

The Town of Collierville **Board of Zoning Appeals** met in regular session on Tuesday, October 13, 2020 at 5:00 p.m. in the Board Chambers of Town Hall, at 500 Poplar View Parkway.

Staff members present were: Development Director, Mr. Jay Cravens; Town Planner, Mr. Jaime Groce; and Administrative Specialist, Sr., Mrs. Shari Michael.

Chairman Luttrell asked Mrs. Michael to call the roll.

Roll Call:

Oakes – present, Frazier – present, Luttrell – present, Floyd – absent, O’Hare – present.

Quorum Present

Approval of the Minutes:

Chairman Luttrell asked if there were any corrections or deletions to the minutes from the August 20, 2020, meeting.

Hearing none, Chairman Luttrell called for a motion to approve the minutes as presented.

Motion by Commissioner O’Hare, and seconded, to approve the minutes as presented.

Hearing no further discussion, Chairman Luttrell asked Mrs. Michael to call the roll.

Roll Call:

Oakes – yes, Frazier – yes, O’Hare – abstain, Luttrell – yes.

Motion approved.

Approval of the Agenda:

Chairman Luttrell asked if there were any additions or changes to the Agenda.

Mr. Groce stated that the agenda stands as advertised.

Chairman Luttrell asked for a motion to approve the agenda.

Motion by Commissioner O’Hare, and seconded, to approve the agenda as presented.

Hearing no further discussion, Chairman Luttrell asked Mrs. Michael to call the roll.

Roll Call:

O’Hare – yes, Frazier - yes, Oakes – yes, Luttrell – yes.

Motion approved.

Formal Agenda:

BZA20-07 – 920 Bray Station Road – Request approval of multiple variances to allow for an existing residential accessory structure to remain in a required side yard setback and the established front yard of the principal structure.

Mr. Groce gave the staff presentation. He explained that the Lot size is 5.01 acres and is currently zoned FAR: Forest Agricultural Residential. The 4,892 square foot home was completed in 1988 and it was staff's review of a home-based business questionnaire that discovered a residential accessory structure was built without obtaining a building permit. If the new accessory structure was used for agricultural purposes, such as keeping horses, livestock, farming activities, etc., a different set of standards would apply. The Town's Accessory structure regulations have changed over time since this property was developed.

The property is heavily wooded and 86% of the property is covered in tree canopy. In the Collierville 2040 Plan, Estate Residential "Place Type" is characterized by an open and rural appearance with a great degree of separation between both buildings and main roads. The applicant has stated that they placed the accessory structure where trees were absent on the property.

Mr. Groce showed recent aerial pictures of the property showing the structures located around the property. He explained that a building permit application received by the Building and Codes Division on March 9, 2020 to place the structure in the front yard of the property. The permit was denied by the Building Official on May 13, 2020, due to zoning ordinance violations, which include the location in the front and side yard and the building materials not meeting the design requirements.

Mr. Groce explained that there are different ways to define a "Yard". The "Required Yard" is required by the zoning district to be open from the ground to the sky and may contain only explicitly listed obstructions. The "Established Yard" is the yard between the house and the lot line as determined by the building footprint. The "Required Front Yard" is the yard extending across the entire width of the lot, with the depth determined by the zoning district. The FAR required front yard is 100 feet, and the FAR required side yard is 75 feet.

The FAR zoning district is designed for low-density residential development, often with a rural character, and characterized by deep setbacks. The home sets 100+ feet from the north side of the property line and 98 feet from the south side of the property line. The minimum required side setback is 75 feet. The home is 428 feet from Bray Station Road, compared to a setback of 330 feet (north) and 249 feet (south) of the neighboring homes. The home is set back 225 feet from the rear property line. The requested variances would allow an accessory structure to be located 29 feet from the north property line, and in the established front yard.

He showed the topography and swales of the lot, and explained that the property already had the maximum limit of accessory structures, which is two, and complied with the maximum size limitation, which is less than 30% of the size of the house. He showed an aerial photograph of where each building is currently located on the property.

The new residential accessory structure is not constructed in a like manner to the principal building in terms of architectural style, roof style and building material.

