permits and one appeal on this morning's agenda. For the conditional use permits a member of the Planning Department staff will give a brief presentation, then the applicant will speak, then anyone else who wishes to speak will be given the opportunity.

We'll hear first from citizens in the room and then from those on Webex. After everyone has had a chance to speak, the applicant and only the applicant will have an opportunity for rebuttal.

When we come to the appeal, that's a slightly different procedure for that case and the Assistant County Attorney will speak on behalf of the Planning Director and then the appellant will present their case. Each side will have a limit of 10 minutes, then anyone else who wishes to speak will be given the opportunity and everyone else other than the County Attorney and the appellant will have a time limit of three minutes. And, again, we will hear from citizens in the room first and then from those on Webex.

This meeting is being recorded, so we will ask everyone who speaks to speak directly into the microphone on the podium in the back of the room there. We'll ask you to state your name and please spell your last name so we get it correctly in the record.

And we have all five members, so I believe we are ready to call the first case.

Mr. Green - Okay. Prior to that, I'd like to share with everyone this booklet that was given out by the Planning staff of certain changes that were adopted by the Board of Supervisors on June 22, 2021, which became effective September 1, 2021 that changed some of our authority and expanded some authority.

I'm sure this is available on a website for those individuals who might want to see it. Typically, on some of the cases we had been a little more receptive, however, under the current rules now we have to be a little bit more stringent in how we look at them. And it's not reflection off of your case, but we're a body that follows the rules and Mr. Bell will certainly make sure we do that. So, we will now hear our first case.

Mr. Blankinship - All right. That is conditional use permit 2021 number 12 Greater Richmond Aquatics Partnership.

CUP2021-00012 GREATER RICHMOND AQUATICS PARTNERSHIP requests a conditional use permit pursuant to Section 24-4205 of the County Code to



expand a noncommercial recreation facility at 317 N Wilkinson Road (Parcel 792-753-8870) zoned One-Family Residence District (R-2A) (Fairfield).

Mr. Blankinship - Mr. Madrigal, you can begin.

Mr. Madrigal - Thank you, Mr. Secretary. Good morning, gentleman.

The Commission - Good morning.

Mr. Madrigal - Before you is a request to expand a non-commercial and recreational facility located in a one-family neighborhood. This is a returning case that was deferred from your May hearing. The subject property fronts on North Wilkinson Road near its intersection with Wilkinson Road. The Board originally approved a CUP for this facility in 1958. Since then several other use permits have been approved expanding the use of the property.

The existing pools and recreation facility have served the neighborhood for 60 years and, like many other community pools, the demographics, use patterns, and economics no longer support the previous model of neighborhood families exclusively supporting and using a facility within the limited timeframe.

14

Despite the volunteer board's best efforts, membership has diminished and the financials have fallen short year-over-year to the point that the facility has fallen into disrepair. As a way to rejuvenate and maintain the facility, the property owner intends to lease the property to Swim RVA, a non-profit organization that promotes health and fitness, water safety, sports tourism, and competitive swimming.

Their plan includes replacing the existing 11,000-square-foot building with a new structure twice as large. The existing pools would be enclosed with temporary tents and heaters to support year-round use. The parking lot would be redesigned to improve traffic flow without reducing on-site parking.

In addition to the physical improvements, Swim RVA intends to offer a year-round programming to include senior aerobics, swim lessons, and lifeguard training. The hours of operation would be expanded from or to 5:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. for outdoor activities and 5:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. for indoor activities.

Swim team activities would continue up to six times a year. The hours of operation would be extended to midnight to accommodate swim meets. In March, the applicant held a virtual community meeting to inform the neighbors of their proposal. After the meeting, the county received 15 emails in support of this request and two in opposition. Almost all the support came from members of the recreation association. The opposition came from the president of the North Henrico Civic Association and one of the immediate neighbors adjoining the property.

In response to these concerns, the applicant decided to operate the pool in its traditional format from Memorial Day to Labor Day and resume their project after the end of this year's season.

With respect to the evaluation, staff has found the applicant's request to be consistent with both the zoning and comprehensive plan designations, especially since this use has been an integral part of the neighborhood for 60 years. Expansion of the facility's programing to year-round use will be a significant departure from past practice.

While enclosing the pools will enable year-round activity, it significantly increases the intensity of the use and impacts the community even though it is technically in compliance with the original conditions.

The early-morning hours would be another considerable impact on the neighborhood, deviating from their traditional hours of 8:00 a.m. to 10:30 p.m. Although the original CUP did not limit the pool hours, it would be unusual for a neighborhood pool to open earlier than 8:00 a.m. Their proposal to begin operations at 5:00 a.m. is a substantial deviation from their standard operations.

Consequently, staff recommends a start time of 7:00 a.m., which would be consistent with the county's noise ordinance and a closing time of 9:00 p.m. for outdoor activities and 11:00 p.m. for indoor activities. This would lessen the pool's impact from staff's perspective. Based on the virtual community meeting held in March, the president of the North Henrico Civic Association and an adjacent neighbor expressed concerns with the proposed year-round activity, early-morning hours, and increased traffic and noise.

The applicant has been in communication with these folks and staff is hopeful these issues have been resolved. With respect to the 15 emails of support, only five included their home addresses. Staff has not been able to verify if the immediate neighbors are among the 10 remaining messages. Instead, they appear to be general members of the aquatic association.

When assessing the adverse impacts of this proposal, a significant issue of concern is traffic. The applicant has proposed an additional site entrance off of Wilkinson Road. Based on the comments from reviewing agencies, no objections have been raised relative to adding the second entrance, while there have been comments relative to the design.

As a result, staff has revised the suggested conditions of approval to allow a second entrance subject to the review and approval of respective county agencies.

In conclusion, this recreation facility has served the community for 60 years, but changing demographics and economics threaten its continued existence. Swim RVA proposes to substantially improve the facilities and significantly expand the operations. This concept will keep the community pool viable but would also intensify the use by adding year-round activities, early-morning hours, and traffic implications.

If the applicant can achieve consensus with the neighbors on these issues, it would render the use compatible with the neighborhood, and staff would have no concerns recommending approval subject to conditions. Yesterday in the late afternoon staff did amass about five emails of support and four in opposition, plus a petition with 33 signatures was submitted, and we provided a copy to you all of those signatures. That concludes my presentation and I'll try to answer questions if I can.

