MINUTES
CITY OF BEAUFORT
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
May 28, 2014, 5:30 P.M.
City Hall Planning Room, First Floor – 1911 Boundary Street
Beaufort, South Carolina

STATEMENT OF MEDIA NOTIFICATION: "In accordance with South Carolina Code of Laws, 1976, Section 30-4-80(d), as amended, all local media were duly notified of the time, date, place, and agenda of this meeting."

Members Present
Brad Hill, Chairman
Tim Wood
Don Starkey
Rod Mattingly

Members Absent
Eric Powell

Staff Present
Libby Anderson, Planning Director

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT COMPLIANCE
Public Notification of the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting has been published in compliance with the *Freedom of Information Act* requirements.

Chairman Hill called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

REVIEW OF PROJECTS
133 Elliott Street, Identified as District R120, Tax Map 5, Parcel 119, Lot Width and Side Yard Setback Variances
Applicant: James and Louise Coleman (ZB14-08)
The applicant is requesting a variance in order to subdivide the lot.

Ms. Anderson showed the site plan and how the existing home is situated on the lot. Ms. Anderson had suggested that if the lot is subdivided, the new house on the new lot should be no more than 75-80' from the front property line. She showed 2 other types of cottages and where they could be located on the lot. She showed the buildable area with the setbacks outside of it.

Mr. Wood said he thought that the driveway was a detail they had to consider last time as it goes out onto Reynolds Street, which serves as an alley. Ms. Anderson said it would be more

appropriate for the driveway to come from the back. Mr. Wood said it was an issue because they had talked about not having garbage pick-up and that Reynolds Street would not function as a street. Ms. Anderson said they wouldn't allow a north-south split of the lot, but for the driveway Reynolds Street would be fine. The city is unlikely to pave and maintain Reynolds Street.

Mr. Starkey said, looking at the drawings, only one house looks like it would fit. **Louise Coleman,** the applicant, said that she wanted the Board to know that they have multiple plans to choose from. Ms. Coleman said there's a cluster of four pines that would have to be removed to put a home on the site, but they have probably 30 pines on their property.

There was no public comment. Mr. Mattingly said there are smaller properties around the applicant's property, so that creates a dilemma for him. He wonders about the neighborhood's feelings for that reason. On the other hand, a nice house could be put there. Mr. Starkey said the air conditioning is within the side setback, which they have to consider, so if the house can be located in the 85', and the driveway from Reynolds Street, the house would make a nice addition. Ms. Anderson said she had underestimated, and it would be more in the 100' range, so that "it's nice and not way back from the lot." It would be 80' to no more than 100', more accurately, she said.

Chairman Hill said the plans presented and the architectural samples look fine. He thinks it would be a positive infill in the neighborhood. He doesn't see a "hardship" in this case. It's currently a single-family residence with a bigger lot than many, but to subdivide to make it profitable in a sale is his only drawback about the project. They don't *have* to subdivide and build so that they can sell it. Mr. Wood said he might feel the same if the setback hadn't panned out like it did. He likes big lots. He agrees that there's no hardship, but he finds the request reasonable, and he thinks the house won't be noticeable from Elliott Street. Mr. Mattingly said there's a 40' frontage, and he agrees that with the pines, it will not be that noticeable. The setbacks are the hardship, Mr. Wood said, and if they can work within them, that solves the problem.

Ms. Anderson said the R-4 minimum lot width is 40', and there is a 28' lot in the Historic District. Mr. Starkey said there is a precedent for this in the city in a different zoning district with smaller or equivalent lot size to this. Ms. Anderson said this property is unusual because the minimum lot side is on Reynolds Street, but that's not what they're considering the front of the property, which they want to face Elliott Street. Mr. Mattingly said within the block there are many smaller cottages on probably 60' lots, so he feels this won't stand out. Chairman Hill asked what he would say on Section 5 of the form if they approve this, in regard to "restriction of utilization of the property." Mr. Mattingly said he would say "must be built 80-100' from the front property line and must face Elliott Street with entrance/exit from Reynolds." Mr. Wood said they'll have no choice but to come in Reynolds Street, but it wouldn't hurt to add it. Mr. Starkey said they would accept the side lot area for the HVAC.