EXHIBITS

1. Applicant's cover letter (9/11/20)
2. Staff analysis of Standards for a Variance (10/9/20)
3. Existing Zoning of Area (2020)
4. Existing Tree Canopy Coverage (2012)
5. Existing Topography (2020)
6. Recent Site Photos (9/23/20)
7. Denial Letter (5/13/20) with 3/9/20 Building Permit Application including Plot Plan and Design of Accessory Structure
8. Explanation of yards (10/9/20)
9. Letter from Neighbor (10/8/20)
10. Picture from Neighbor (received 10/13/20)

He reviewed from the staff report several alternatives that exist to putting such a structure in the front yard and the nine Standards for a variance:

- The home is set back 256 feet+/- from the rear property line, providing ample room for another accessory structure. Existing trees could be removed to make room for the accessory structure and the extension of any driveways to the rear of the property.
- The new structure could have been designed to better match the existing home and detached garage. A gabled roof and asphalt shingles could have been used.
- One of the 2 existing residential accessory structures could be removed so that the total number of structures does not exceed 2.
- The small shed at the rear of the property could have been replaced with a new one that better meets the applicant's storage needs.
- The size of the new structure could have been reduced to allow the total combined area of all residential accessory structures to not exceed 30% of the size of the home.
- The need for additional storage space could be accomplished by an addition on the rear of the home. It is unclear how this would impact the internal layout of the home.
- The need for additional storage space could be accomplished by leasing space off-site.
- The drainage swales on the property could be moved or eliminated. Any potential negative consequences from adjusting stormwater flows would need to be evaluated by an engineer.
- The septic tank field lines could be relocated but this would have to be approved by the Health Department.

Mr. Groce reviewed the staff analysis to each of the 9 standards for a variance included in the staff report as follows:

1. The 5.01-acre, heavily-wooded property has atypical topography compared to most lots in Collierville as it has a drainage swale running along the north property line. There is also a septic field that precludes the placement of an accessory structure on a portion of the property. The presence of these features restricts the buildable area for portions of the property, but not all of the property. The existing accessory structures were placed in unconstrained areas. Due to the large setbacks of the home, the rear of the property has ample room for a new accessory structure or a replacement of the existing prefabricated shed.
2. The condition caused by the topography is not applicable, generally, to other property throughout Collierville, as most properties with single family dwellings are relatively flat. Many properties in Collierville have existing trees. Tree canopy can be easily replaced with new plantings. FAR lots may be more likely to have septic tanks if they were developed in a rural area and are over 2 acres in size.
3. The variance will not authorize activities or uses other than those permitted by ordinance in the FAR zoning district. Accessory structures with garages, for the purpose of storage, are allowed in the FAR zoning district provided that they do not have all of the elements of a dwelling (full kitchen, bedrooms, bathing facilities, etc.) and no home occupation/home-based business is conducted in the accessory structure. Storage of equipment or materials related to a home occupation/home-based business is allowed.
4. There are factors other than financial gain being considered, such as physical characteristics of the property, such as those listed in Criteria 1 and 2.
5. The topography, tree canopy cover, and septic system existed at the time the applicant purchased the property in 2005. The applicant did not construct the house or the two previous accessory structures (detached garage and prefabricated shed).
6. The requested encroachment into the side yard and established front yard allows the accessory structure to be constructed in a way that does not disrupt the septic system but it makes the structure, which does not match the house, highly visible to the neighbors to the north and south. Since the property already

has two accessory structures for storage plus an attached garage, the property owner already has reasonable use of the land.

7. The requested variances could be considered injurious to other property or in the area as the structure, which does not match the house, and is highly visible due to its location in the established front yard. The neighbor to the north also cites issues with increased stormwater runoff since the accessory structure was built.
8. The requested variances will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property, substantially increase the congestion in public streets, increase the danger of fire, or endanger the public safety. No evidence from an appraiser has been submitted from neighbors to show that this structure will substantially diminish or impair property values within the area. The structure, located in the front yard and highly visible, does not match the house in several ways.
9. The requested variance will not interfere with or encroach upon any known recorded public or private easements.

There are three separate questions to be viewed by the commissioners and there are three separate example motions contained in the staff report to address each issue before you tonight. The commissioners should decide if the site needs a third accessory structure, and if so, how large it should be. The commissioners should also decide if the location of the accessory structure appropriate, and is the design of the accessory structure appropriate?

Chairman Luttrell asked if there were any questions of staff.

A discussion ensued regarding the three separate motions.

Hearing no further questions, Chairman Luttrell called the applicant forward.

Mr. Darin Bommarito, property owner at 920 Bray Station Road, addressed the commissioners. He thanked the commissioners for hearing this application tonight and commented that he is requesting a variance like many other homeowners located on his street. He said that he was sad to hear that the Cartwrights had an issue with his structure. He had no intentions of bypassing any permits or neighbor's approvals when it was started almost two years ago. The structure was not going to be a permanent structure in the beginning, and was to be a post structure to house his family's recreational vehicles. His wife did not like the look of the original structure, so he made plans to enclose it. They stopped working on the structure until this is resolved. In his opinion, there are eleven buildings on his street that are out of compliance and need variances, including the Cartwright's property. The location he chose was the only open place with no trees needing to be cut down and no grading needed to be done. The lot is five acres and looks like a forest. No septic lines were affected and the topography is difficult. There are some trees that could have been removed, but they are very large. He bought this home fifteen years ago and the previous owner enclosed the current attached garage and built a separate garage. It is not connected to the main house, and he has not been able to figure out a way to do so. He found out that the previous owner obtained a permit for a portable building in the back of the property and he cannot move it without tearing it down. He was informed that the zoning had been changed recently to FAR zoning and that changed the applicable setbacks. He was not aware that had happened. He built the Cartwright's home and it has an accessory structure in the back of the property. He doesn't believe it is in compliance with the side yard setback and that is why they received a variance for the building when they added onto it. When he built their house he was required to get a variance on their pool house along with a separate garage. He knows that they have recently added to their separate garage and used a similar metal roof, which is different than their home. He knows the Cartwright's really well and he has been a customer of their nursery for years. He has called Mr. Cartwright three times and he never got in touch with him. He never wanted this to be a battle and never had intentions of offending them. He knows that they are well connected in the Town and own a lot of property and that's fortunate for them.