190 Mr. Green - Thank you. Are there any questions from the Board to staff?
191 Thank you.

193 Mr. Madrigal - Thank you.

Mr. Blankinship - Mr. Chair, I failed to follow my own instructions earlier. Would everyone who intends to speak to this case please stand and be sworn in? Nobody else is for this? All right. Do you swear the testimony you're about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth so help you God? Thank you. All right. If you can give us your presentation.

Mr. Geiger - Mr. Chairman, members of the Board, Secretary Blankinship, my name is Jeff Geiger here on behalf of Swim RVA the applicant of this conditional use permit.

 C_{05}^{204}

As staff indicated, we received a copy of the petition last night at 8:00 p.m. Given that communication from the community we would like to ask the Board for a deferral so that we can have another community meeting. It is our intent to reach out to those who signed the petition and to meet with them in person, hopefully at the site.

If it's the Board's pleasure, we would appreciate a 30-day deferral. If it is into the Board's pleasure, we are prepared to move forward.

Mr. Green - Is there a motion for a 30-day deferral?

Mr. Pollard - I move that we honor his request and grant him a 30-day referral.

218 Mr. Green - Is there a second?

220 Mr. Reid - Second.

Mr. Green - The motion was made by Mr. Pollard, seconded by Mr. Reid.
All in favor say aye for a 30-day referral.

On a motion by Mr. Pollard, seconded by Mr. Reid, the Board **deferred CUP2021-00012 until the October 28, 2021, meeting** of the Board of Zoning Appeals.

229 230 231 232	Affirmative: Negative: Absent:	Bell, Green, Johnson, Pollard, Reid 5 0 0
233234235	Mr. Green -	Your deferral has been granted, sir.
236 237	Mr. Geiger -	Thank you.
238 239	Mr. Blankinship -	And that would be October the 28th.
240 241	Mr. Geiger -	Thank you very much.
242 243	Mr. Green -	You're welcome.
244 245 246 247	Mr. Blankinship - number 20 Luke Manley.	All right. The second case is conditional use permit 2021
247 248 249 250 251 252		LUKE MANLEY requests a conditional use permit pursuant the County Code to build a detached garage in the side yard at ad (SHADY GROVE ESTATES) (Parcel 733-773-5413) zoned Three Chopt).
253 254 255 256	stand and be sworn in?	Would everyone who intends to speak to this case, please Raise your right hand, please. Do you swear the testimony truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth so help you lley, you can begin.
257 258 259 260	Mr. Gidley - members of the Board.	Thank you, Mr. Secretary. Good morning, Mr. Chairman, and
261 262 263 264 265	north of Kain Road. It co applicant purchased the pr a 24 by 40-foot garage cor	t the western terminus of Heather Grove Road, which is just ontains a 3,314-square-foot dwelling on a 1.19-acre lot. The roperty last year. There's a home across the street and it has nnected to their home. And this is the home across the street. ge here that's connected to it.
266 267 268 269 270 271	himself and so this is bas however, he has a 50-foot	iked that and wanted to build something to somewhat similar sically what he's proposing. Due to the well in his backyard, setback around the well and because of that he would like to rage in the side yard. And that's shown right here on the plot
272		

274

You can see it's behind the 50-foot setback and its limitations, so the applicant would

build this garage right here. If it's connected by a breezeway, 10 feet in width or greater,

it's considered attached. It would not need a use permit, but it would have to meet setbacks for the home. Because it cannot do that, the applicant's going to keep the breezeway under 10 feet in width, which makes this a detached garage. And, as a result, it only needs to be 5 feet off the property line.

However, as you know, a conditional use permit is required for a detached garage in the side yard, thus today's application.

Here's an elevation of the applicant's proposed garage. And a floor plan. And you see the breezeway is just barely under 10 feet in width at 9 feet, 11 inches. In evaluating this request, with regard to the comprehensive plan, the property is designated Rural Residential on the Land Use Plan and a one-family dwelling is consistent with this designation.

With regard to the zoning ordinance, the property is zoned A-1 Agricultural District and is in compliance with the district's lot area and lot width requirement.

As noted, a detached garage in the side yard is allowed with the approval of a conditional use permit by this board. With regard to its compatibility with the surrounding area, as you can see here, the surrounding area consists of single-family homes on large lots and several of these also contain detached accessory structures, so it would be consistent with the surrounding area.

C²⁹⁶

Finally, impacts on public health, safety, and welfare. The garage would not create any additional traffic or noise impact on nearby property and, as you can see here, the adjacent property in the area next door to where the garage would be is wooded, and so that lessens its impact. The other item lessening its impact was the fact that the lot is 1.19 acres in area. So it's a pretty good-sized lot for a suburban lot.

Finally, I would note there is a 16-foot drainage and utility easement that runs along the property line right here. Obviously, the garage cannot be within this easement, so the applicant is working with the county to relocate this easement onto the adjacent property. And, from what we understand, the adjacent property owner is onboard and okay with that. But there is a condition in your staff report saying that the easement needs to be relocated. Its infrastructure needs to be relocated and public utilities needs to be fully satisfied.

In conclusion, while the proposed structure is rather large, the lot is over an acre in area and the adjacent acreage parcel is wooded. So long as the applicant is successful in relocating the drainage and utility easement, staff can recommend approval of this request subject to the conditions in your staff report. If you have any questions I will be happy to answer those. Thank you.

Mr. Green - Are there any questions from the Board to staff? Hearing none, we'll move to the applicant.

- Mr. Manley Good morning. Thank you for having me. And I don't have a slide presentation, but I think the drawings kind of explain the situation. I'm just asking for a blessing to build a detached garage on the side yard giving the placement of my well on my property.
- We are working, as mentioned, with the County to move the easement. Currently the bank had to sign off on the trustee. The neighbor has signed off on that. We will be submitting that to the record room this week and it's my understanding from the County that as soon as they see that that has been recorded, that we would need to post bond and proceed with the moving of the utility pipe and easement.
- Mr. Green Any questions from the Board to the applicant? Hearing none, as the Three Chopt representative, I move that we approve the conditional use permit subject to the conditions recommended by the staff. One, consistent with the comprehensive plan. Two, consistent with the A-1 zoning of the neighborhood. Three, similar to the garage across the street. And it will not adversely affect the health and

So I'm just asking for your blessing to allow a conditional use permit for this side garage.