Mr. Mattingly made a motion to accept the recommendation with the stipulation that, if the lot is subdivided, the building will be no more than 80-100' from the Elliott Street property line; the setback for the HVAC will be accepted as well. Mr. Wood seconded the motion. The motion passed 3-1, Chairman Hill opposed.

1711 King Street, Identified as District R120, Tax Map 3, Parcel 802, Special Exception
Applicant: Beaufort Rentals, LLC for Blake Yaralian (ZB14-05)
The applicant is requesting a special exception in order to have a short-term rental.

Ms. Anderson said this is a special exception application. It's at the corner of King and Hamar Streets and is in the Northwest Quadrant. The property is zoned General Residential District and a single family dwelling is on the property and is a contributing property in the city. The house is in the corner of the lot and has a generous back lot if needed for parking.

The applicant, Beaufort Rentals, would like to use this property for short-term rental of a minimum of two days. The applicant is a rental management company, and they manage other short-term rentals in the city. The rental agreement states that the minimum stay is 3 days, which exceeds the minimum requirement. There is adequate parking and a monitored fire system will be required. No public comments on the application have been received.

CRITERIA FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION

1. **Proposed use is compatible with existing uses in the surrounding area:** The property is on King Street and is a block off Bay Street, which is a collector street, Ms. Anderson said. It has good access to downtown and Ribaut Road. The property is across the street from Beaufort Elementary.
2. **Proposed changes are harmonious with character of area:** No changes are proposed to the building or the site.
3. **Impact on public infrastructure:** The use as a short-term rental should have no more or less impact than a long-term rental or owner-occupied would, staff feels.
4. **Proposed use is in conformity with the city's Comprehensive Plan and the Civic Master Plan:** It's in general conformity, Ms. Anderson said.
5. **Impact on public health and safety:** Health and safety would experience minimal impact, and they have a professional management plan.
6. **Potential creation of nuisances:** Staff feels that there is little potential to create nuisances; there is also a professional management company and a monitored fire alarm system.

Mr. Starkey said it would be useful to know in future if there are other short-term rentals in the area. Ms. Anderson agreed that that was a good idea. J.C. Cuppia, representing the applicant, said the city's noise ordinance is in the rental agreement, and they also have when the trash pick up is. The owner wants to do a 7-night minimum, ideally, and they will keep it limited to 5 occupants and a two-car minimum, even though there's plenty of parking. Mr. Mattingly asked what they do if they have a short-term rental from Monday – Wednesday: who takes the trash

to the curb? Mr. Cuppia said he does.

Mr. Starkey said looking at the parking, he thought it would be a good idea to delineate the parking spaces better to keep people from parking on the grass. Mr. Cuppia said there is gravel there, but it's overgrown, but he agreed to delineate it. Mr. Mattingly said in the payment they ask for 50% down 60 days before. Mr. Cuppia said it depends on when they reserve the property, and the 50% is a deposit.

Charles Kresch said he lives at the other end of King Street, next to Adventure Street. He said he has questions, not a problem with this applicant. He asked who checks on the rental company, if say, the owner decides they don't want a rental company anymore in six months. He asked if there were follow-up. Ms. Anderson said they are comfortable with the recent applications because either the owner is local, or they have a professional management company, but when there is a company, that is a good issue to consider. The owner could let the company go, Ms. Anderson said, but it's professional management that's being approved: the management of the property by an owner or a management company. She said there is no formal check-up, but they can do it when the business license is renewed, and the management companies could call the city when something changes. Chairman Hill said there are other instances where the owners live down the street and manages the property themselves.

Mr. Mattingly asked if there wasn't the option of an annual inspection. Ms. Anderson said there is a mechanism for an annual physical inspection; the applicant in some situations is the management company, so she feels checking management should be part of the business license renewal. The owner would have to come up with a new plan if they weren't using the original property management company that applied.

Mr. Kresch asked what could be done with the variance once it is granted. Ms. Anderson said the only thing that could be done is a short-term rental or a long-term rental, which doesn't require approval, or it could be owner-occupied. The variance is for the management company to manage it in these cases, because they are trying to avoid problems for the neighborhood.