He has stopped work on the building and it has morphed into what it is today. It does have a concrete floor but no footings. The Town says it doesn't match the main house, but the trim color does match and the color of the walls now of the garage are what they are planning to repaint their main home soon. When they paint their home it will match. They will use asphalt shingles and that will match. The extension to the garage will be a corrugated roof. They will landscape around the shed if it is approved. There are so many trees and it is so far away from the road, and the only people who see it is the Cartwright's. He would be happy to landscape it so they cannot view it. He can solve the look of it by landscaping, and make the paint match the house when they repaint their home. There was a dirt path on his property and they graveled it so that the rain would not fill up his property with water. The other neighbors have placed drain pipes under their fence and he catches all their water drainage. One neighbor behind him added onto their house and the contractor dumped all the debris in his yard. That is how much trees are on his property and no one can see that they live there. He requests that the BZA approve his request. He did not know that the Cartwright's have had such an issue with it. There is electricity going to the structure, and he can place landscaping around it and make it work. The Cartwright's have a third accessory structure in the back of their property and he hopes they received a variance of it. The Code's Compliance Officer who keeps coming to his house is driving him crazy and is always over at the Cartwright's property taking pictures of his property and the structure. He started calling his office and threatened his secretary with taking him to court, which they did. He went and found out that the Town of Collierville Code Compliance Officer has a structure in his backyard that he does not believe is in compliance with Town's regulations, and the materials on it do not match his home. The pot calling the kettle black is kind of difficult for him because he doesn't want to be doing wrong and then everyone is pointing their finger at him like he has done something horrible wrong. There are eleven people on his street with accessory structures, the Town Inspectors, the church has one, and everyone has all these buildings, including his neighbors. He asks the BZA to approve this and he will be glad to screen it however the commissioners feel it is necessary. It is not a building for a business, it is just a place for him to store some of his belongings. He doesn't want to spend money to finish it if he has to tear it down and he agrees that it looks bad now.

Chairman Luttrell asked if there were any questions of the applicant.

Commissioner Oakes stated that this building is been in place for over 18 months as it was originally a wood post cover for yard and lawn equipment, and then they built it into what it is now. Is that correct?

Mr. Bommarito stated that they enclosed 3 walls first, and his wife asked him to pour concrete for a floor and then they added the fourth wall to enclose it. This was done over 6 months within building the original structure, which was built about twelve months ago. Then he filled the bottom edge of the structure with concrete and then enclosed the last wall and framed in the garage door. It morphed into the structure that it is now.

Commissioner Oaks asked at what stage of building this structure were they notified that it needed a permit.

Mr. Bommarito stated that is at the stage the building is now. He said that he stopped construction when they told him he needed a permit. When he received his first letter from the Code Inspector, he called Administration and spoke with someone there and they told him they didn't think he needed a permit, but obviously they were both wrong.

Commissioner Oakes asked if, by the time he got around to asking for the permit, he was already done with the structure?

Mr. Bommarito stated yes. He knows it looks terrible, and if he wanted to sell his house today it would be terrible. When he moved into the home, the previous homeowner didn't pave the driveway and it didn't look that great. It looks bad now, because it is not finished yet and he had to stop work on it.

Commissioner Frasier asked if there was any plumbing in the garage or electricity.

Mr. Bommarito stated that there is electricity and no plumbing.

Commissioner Frasier asked when the electricity was added.

Mr. Bommarito stated that he didn't really know, but he thinks it was before the garage door was added.

Chairman Luttrell stated that the encroachment into the side yard setback is what concerns him and the side yard drainage from the inspection around October 10, 2020. He asked if he added any kind of French drain to avert runoff from going into the Cartwright's property.

Mr. Bommarito stated that he did not influence the drainage pattern, but it is extremely wet through that area when it rains and he doesn't believe that they influenced the drainage at all.

Chairman Luttrell asked if he has seen the runoff that is now going onto the Cartwright's driveway. He understands why the homeowner has concerns. He wanted to know if the runoff was that bad before, or did this structure cause it to get worse.