341 Mr. Pollard - I second.

safety or welfare. Do I hear a second?

- Mr. Green A motion was made by myself, Mr. Green, seconded by Mr. Pollard. Any discussion? All in favor? Motion passed.
- On a motion by Mr. Green, seconded by Mr. Pollard, the Board approved case CUP2021-00020 LUKE MANLEY's request for a conditional use permit pursuant to Section 24-4404.A.1 of the County Code to build a detached garage in the side yard at 12610 Heather Grove Road (SHADY GROVE ESTATES) (Parcel 733-773-5413) zoned Agricultural District (A-1) (Three Chopt). The Board approved the request subject to the following conditions:
- 1. This conditional use permit applies only to the location of the proposed detached garage in the side yard. All other applicable regulations of the County Code remain in force.
- 2. This conditional use permit applies only to the garage and breezeway shown on the plot plan and building design filed with the application. Any additional improvements must comply with the applicable regulations of the County Code. Any substantial changes or additions to the design or location of the improvements will require a new conditional use permit.
- 363 3. Before beginning any clearing, grading, or other land disturbing activity, the applicant 364 must obtain approval of an environmental compliance plan from the Department of Public 365 Works.

325

331

332

339 340

345

352

356

362

- 4. The new construction must match the existing dwelling as nearly as practical in materials and color. Any exterior lighting must be shielded to direct light away from adjacent property and streets.

5. Prior to building permit approval, the 16-foot drainage and utility easement along the western boundary of the property must be vacated, and any infrastructure within this easement must be relocated as required by the Department of Public Utilities.

6. The detached garage must not be occupied for dwelling purposes or as a short-term rental.

7. The applicant must obtain a building permit for the proposed garage by September 25, 2023, or this conditional use permit will expire. If the building permit is cancelled or revoked after that date due to failure to diligently pursue construction, this conditional use permit will expire at that time.

\$89

Affirmative: Bell, Green, Johnson, Pollard, Reid 5
Negative: 0
Absent: 0

Mr. Manley - Thank you. And can I just ask one question? As far as the conditional use permit, because it's new to me, I've never got a conditional use permit. How do I go about obtaining the actual permit? Is there an actual follow up from you? Or do I receive that?

Mr. Blankinship - Mr. Madrigal will help you with that.

Mr. Manley - Thank you.

CUP2021-00022 MICHAEL TAYLOR requests a conditional use permit pursuant to Section 24-4404.A.1 of the County Code to allow an accessory structure in the front yard at 7330 Elko Rd (WHITE OAK FARMS) (Parcel 856-695-4055) zoned Agricultural District (A-1) (Varina).

Conditional use permit 2021 number 22 Michael Taylor.

Mr. Blankinship - Would everyone who intends to speak to this case please stand and be sworn in? Do you swear the testimony you're about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth so help you God?

Mr. Taylor - I do.

Mr. Blankinship - Okay. Mr. Gidley.

Mr. Blankinship -

Mr. Gidley - Thank you, Mr. Secretary. The subject property contains 24 acres of land and is located off of Elko Road. The applicant purchased the site in 2017 and in 2019 he constructed an 1,800-square-foot, 3-bay garage on the property. And this is a picture of the garage right here.

The applicant would like to construct a home on the property now in the cleared area that's to the rear of the existing garage. Behind me in this picture would be that garage. And this is the cleared area where the applicant would like to place his home. And you can note there are a number of trees around it that would screen it and give privacy.

Because the garage would be located in the front yard, to the front of the home, a conditional use permit is required. Staff also noted on our site visit there is a 12 by 9-foot shed to the north of the existing garage. I believe I have a picture of this. This smaller shed right here. That was not included in the initial request, so the applicant will either need to remove it, place it behind the home once it's built, or include this as part of the conditional use permit as well.

In evaluating this request, with regard to the comprehensive plan, the property is designated as Prime Agriculture and Environmental Protection Area. A one-family dwelling is consistent with the prime agriculture designation and the home and garage would be located within this designation.

With regard to the zoning ordinance, the property is zoned A-1 Agricultural District. It's in compliance with the lot-width and lot-area requirements of the A-1 District.

With regard to the compatibility of the use with the surrounding area. As you can see here, these are large lots consisting of several acres. The homes tend to be set back quite a bit from the road, as would this home here. So it's basically compatible with the surrounding area. And, again, it is screened by a lot of trees which also provide privacy.

With regard to public, health, safety, and welfare. While the applicant could construct the home in front of the garage, his desire to place the home behind the garage is consistent with the setbacks of the adjacent homes. Again, they're set back quite a bit right here. It would also preserve the wooded buffer here, which provides privacy to both the applicant's property and the neighbors'. And this view is going up the driveway here and you can see this buffer here is quite effective at giving people privacy from Elko Road. So, staff does not anticipate a substantial detrimental impact from this request.

In conclusion, the applicant would like to place the dwelling behind the existing garage. Staff agrees with him that his proposed location is more suitable compared to building the home in front of the garage. Both structures would be over 100 feet from nearby residents and so we do not anticipate any substantial detrimental impact.

As a results, staff recommends approval subject to the conditions in your staff report. And if you have any questions, I'll be happy to answer those. Thank you.