Mr. Kresch asked if a short-term rental could be rented to multiple people at one time. Ms. Anderson said no, it's a single-family dwelling. Mr. Kresch asked if there could be 3 different families at one time. Chairman Hill said it is for five people in this case, who might be from different families. Mr. Kresch asked if it could be "like Two Suns Inn … with multiple unassociated people renting at the same time." Ms. Anderson said that's not the intent; it's a short-term rental, not a B&B, so there is only one rental agreement at a time. Chairman Hill said that would be up to the management company to determine, and they are unlikely to sublet rooms during a guest's stay.

Mr. Kresch asked if this designation could lead to a change in the zoning and variances for something else. Could a short-term rental be something other than a residence? Mr. Mattingly said no, not commercial or anything else.

Mr. Kresch told Ms. Anderson that he has been unable to reach her by phone because the message says the City Hall is closed for Memorial Day, "which is why there was no public comment on this matter." Ms. Anderson said she had gotten his message and returned his call that day.

Mr. Starkey made a motion to approve the short-term rental with the criteria set by the staff recommendation and requesting that the management company notify the Planning Department of the City of Beaufort if any change in management occurs. Mr. Mattingly seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Anderson said they would add to the language of the application that if there is any change in management, this becomes null and void. She said this would be sent to all short-term rentals run by management companies.

820 Paul Drive, Identified as District R120, Tax Map 7, Parcel 184, Variance
Applicant: James and Mary Lamie, Owner (ZB14-12)
The applicant is requesting a variance in order to locate a shed.

Ms. Anderson said this is a variance for a property in the Royal Pines neighborhood. It's a single-family dwelling, and it's zoned R-2. The applicant wishes to relocate a 336 square foot existing shed from a neighboring lot. The ordinance limits sheds to 320 square feet. It was installed without a permit on a different property, and is in the setback area on the side of the property. The city has had an enforcement action for several months to get this resolved, and now the shed will be purchased and relocated to the rear of 820 Paul Drive, but it's still larger than is allowed, so that's why they need the variance. There has been no public comment.

VARIANCE FINDINGS

1. **Extraordinary and exceptional conditions:** There may be unusual conditions in that the shed on the adjoining property has been located there and is too large and without a permit, Ms. Anderson said.
2. **Conditions as applied to other properties in the vicinity:** They hope they do not apply elsewhere, Ms. Anderson said.
3. **Conditions are not the result of the applicant's own actions:** The conditions did not result from the applicant's action.
4. **Granting the variance would not conflict with Comprehensive Plan:** This is not in conflict with the plans and would be in the proper place in back of the applicant's dwelling.
5. **Unreasonable restriction on utilization of the property:** This would be an equitable resolution to the problem, Ms. Anderson said. The shed is only is 5% larger than what's allowed.
6. **Granting a variance will not be a detriment to adjacent property and the public good:** The variance is small, and the shed will be permitted and out of sight, plus this will correct an existing code violation.

Mr. Starkey asked about the size of the house and lot of **James Lamie**, the applicant, who is taking the shed. Ms. Anderson said they got the information from the JL saying that they were getting the shed and would put it 5' from the property line. JL showed where the shed would be located. He said there was a shed there when he bought the place in 1975. He said this shed will be tied down and located on blocks where the old shed was. Mr. Mattingly asked how they are going to move the shed. JL said he has found a company that moves sheds, and he had been looking for a shed, so this was a good opportunity, since the current owner couldn't afford to move it. There was no public comment.

Mr. Wood made a motion to approve the variance on the size of the shed to be moved to 820 Paul Drive per staff recommendation. Mr. Mattingly seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

2001 Boundary Street, Identified as District R122, Tax Map 1, Parcel 12, Special Exception
Applicant: Town Center, LLC (ZB14-09)
The applicant is requesting a special exception in order to have a restaurant with a drive-thru.

Ms. Anderson said the address of this will change, but it's "generally" 2001 Boundary Street. It's zoned Boundary Street Redevelopment District. The applicant wants to develop a Starbucks coffee shop.

CRITERIA FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION

1. **Proposed use is compatible with existing uses in the surrounding area:** There are a number of businesses with drive-throughs in the area, Ms. Anderson said. The McDonald's was built as part of the Boundary Street Redevelopment District and a special exception was given for their drive-thru. Staff feels this would be appropriate.
2. **Proposed changes are harmonious with character of area:** This will be new construction, and the city architect will review the plans. Boundary Street Redevelopment District is a form-based code, so it's quite detailed as to how it will be sited.
3. **Impact on public infrastructure:** There is good access to this site, and Boundary Street is being redeveloped. The point of the code is to encourage additional development within the Boundary Street corridor, Ms. Anderson said, so a coffee shop should have no major impact on services.
4. **Proposed use is in conformity with the city's Comprehensive Plan and the Civic Master Plan:** The property is in the Boundary Street Master Plan and complies with the code.
5. **Impact on public health and safety:** These activities should have no more impact than other commercial uses in the Boundary Street area. The light will accommodate safe left turns.
6. **Potential to create nuisances:** The building will need to comply with health and safety codes and there will be little opportunity to create nuisances, Ms. Anderson said.

Staff recommends approval for a restaurant with a drive-thru, but not any specific architectural

plans, etc. Mr. Starkey asked what happens if the Board approves a drive-through, and it's behind the restaurant, but Starbucks changes their minds and puts it in the front by the street. He said he doesn't want another Caffino, which was not appropriate. Ms. Anderson said that was built before the Boundary Street Master Plan. Ms. Anderson said this is not a full plan review for the Zoning Board of Appeals. They are looking only at the site plan: a building in front and a drive-thru in the back. Chairman Hill said the motion is to approve a drive-thru that is not visible from Boundary Street.

Courtney Worrell, representing the applicant, said the picture of the site is in the Board's packets. She also showed the detail of the Boundary Street Master Plan. They have been working with Starbucks for more than a year. **Lauren Kelly** made a sketch of the drive-thru and how it could be achieved, and it meets the city's, property's, and Starbucks's requirements. The building will front Boundary Street and have the parking and drive-thru behind. The parking lot will be a more formalized roadway. Access will be off Marsh Drive. They have been working to improve the access to the parcel, Ms. Worrell said. Starbucks only has stand-alone shops when there is more population within walking district than there is in Beaufort, so that's why they need a drive-thru. They would also like to service military who may not be able to get out of their cars. They believe this use meets all the requirements of the Redevelopment Plan and the Comprehensive Plan, Ms. Worrell said, as it's close to walkable areas, City Hall, the county complex, etc., and maintains walkability and pedestrian friendliness.

Mr. Starkey said he doesn't like drive-thrus because they have to be crossed to get to the restaurant, and going around a corner, someone could be hurt. He said he wanted to comment about design: they want Boundary Street to look pedestrian-friendly, but it doesn't look like there's access to the Starbucks from Boundary Street. He hopes the architect is considering that. Ms. Worrell said the landscaping plan hasn't been approved. Starbucks has the same concerns as Mr. Starkey expressed, but they have to meet certain requirements. She said there is a crossway that will delineate the pedestrian crossing so people know they are coming into traffic to make the drive-thru safer. There are planters and railings so they can only cross in one area, not wherever they want to, which could be dangerous. Ms. Worrell showed where the connections are for entry. She showed a wood deck with seating and said they are maximizing the seating and "hoping it will be a hotbed of activity." Ms. Worrell agreed with Mr. Starkey's points. Mr. Starkey said there should be room from the front car to the crosswalk to put money and coffee away while not holding up the line of traffic. He said it would be nice to be able to pull up and put stuff away without being in the crosswalk.

Mr. Mattingly asked if there were any chance the live oaks would be saved. Ms. Worrell said that two on the right side the arborist has said couldn't be saved because they are in poor or failing health. The arborist is **Michael Murphy** with Preservation Tree. They "have made significant efforts to save as many grand trees as possible," though, she said.

Mr. Mattingly asked if they could elevate the crosswalks as well as doing the other differentiation. Ms. Worrell said Starbucks may elevate a portion but they may have an issue

with raised areas in the drive-thru and where people are walking, but she said she would ask about that. Mr. Mattingly said he didn't see bike racks. Ms. Worrell said she just found out about that requirement and is "happy to ask."

Chairman Hill said the Board is to approve or disapprove the drive-thru. He said cars will be stacked, but the screening for the further-back stacked cars would be good. Ms. Worrell said they would have a living fence, so the further cars and the menu board will not be seen. The way the landscaping is designed, there are various levels, and then the living fence, "so there's nice lush landscaping and not cars or a menu board."