_		
C ₁₅₀		
460	Mr. Green -	Are there any questions from the Board to staff?
461	Will Green	The there any questions from the Board to stair.
462	Mr. Johnson -	The little house that's next to it, do they want to keep it on the
463	side?	
464		
465	Mr. Gidley -	This little one here?
466	-	
467	Mr. Johnson -	Yes.
468		
469	Mr. Gidley -	We noticed it when we went out there. It was not mentioned
470		o, as a result, technically that would be in front of the home, so
471	• •	eed to include it in this conditional use permit, I guess just by
472	noting it when he speaks,	or he could remove it or relocate it behind the home.
473		
474	Mr. Johnson -	Okay.
475	Mr. Croop	Any other additional questions? We'll now hear from the
476	Mr. Green -	Any other additional questions? We'll now hear from the
477 478	applicant. Thank you.	
478	Mr. Gidley -	Yes, sir.
479 480	Wil. Cidicy	163, 311.
(81	Mr. Taylor -	Good morning. My name's Michael Taylor. Last name T-a-y-
482	,	rty in 2017. It's a fairly large piece, 24 acres, but it consists
483		down in a swampy area and there's about a 3-acre pond that
484	I share with a neighbor as	
485	· ·	
486	The building site where I h	have my existing building and where I want to build my home, I
487	can take advantage of the	view of the pond. I didn't want to have an obstruction behind
488	the house or impede upon	the wetlands down there. So that's why we chose this area to
489	build on.	
490		
491		the left of the existing building, I would like to include that as
492	part of my conditional use	permit and keep it where it is, if it's okay with the Board.
493	Ma Casan	And the one conversations from the Decard to the condition to
494	Mr. Green -	Are there any questions from the Board to the applicant?
495	Mr. Johnson -	So there's a pand right habind where you're proposing the
496 497	house?	So there's a pond right behind where you're proposing the
497	nouse:	
498	Mr. Taylor -	Yes, sir. In the picture, you can see where what I would call
500	•	t splits the pond in half. I share it with Mr. Steve Frazier to your
501		pond. It's a beautiful pond. Clear. It's a spring-fed pond. And
502		se, I'm elevating my house high enough where I can see out
03		ad my engineer came out, we have an RPA buffer around the
	•	

504 505	pond. We can't build with and just take advantage o	in the RPA. I've got that engineer-taped off to protect that area f the views there.
506 507 508	Mr. Green -	Are there fish on the pond?
509 510	Mr. Taylor -	Yes.
511 512	Mr. Green - there any additional quest	So we're invited to fish there like you are! I'm just joking. Are ions of the applicant? Is there a motion?
513514515	Mr. Blankinship - case. Is there anybody or	Mr. Chair, there's no one else in the room to speak to this a Webex to speak to this case, Ms. Deemer?
516 517	Mr. Green -	Oh, I'm sorry.
518 519 520	Ms. Deemer -	We have no one on Webex for this case.
521 522	Mr. Blankinship -	Thank you.
523 524 525 526 527	years. Ms. Purcell's been they both wrote letters he	Thank you. Mr. Chairperson, I do have letters from both my do the south sides of my property. Mr. Frazier's been there 47 there 35 to 40 years. I have a good relationship with them and the tree that I can give to the Board that they recommend approval the ones most directly impacted by this structure. So.
528 529 530	Mr. Blankinship -	We would like to add those to the file. Yes, please.
531 532	Mr. Green -	Hearing no other questions from the Board, is there a motion?
533 534 535 536		Since the property is agricultural and the garage there has ided to build on it as well. It would benefit both the applicant You have trees there that
537 538	Mr. Taylor -	I'm sorry, I can't hear you, sir.
539 540 541	Mr. Johnson - the property owner.	You have trees that also benefit both the residents as well as
542 543	Mr. Taylor -	Yes, sir.
544 545 546 547 548	the house as well. And, impact on the neighbors a keep everything keep the	And I think that also having the carport where it is now, from so it really is not in front of the house. It would be the side of with that, I recommend that well, since it wouldn't have any and is also beneficial because the trees and all there that would be neighbors and the property owner from cutting trees, which
549	also is a benefit.	

C₅₅₀

I move that we approve the conditional use permit subject to conditional recommended by staff and consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, it's consistent with the A-1 zoning, and the setback is similar to the adjoining houses as well and it will not adversely affect the health and safety and welfare.

Mr. Blankinship - Mr. Johnson, does that include the small building as well as the large one?

Mr. Johnson - And that the small building -- I think it would be okay where it's setting at now.

Mr. Blankinship - Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Johnson - I'll just leave it there.

Mr. Green - A motion by Mr. Johnson. Is there a second?

Mr. Bell - Second.

Mr. Green - Bell?

 C_{72}^{571}

Mr. Pollard - Mr. Bell.

Mr. Green - The motion was made by Mr. Johnson, seconded by Mr. Bell, any discussion among the Board? Hearing none, all in favor say aye. All opposed say nay. Granted.

On a motion by Mr. Johnson, seconded by Mr. Bell, the Board approved case CUP2021-00022 MICHAEL TAYLOR's request for a conditional use permit pursuant to Section 24-4404.A.1 of the County Code to allow an accessory structure in the front yard at 7330 Elko Road (WHITE OAK FARMS) (Parcel 856-695-4055) zoned Agricultural District (A-1) (Varina). The Board approved the request subject to the following conditions:

1. This conditional use permit applies only to the location of the existing garage and shed in front of the proposed dwelling. All other applicable regulations of the County Code remain in force.

2. This conditional use permit applies only to the improvements shown on the plot plan and building design filed with the application. Any additional improvements must comply with the applicable regulations of the County Code. Any substantial changes or additions to the design or location of the improvements will require a new conditional use permit.



3. Before beginning any clearing, grading, or other land disturbing activity, the applicant must obtain approval of an environmental compliance plan from the Department of Public Works.

- 4. Approval of this request does not imply that a building permit will be issued. Building permit approval is contingent on Health Department requirements, including, but not limited to, soil evaluation for a septic drainfield and reserve area, and approval of a well location.

 5. Prior to the issuance of a building permit for the proposed home, the applicant must ensure the existing garage satisfies the requirements of the Building Inspections
 - 5. Prior to the issuance of a building permit for the proposed home, the applicant must ensure the existing garage satisfies the requirements of the Building Inspections Department.
 - 6. The applicant must obtain a building permit for the proposed home by September 25, 2023, or this conditional use permit will expire. If the building permit is cancelled or revoked after that date due to failure to diligently pursue construction, this conditional use permit will expire at that time.

612	Affirmative:	Bell, Green, Johnson, Pollard, Reid	5
613	Negative:		0
614	Absent:		0
615			

- 617 Mr. Taylor All right. Thank you, sir. Thank you for your time.
- 619 Mr. Blankinship All right.
- 621 Mr. Green Mr. Blankinship.
- 623 Mr. Blankinship Yes, sir.