There was no public comment. **Mr. Starkey made a motion that the special exception be approved for a drive-thru with the following provisions: the drive-thru is located in the rear of the building, the lanes and crosswalk are safely delineated so people are lead to the crosswalk, and the drive-thru is appropriately screened as shown in the drawings. Mr. Wood seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

2001 Boundary Street, Identified as District R122, Tax Map 1, Parcel 12, Variance
Applicant: Town Center, LLC (ZB14-10)
The applicant is requesting a variance in order to install a menu Board and drive-thru lane.

Ms. Anderson said the conditions for approval in the Boundary Street Plan for a drive-thru limit the stacking lane to 3 vehicles. The proposed site plan shows 5 cars proposed to be stacked. The applicants are asking for a variance of that provision. They are not to have outside menu Boards, so they are also requesting a variance for a menu Board. The Zoning Board of Appeals considered a similar request for McDonald's and approved it. The advertising to the public was the same as in the previous project.

VARIANCE FINDINGS

1. **Extraordinary and exceptional conditions:** Ms. Anderson said the small size of the site and its location on a major arterial are two of these conditions. There are other restaurants with drive-thru facilities in the area. The goal of the Boundary Street Master Plan is to make the area more exciting for pedestrians and bicycles, but they need to accommodate motor vehicles in the commercial facilities.
2. **Conditions as applied to other properties in the vicinity:** Most of the commercial lots on Boundary Street are much larger than this one.
3. **Conditions are not the result of the applicant's own actions:** The applicant is improving the conditions on Boundary Street, Ms. Anderson said.
4. **Granting the variance would not conflict with Comprehensive Plan:** The Boundary Street code will be adhered to in all other areas of the development. The drive-thru will be in the appropriate place, and the stacking lane is not excessive and smaller than the lanes at McDonald's.
5. **Unreasonable restriction on utilization of the property:** Additional stacking of 2 cars doesn't seem excessive, staff feels. The menu Board issue will probably be reconsidered in the

whole Boundary Street ordinance, so it should be allowed, Ms. Anderson said, and will be changed overall in the future.

6. **Granting a variance will not be a detriment to adjacent property and the public good:** Staff feels the finding can be made that these matters are in compliance with the Boundary Street code, and they hope to see some improvements in the area.

Staff feels that all of these criteria can be met and recommends approval.

Mr. Starkey asked where the Board would be located. Ms. Worrell said she'd asked Starbucks why they needed the menu Board, and they said it allows people to order more efficiently than at an ordering window. They need a 5-car stacking lane is because they hope to have a lot of customers in their drive-thru; they know customer patterns and the traffic flow very well and this keeps things clear and flowing well.

Ms. Worrell showed on the site plan where the menu Board would be. It will be dark bronze and screened by a living fence. Mr. Mattingly said it's not the Board's job to decide things like this, but it seems the sign is too far back in the line. Ms. Worrell said it's where Starbucks requested them to put it. She said they need a certain number of cars between the Board and the pick-up window, and she doesn't know what that number is. Chairman Hill said it's probably been engineered and determined through experience. Mr. Mattingly said he knows it's not the Board's job to determine this. It will be scrutinized through the Design Review Board, so he wouldn't consider the placement. There was no public comment.

Mr. Starkey said if the Zoning Board of Appeals thinks there's a safety issue with cars backing up into the parking lot, he feels it should be the Board's job to tell Starbucks that having cars parked in the crosswalk is not a good idea. As long as the Board is hidden from Boundary Street and not obvious, that's OK, but stacking cars behind the menu Board is unacceptable. Mr. Mattingly asked Ms. Worrell if Starbucks ever has two Boards – one to read then another at which to order. Ms. Worrell said they do, but she thought they couldn't get two approved at this location. Mr. Mattingly said if they have 5 vehicles there, two Boards might smooth out the flow of cars, so this is another potential option. Ms. Worrell said if they know this is an option, it is likely to be their preference. Chairman Hill asked where the pre-order Board would go. Ms. Worrell said Zaxby's and Arby's have pre-order Boards, and she speculated where Starbucks might put them.