606

607

608

609 610 611

616

620

624

628

- Mr. Green I apologize and go back. The first case, I didn't know if there were any individuals on Webex that were willing to speak for or against. And if there were, I apologize for not recognizing them and I won't make that mistake again.
- 629 Mr. Blankinship Thank you, Mr. Chair.
- 631 Mr. Green But were there?
- Mr. Blankinship I'm attempting to use my phone to stay in contact with our
 Webex team, and I'm afraid we may have missed somebody, or deprived somebody of
 the opportunity to speak in opposition to the deferral. But at least it is just a deferral, and
 they will have an opportunity to speak again next month. But, yes, I acknowledge that as
 well.
- Mr. Green So I apologize for that and trust that Mr. Blankinship will kick me under the table or remind me not to do that again. Thank you. Moving on to our next case, please.



Mr. Blankinship - Yes, sir. Conditional use permit 2021 number 23 Brenda Womble.

CUP2021-00023 BRENDA WOMBLE requests a conditional use permit pursuant to Section 24-4404.A.1 of the County Code to allow a carport to remain in the front yard at 114 Meroyn Drive (Parcel 824-717-4952) zoned One-Family Residence District (R-3) (Varina).

Mr. Blankinship - Would everyone who intends to speak to this case, please stand and be sworn in? Ma'am, would you raise your right hand? Do you swear the testimony you're about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth so help you God? Thank you. Mr. Madrigal.

Mr. Madrigal - Thank you, Mr. Secretary, Mr. Chair, members of the Board.

Before you is a request to allow a car port in the front yard of a single-family dwelling. The subject property is located at the southeast corner of West Union Street and Meroyn Drive in West Sandston.

€64

The property is triangular in shape, is over 32,000-square-feet in area, and is improved with a one-story, 1,700-square-foot home with open parking built in 1962. The applicant purchased the property in February of 2019.

In July of this year the County received a complaint regarding a metal carport in the front yard of the subject lot. A code enforcement inspector verified the complaint and contacted the property owner regarding the code requirements on the carport. She subsequently applied for a building permit followed by a conditional use permit in an attempt to keep the carport at its present location.

Although the lot meets the minimum lot-area and lot-width requirements of the R-3 District, the carport does not comply with minimum setbacks. The required front-yard setback is 35 feet and the street side yard setback is 10 feet under the new code. The carport is located approximately 13 feet from the front property line and 6 feet from the side street property line, so it's rather close.

Under Article 4 of the zoning ordinance, the single-family dwelling is allowed as a principle use in an R-3 District. A detached accessory structure is allowed as an accessory use. If it's located in the side yard, it may be approved by way of a conditional use permit. In this case the carport was constructed without the benefit of required permits.

Additionally, the carport is substantially out of character as compared to the other properties on both sides of the street on this block and the block further north. None of the properties have detached accessory structures that violate the front yard setback.

The location of the structure is also inconsistent with the established development pattern at this intersection. The three other corner lots have open and unobstructed yards at their street corners.

Furthermore, the carport presents a safety issue in regard to traffic visibility, as it violates the site-distance triangle that we apply at corner lots.

In conclusion, the applicant had a carport built on the property without County review and the necessary permit. The structure is prominently located on the street corner in violation of minimum setbacks. The location of the carport presents a potential traffic safety concern as it blocks visibility. It is inconsistent with the general development pattern along Meroyn Drive and at the subject intersection. It is also architecturally inconsistent with the applicant's home and the surrounding dwellings, creating an adverse impact.

Based on these findings, staff recommends denial of the applicant's request. We have not received any letters or emails in support or in opposition to this.

This concludes my presentation. I'll be happy to answer any questions.

Mr. Green - I have a question. When individuals go out and purchase carports and these sheds and -- I know they sometimes have to go through their homeowner's association. Wouldn't the individual who is installing the carport check to make sure -- or shouldn't they check to make sure that the necessary permits have been granted?

Mr. Madrigal - They should, but a lot of times they just don't. So I think a lot of times what happens is they'll approach a customer and they'll say, Hey, you know, if you want to get a permit, it's probably going to be an additional charge. So, its up to you, but we put these everywhere in the counties, and there haven't been any issues. That's my guess as to what the normal conversation is.

But, again, each situation is different. And I would probably defer that question to the applicant.

723 Mr. Green - Okay. Are there any other questions from the Board to staff?

725 Mr. Reid - I have one. Would it be possible to put it up in the side yard where it fits?

Mr. Madrigal - This is the site map. So the house fronts on Meroyn Drive.
So, you know, all of this area here in front of the house probably wouldn't work. Maybe back here might work.

732 Mr. Blankinship - You were asking about the Union Street side.

C734

Mr. Reid -

But on the Union Street side.

Mr. Madrigal - On Union Street, they unfortunately have already an existing structure here, so they'd have to just measure it out, see if it would meet code. Because it would have to be 10 feet away from the house and then at least 3 to 5 feet away from the side property line, 6 feet from this structure here.

741 Mr. Reid -

Okay.

Mr. Madrigal

So, you know, I guess the answer would be maybe.

Mr. Blankinship - It would be more compatible just because you can see there's a detached structure right across West Union Street there. So it would at least be similar to what the neighbors have.

Mr. Madrigal - Right, right. But, if you can see here, they've got their garage back here behind.

Mr. Johnson - Also, in addition to that, I've been out there looking at this. Where it's at now, is it any way that the distance from the house is a thing like a little porch or something on the back end of it? Any way for the driveway to get around to the back?

Mr. Madrigal - So based on where the carport's at now, this is Meroyn, this is Union, there's that enclosed porch that you were talking about. So, you know, they've got what essentially what works out to be their back yard -- enclosed by fence. So, they'd have to open that up and then somehow place that structure in the back.

Mr. Green - Right. Are there any other additional questions from the Board of staff? Hearing none, we'll now move to the applicant. Please state your name and spell it.

Ms. Womble - Good morning. My name is Brenda Womble, W-o-m-b-l-e. You gave a good question. When I purchased this carport, I didn't have any clue about the code or anything. But, as you can see, I have an unusual lot. I can't put it in the back because that won't meet the code either, because I don't have enough room in the back yard. Okay.

All my space is to the right of the house. That will make sense. I'm disabled. I put it up to be closer to protect my vehicle and for me also, like, for the winter and stuff like that, by me being disabled, I can use the side porch step when I get out my vehicle. I have lights inside the carport also that helps me for my safety and everything like that. But I didn't have any idea. If I had known I just wouldn't have put it up. But, like I said, the way my property is, it wouldn't make sense for me to put it on the right. Because, number one, I don't have a driveway on the right. And then that would be too far from the house for me to have a carport.

I don't have room in the backyard. That wouldn't work either. And there is another carport 780 on Early Street that is detached like that. And I just thought it was okay to just put it up 781 there. 782 783 Mr. Green -Are there any questions from the Board to the applicant? 784 Hearing none, is there a motion? 785 786 Mr. Blankinship -Let me just state for the record, there is no one else in the 787 room or on Webex. 788 789 Mr. Green -Oh. I'm sorry. 790 791 Mr. Blankinship -To speak at the public hearing. 792 793 794 Mr. Green-Okay. Hearing none, is there a motion? 795 Mr. Johnson -What is happening here is that because of the location of the 796 garage in the front, and the new regulations we have now also indicate that nothing should 797 be in the front yard. And also, trying to get to the back and then there's no space back 798 there. And also there is the 10 feet setback from the Union side which is not large enough 799 to put a carport. 800 801 With that, I move that we deny the conditional use permit. It is not consistent with the 802 surrounding neighborhood and no other homes in the neighborhood have a carport in the 803 front yard. 804 805 The carport is metal siding and the home is brick --- and the traffic hazard because of the 806 blocking of the vision of this intersection also is impacted. And, also, you're not supposed 807 to have a lighting there. 808 809 I motion we deny. 810 811 Mr. Green -There a second? Is there a second? I will second it. The 812 motion was made by Mr. Johnson, seconded by Mr. Green. Is there any discussion? 813 814 815 I know because of your condition. But, still, there is -- to put a Mr. Johnson carport there we can't do that based on our regulations. 816 817 Mr. Reid? The motion was made by Mr. Johnson to deny. Mr. Green -818 Seconded by myself, Mr. Green. We've had discussion. All in favor say aye. Opposed. 819 It has been denied. 820 821

822

823

824

825

On a motion by Mr. Johnson, seconded by Mr. Green, the Board denied case CUP2021-

00023 BRENDA WOMBLE's request a conditional use permit pursuant to Section 24-

4404.A.1 of the County Code to allow a carport to remain in the front yard at 114 Meroyn

Drive (Parcel 824-717-4952) zoned One-Family Residence District (R-3) (Varina).

-			
826			
827 828	Affirmative:	Bell, Green, Johnson, Pollard, Reid	5
829	Negative:	Bell, Green, Johnson, Pollard, Reid	0
830	Absent:		0
831			
832			
833	Mr. Blankinship -	That completes the conditional use permits for	or this morning.
834	There are no variances or	n this morning's agenda.	
835 836	There is one anneal which	h is Appeal 2021 number 1 A&FI, LLC.	
837	There is one appear, write	in 19 Appear 2021 number 1 Adi 1, EEO.	
838			
839	APL2021-00001	A&FI, LLC appeals an administrative decision	0
840		City Road (Parcel 827-702-8810) zoned Agricul	tural District (A-
841	1) (Varina). Code Section	n: 24-2104.C.	
842	Mr Plankinshin	Will everyone who intends to speak to this car	co pleace stand
843 844	Mr. Blankinship -	your right hands, please. Do you swear the to	
845		the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so he	
846		rphy, if you would go first.	1 7
847			
48	Mr. Murphy -	Mr. Blankinship, do we have the PowerPoint	up here?
849	Mr. Richard Booker -	(indiscernible)	
850 851	WIT. MICHARU DOOKET -	(indiscernible)	
852	Mr. Green -	So you will be requesting a deferral?	
853		, ,	
854	Mr. Booker -	Yes, sir.	
855			
856	Mr. Green -	Can we take two to three minutes for you all	to confer to see
857 858	if you would be receptive	to that?	
859	Mr. Murphy -	Yes, we can talk about this.	
860	,	,	
861	Mr. Green -	Okay.	
862			
863	Mr. Murphy -	I'll go talk to him.	
864 865	Mr. Green -	We'll give you two minutes.	
866	WII. OTOGIT -	TTO IT GIVE YOU TWO HIMILITIES.	
867	Mr. Blankinship -	Normally when that happens, the motion then	·
868	•		
869	[Break in audio]		

871 872 873 874 875 876	this case must be heard a window. However, I'm s	May it please the Board, we discussed the matter. This would a for a deferral. I understand there's a 90-day window in which and that the next time the Board meets would be outside of that till not prepared to go forward today and I'd ask the Board anting that deferral. We're happy to waive any statutory necessary.
878 879	Mr. Green -	What's the 90-day limit? Could you brief us?
880 881 882	Mr. Blankinship - application or appeal that	Yes. There is a requirement under state law that any is brought before the Board must be heard within 90 days.
883 884	Mr. Green -	Within.
885 886	Mr. Blankinship -	Yes.
887 888	Mr. Green -	So we can hear it within 90 days.
889 890 891 892 893 894	And as you've seen in the	When they originally filed, they filed a statement that they ere was no grounds for appeal. Which the code also requires. County Attorney's letter, that's one response of theirs is that ed, because they never stated grounds of appeal. But let's hear
895 896	Mr. Madrigal -	For the minutes he has to identify himself.
897 898 899	Mr. Blankinship - position here?	Oh, okay. We'll get that. Mr. Murphy, what's the County's
900 901 902 903 904 905 906	position is that there was The appeal was not prope	Yes. My name's Ryan Murphy. I'm assistant County Attorney office. My office represents the Director, Mr. Emerson. Our a notice of appeal filed. It was not a proper notice of appeal. erly perfected. And our position would be that any arguments have not been presented in a timely fashion to the Board, and all not consider them.
,00		

This is consistent with appellate practice in the courts of Virginia. If an appellate does not notice its arguments, those arguments are waived and that is now the situation that we have here.

So, therefore -- and also given that Virginia Code 15.2-2312 requires Boards of Zoning Appeals to render decisions within 90 days of an application or an appeal. It's my office's position that the deferral should be denied and that we should go forward.



919 Mr. Blankinship - All right. Mr. James, have we got the PowerPoint loaded yet? 920 Oh, great. Perfect, thank you.

Mr. Murphy - So some background for the Board of Zoning Appeals. Again, my name is Ryan Murphy, Assistant County Attorney, the County Attorney's office. And we're representing Mr. Emerson, the Director, on this appeal.