There was a discussion of how to determine if there would potentially be pedestrians in the crosswalk if a car were ordering. Mr. Mattingly said the first car being where the order Board is unacceptable. Mr. Mattingly said the order station should be further back. Mr. Wood said he doesn't think it's the Zoning Board of Appeals' job to design. They are leaning toward approving the variance, he said, but the problem is how to make the motion to mention safety concerns. Chairman Hill asked, if they were to specify where the pre-order Board and menu Board are as part of the motion, and Starbucks comes back and says it doesn't work, and they have to move

the order Board back one because that's "the science of it" for ordering, how difficult would it be to change the Zoning Board of Appeals decision? Ms. Anderson said the applicant would have to come back if what ZBOA suggests doesn't work; then Ms. Worrell could come back before the Board to say it didn't work. Mr. Starkey said he feels "there needs to be at least 1 car between the order Board and the sidewalk." He'd rather see the order Board at car #4. Mr. Wood said they could approve the variance "with the strong recommendation that the order Board be at the third car, and the viewing Board is at the fourth car." If it doesn't work, Starbucks can come back and say why.

Mr. Mattingly made a motion that the variance be granted for a five car drive-thru stacking lane with the strong recommendation that the pre-order Board is at car #4 and the order Board is at car #3. Mr. Wood seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

611 E. Mystic Drive, Identified as District R120, Tax Map 7, Parcel 625, Variance
Applicant: Crish S. DeLoach, Owner (ZB14-11)
The applicant is requesting a variance in order to construct a garage.

Ms. Anderson said this is in the Royal Oaks neighborhood. It is zoned R-2. The applicant wants to build a 2-car garage at the rear of the building. The ordinance limits vehicle storage buildings, and there is already a one-car carport. Carports are considered the same as garages by the ordinance. The applicant is requesting a variance to allow the 2-car garage to be built. Public notice was made.

VARIANCE FINDINGS

1. **Extraordinary and exceptional conditions:** Ms. Anderson said this could be found, and there is a one-car carport.
2. **Conditions as applied to other properties in the vicinity:** Many carports in the neighborhood have been converted to habitable space, according to Ms. Anderson.
3. **Conditions are not the result of the applicant's own actions:** The applicant didn't build the dwelling in its current configuration.
4. **Granting the variance would not conflict with Comprehensive Plan:** A garage behind the dwelling is the proper location from an urban design perspective, staff feels.
5. **Unreasonable restriction on utilization of the property:** Staff feels it would be unreasonable to have the applicant convert the carport to habitable space in order to construct the garage.
6. **Granting a variance will not be a detriment to adjacent property and the public good:** Granting the variance will not harm the neighborhood, Ms. Anderson said; it will be behind the home and will put an end to parking in the front yard, as "there are many vehicle associated with this site."

Staff recommends approval on the condition that no vehicles are parked in the front yard and only in the formal driveway that leads to the carport and the new driveway that serves the rear garage or in the garage, Ms. Anderson said.

Chairman Hill asked if the driveway would go around the left side of the home, and Ms. Anderson said yes, and there are no setback conditions on driveways. Mr. Starkey asked if there were driveways associated with the building plans. Ms. Anderson said that they asked for the driveway, but it's not shown in the application. She said the applicant might have it with him but what she has shows the garage but not the driveway. She believes it's sketched on the site plan.

Crish DeLoach, the applicant, said he has storage space in the carport, and he wants a garage that will allow him to move a vehicle to the back and also to use it for storage. Chairman Hill said a 20' garage is tight for 2 cars, and the garage will be full of stuff if Mr. DeLoach is like him. Mr. Starkey asked the applicant if they intend to put in a gravel driveway. Mr. DeLoach said yes, and he can't put in cement. There would definitely be a driveway. Mr. Starkey said they should ensure it's a part of the recommendation that there is a garage so that other vehicles don't go on the lawn.

Mr. Starkey made a motion to approve the second garage as shown on the plat, and staff will review the application for the driveway and garage, with compliance to include all recommendations of staff, including the prohibition of parking in the front yard - only in the carport or the rear of the house. Mr. Mattingly seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Anderson said there would be a June Zoning Board of Appeals meeting. Chairman Hill said he would not be present. The other members present said they would be able to attend that meeting.

There being not further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 7:19 p.m.