A&FI, LLC is the owner of property at 3740 Charles City Road and 6736 Beulah Road. This property is zoned A-1 Agricultural. The tax cards are attached to the letter that my office submitted as exhibit A.

In 2015 A&FI obtained CUP2014-00034. That conditional use permit is attached to the Exhibit B to the letter. That conditional use permit permitted A&FI to conduct extractive operations at the property. Those operations were to be discontinued by January 22, 2017 and the permit also required restoration of the property by January 22, 2018.

On May 25 County Inspector James Rice visited the property. The gate was opened. He entered the property via the driveway and he observed a great deal of discarded debris, mostly lumber, some tires, insulation, concrete. The debris was stacked into a dumpster and also scattered about the property. He also observed that the disturbed areas of the property had not been covered by vegetation and that stockpiles of soil remained in the area on the property as well.

Based on those observations the Director issued an NOV, a notice of violation, on June 2, 2021. The NOV is attached to your letter as exhibit C. The NOV recited that the Director had determined that illegal dumping was occurring on the property. It recited that Section 24-6 requires compliance with all provisions of the zoning ordinance. It noted that section 24-52 and section 24-116 require conditional use permits for extractive operations and landfills and dumping -- or dump areas respectively. It also noted that the permit had expired on January 22, 2017 that the landowner had been previously notified of that expiration in January of 2018.

And, finally, it cited that Section 24-103(g) requires the property to be restored when the permit is expired.

Now, on appeal, the standard of review provides that the Board must determine whether the Director was correct in his determination. And by law there is a presumption of correctness that the appellant is required to rebut by the preponderance of the evidence.

So, we have some questions for the BZA. I put them up here on the slide. Break this case down to four questions. I'll just recite them to you. But. Did A&FI satisfy the preconditions for perfecting an appeal to the Board? May A&FI allow dumping or

7

landfilling at the property? May A&FI conduct extractive operations at the property? And may A&FI fail to restore the property as required by CUP2014-00034 and Henrico Code Section 24-103.

Now going to the first question, my office's position is that the NOV is final and unappealable. We discussed this earlier, but the requirements of the State code and the County code and also the Board's rules require an appeal to state the notice of grounds. Therefore, the letter that was submitted by A&FI did not contain any grounds for an appeal. And that's left my office and also yourselves essentially flying blind here. We don't know what their arguments are, we don't know why they disagree, and lacking that, it's difficult for you to consider and limit discussion to relevant issues. So, we submit that

And as appellant practice occurs in the courts of Virginia, any arguments that they would present have been waived and we suggest that you not consider them. But, more importantly for purposes of the standard of review, because they have not submitted any grounds of appeal or any evidence in support of an appeal, they have necessarily failed to overcome the presumption of correctness that attaches to the Director's decisions.

Moving to the substance. As noted, Inspector Rice observed great deals of lumber, concrete, insulation, some tires dumped on the property. He went back on a subsequent date, observed evidence that the dumping was continuing.

Now in the A-1 Agricultural District, the permitted principal and accessory uses are inclusive. Anything that is not listed is therefore prohibited or it requires a conditional use permit. Dumping, planned filling, extractive uses, are not specifically permitted as a principal or accessory use. Therefore, they require a special use permit or they are prohibited.

In this case, 24-52(d) authorizes applicants to obtain conditional use permits for extractive operations. 24-116(d) authorizes applicants to obtain conditional use permits for landfills or dumping operations. There are no active conditional use permits at this property, therefore the dumping activities that are observed and the extractive operations may not occur at this property. And we submit that the Director was correct in his determination that those activities that are occurring at the property are not permitted.

And, finally, the A&FI must restore the property as required by Henrico Code 24-103 and CUP2014-0034. These are the relevant sections of 24-103. Requires a plan of operation to be submitted and approved by the Board. Back in 2015 A&FI did so. That plan of operation required topsoil to be spread back out over the property and required permanent vegetative cover over the property.

As noted, the inspector observed that the disturbed area remains uncovered by vegetative cover, and there are berms consisting of topsoil that were removed in preparation for the extractive operations. So, the applicant has not complied with 24-103. And, in addition, the conditional use permit incorporated those provisions into paragraphs

that was not properly perfected.

26 and 27 required the restoration to be complete January 22, 2018. That has obviously not been done. So, and we submit that is also a violation, and the Director was correct.

These are the paragraphs 26 and 27 in the permit. As noted, the site was required to be covered with five inches of topsoil and vegetative cover, and that has not occurred.

So, I conclude with the requested findings of the Board. I submit that all of the answers to the questions that I proposed earlier to you are, No. And I also offer a proposed motion for your consideration.

I suggest that for all the reasons stated in the letter from the County Attorney, the Board finds that, one, the appeal was not properly perfected and, two, the decision of the Director was correct. Accordingly, the Board affirms and upholds the Director's decision.

If there are any questions, I'm happy to answer them.

Mr. Green - Are there any questions from the Board to the County
Attorney?

-29

Mr. Johnson - Also, when the ones that were supposed to have been taking care of, the facility, aren't they supposed to keep the gates locked. And also make sure that no one is bringing in things that is not --

Mr. Murphy - That would be one way to prevent illegal dumping. As noted, the inspector observed that the gate was open on the day that he went by, May 25th. I acknowledge that there were other days when the gate was closed, but at least on this occasion it was open and there was evidence that there was dumping occurring at the property.

Mr. Green - Are there any other questions from the Board to the County Attorney? My observations are -- which are technical, which I think we have to really take into consideration. And I know that the gentleman was here to ask for a deferral. But technically the letter for the grounds of appeal was not properly executed, one. A special conditional use permit was not asked for, two. And failure to restore occurred, three. As such, I'm just going to ask the Board that we move directly to a motion.

Mr. Johnson - And one more thing.

Mr. Green - Okay, sir.

Mr. Johnson - Is that there was several times that permits were asked to be -- they was asked to get permits and there was at least three times that your permits was expired because they didn't do what they are supposed to have been doing. That the county had sent something to them, -- in violation.

1053	Mr. Blankinship -	Well, yes. As you know, Mr. Johnson, these permits are
1054	typically approved for two	years.
1055		
1056	Mr. Johnson -	Right.
1057 1058	Mr. Blankinship -	And we do expect applicants to come back every two years.
1059		and 2014 and then they stopped.
1060	, and they did that in 2012	and 2011 and mon may stopped.
1061	Mr. Johnson -	Then they yes.
1062		
1063	Mr. Blankinship -	They've not been back since.
1064	Mar Internation	The Product of the Pr
1065	Mr. Johnson -	That's what I noticed here.
1066 1067	Mr. Green -	So I'm going to ask that the Board just
1068	Wil. Of Con-	Co Thi going to ask that the board just
1069	Mr. Murphy -	In the interest of fairness I'd suggest that we let the
1070	representative here speak	on their behalf.
1071		
1072	Mr. Green -	Okay, but he was ready for a deferral.
1073	Mr. Murphy -	Okay.
1074 1075	Wil. Walphy -	Okay.
1076	Mr. Green -	Okay.
1077		
1078	Mr. Blankinship -	And begin by giving us your name and spelling it, please.
1079		
1080	Mr. Booker -	Richard Booker, R-i-c-h-a-r-d B-o-o-k-e-r on behalf of Kevin
1081 1082		And at this point I would renew my motion for deferral. I did ard with some pertinent information. The principle of this matter
1082		of town on business and would be required to quarantine for 14
1084	•	ve been able to put on any evidence in defense of A&F I at this
1085	•	her or not my client was available because of the quarantine
1086	status.	
1087		
1088		ed the Board members to consider allowing us to amend the
1089 1090		requirements. And I don't have any evidence or anything other ferral or leave to amend the pleadings.
1090	than that request for a del	errai or leave to amend the pleadings.
1092	Mr. Pollard -	What's your argument for appeal?
1093		,
1094	Mr. Booker -	I don't have any factual arguments at this time?
1095		
1096	Mr. Green -	Nothing in general? Just an idea of what the
1097 1098	Mr. Booker -	I just came here to ask for a deferral.
1070	WII. DOOKEI -	I just carrie liere to ask for a deferral.

699			
1100 1101	Mr. Pollard -	Okay.	
1102	Mr. Booker -	The client's not available to that's	
1103 1104 1105	Mr. Blankinship - mention that in the notice	In terms of the client not being available, Mr. letter it clearly states that you can join this meet	
1106 1107	Mr. Green -	Through Webex. Yes.	
1108 1109 1110	Mr. Johnson -	Yes.	
1111	Mr. Green -	I'd like to make a motion for the anybody have	ve a question?
1113	Mr. Johnson -	No.	
1115 1116 1117 1118	stated in code, and that the	I'd like to motion that for the reasons stated in Board finds that, one, the appeal was not proper ne decision of the Director was correct. According trector's decision. Is there a second?	ly perfected as
1119	Mr. Bell -	Second.	
1122 1123	Mr. Johnson -	Second.	
1124 1125 1126	,	All right. The motion was made by myself. Se ion among the Board? Hearing none, all in favor opposed like sign. Done.	-
1127 1128 1129 1130	-	en, seconded by Mr. Bell, the Board denied the the Director of Planning.	ne appeal and
1131 1132 1133 1134 1135	Affirmative: Negative: Absent:	Bell, Green, Johnson, Pollard, Reid	5 0 0
1136	Mr. Green -	We're affirming and upholding the Director's de	ecision, sir.
1138	Mr. Booker -	Thank you, sir.	
1140	Mr. Murphy -	Thank you, members of the Board.	
C 43	Mr. Green -	You had the you had it.	

1145	Mr. Blankinship -	He wanted it.	
1146	Mr. Croon	Oh I'm corn	
1147 1148	Mr. Green -	Oh. I'm sorry.	
1148	Mr. Blankinship -	Mr. Chair, can we proceed to the minutes of	of the August 26th
1150	meeting?	Wil. Orlan, bull we proceed to the fillington	, the ragaet zen.
1151			
1152	Mr. Green -	Yes. Has everyone had the opportuni recommended changes to the minutes?	ty to review the
1153 1154	minutes? Are there any	teconinended changes to the minutes:	
1155	Mr. Johnson -	Motion to approve the minutes of August 26	5. 2021.
1156			,
1157	Mr. Green -	Is there a second?	
1158			
1159	Mr. Reid -	Second.	
1160		0	
1161	Mr. Pollard -	Second.	
1162	Mr. Croon	A motion was made by Mr. Johnson, soco	aded by Mr. Peid
1163	Mr. Green -	A motion was made by Mr. Johnson, seconutes have been approved.	ided by Mr. Reid.
1164 1165	All III lavoi say aye. Will	lutes have been approved.	
1166	On a motion by Mr. Joh	nson, seconded by Mr. Reid, the Board appro	ved the minutes
1167			
1168	01 110 / laguet 20, 2021	sould of Zormig , ippoute mooming.	
1169			
1170	Affirmative:	Bell, Green, Johnson, Pollard, Reid	5
1171	Negative:		0
1172	Absent:		0
1173			
1174			
1175	Mr. Blankinship -	Mr. Chair, I don't have any new business,	
1176		know about. During the month of December, the	
1177		om. Some of the computer equipment, some of replaced, so we will probably not be able to h	
1178 1179		, so we will be selecting an alternative location	
1179	know that as soon as we		rana wen let you
1181	Know that as soon as we	o dan.	
1182	Mr. Green -	Yes, sir.	
1183			
1184	Mr. Blankinship -	In October and November we'll be right her	e.
1185			
1186	Mr. Green -	Is there a motion to adjourn the meeting?	
1187	17 1.		
1188	Mr. Johnson -	So moved.	
1189	Mr. Craan	la thora a accord?	
1190	Mr. Green -	Is there a second?	

[9]		
1192	Mr. Pollard -	Second.
1193		
1194	Mr. Green -	Motioned has been made and seconded. Meeting adjourned.
1195	Thank you. We'll see you	next month.
1196		
1197		
1198		1
1199		1. Jan 1-1 1- WA A
1200		(for the money /3
1201		Mr. Terone B. Green Chair
1202		
1203		
1204		$O \cdot O \circ \circ$
1205		
1206		- Car May
1207		Mr. Benjamin W. Blankinship, Secretary