Mr. Bommarito stated that it has always had a drainage problem in that area. There is a water pooling problem along his north property line and there has always been a problem. There is constantly a stream of water running from his back property line beside the neighbor's yard behind him and out to the street.

Hearing no further questions or comments, Chairman Luttrell called citizens forward who wished to speak.

Mr. Kevin Vaughan, 1115 Halle Park Circle, addressed the commissioners. He is a former vendor to Mr. Bommarito and he also provides services to Mr. Cartwright so he is in a difficult situation. He wants to add some factual information pertinent to the case. He explained that the structure not only exceeds Mr. Bommarito's established front yard, but it exceeds Mr. Cartwright's established front yard. They can see it in front of their home from their front porch. If you look at the topography, you can see the four to six foot fall in that area and it is equivalent to the rear yard where it could be located. There are similar areas in the back yard of the property where the structure could have been built. There are no structures on Bray Station Road that have any front yard residential accessory structures or buildings; however, Mr. Carruthers has one barn that was approved for agricultural use and there is one located two doors down that preceded the home and has been there for a long time. There are some homeowners who have received variances on Bray Station Road, but there are only two accessory structures in front yards. If this structure needs to be relocated, there is a minimal amount of cost to the homeowner to do so. The building permit applications shows estimates of the cost of the structure to be less than \$2,800.00.

Mr. Robert Cartwright, Jr., stated that he would like to yield his time to his father.

Mr. Bob Cartwright, resident at 940 Bray Station Road, addressed the commissioners. Mr. Darin Bommarito is a home builder and ignorance is not an excuse for violating the law. This building has morphed into what it is today. He created this himself. He has turned into the BZA a letter and statement and he hopes they have had a chance to read his responses to Mr. Bommarito's questions. Mr. Bommarito states he has lived in Collierville for almost forty three years. Mr. Cartwright stated that he has lived in Collierville for almost sixty-two years

and his family has been on this property for 170 years. He doesn't feel sorry for someone who lives on a lot that is 21 times larger than the newly approved lot size in Collierville. He thanked the BZA for holding the meeting tonight to hear this case. The structure is not in compliance with the side yard setbacks, and as Mr. Bommarito is a builder and he should know this information. Mr. Cartwright said that he has measured the distance between the garage and his fence with a laser tool, and it was recorded it to be 26.6 feet.

Mr. Groce explained that if the fence is on the shared property line then you would measure it to the closest points.

Mr. Cartwright stated that this is what he did and how he measured it. He sees that there are now four accessory structures located on his property. One building has recently been removed because the code inspector made him remove it. There are a lot of trees on his property, however, there are many other locations he could have put the structure on. There are scrub trees that could be removed easily without a lot of damage to the land or other trees. The topography changes are about the same on each lot, but he has a huge back yard where this structure could have been placed. The other structure further back on the property has been abandoned. In his packet of page 3 of the pictures, he is showing how he can see his structure out of his front door. The Town of Collierville has an application for a building permit. Note number 4 requires contractor information and states that all electrical, plumbing and air conditioning must be installed by a licensed contractor. None of this work shall be started before obtaining the permit, and he never obtained a permit.

Chairman Luttrell asked about the runoff of the drainage onto his property.

Mr. Cartwright stated that it is worse now that he has built this structure.

Mrs. Madge Cartwright, property owner at 940 Bray Station Road, addressed the commissioners. She explained that they started this journey for justice back at the first of the year. Mr. Bommarito has been a long time homeowner in Collierville as well as a contractor and he knows all the rules of Collierville. His shop at her front door has so negatively affected her home. There is constant noise, men coming and going, equipment coming in and leaving on a five acre residential home. His stormwater runoff has damaged her side yard so bad that it is gully trenched all along the fence line of their property. He has directed all of his water directly to her side and front yard. Mr. Bommarito owns an irrigation company and should know how to correct these issues. Rules are for everyone and that does include him. Please finalize this charade of court dates that have been pushed back, violations that have been trampling forward and continue at 920 Bray Station Road, and stand with the Town's Ordinances and have the structure removed. Their daughter got married in the spring of 2020. They were so uncomfortable in their own home that they could not have a small gathering without worrying about what was going to be coming and going out of that small shed. It's just too much, and they deserve much better than this. She does not know what goes on over there, but they are a family and she wants to use her home and doesn't want to see someone's business working out of their front yard next door. People are in and out of his property at all hours of the day and night, and she knows from her cell phone that he has WIFI coming out of that shed. What is going on in the shed that he needs electricity and WIFI. There was never a permit issued for electricity, nor was there an inspection, and it is a fire hazard. There is no insurance company that she knows of that would insure this type of structure. If it burns down, it could catch her house on fire. She is just an ordinary Town citizen who obeys the laws, respects the wheels of justice and they want to be able to use their home in the comfort of which is not there now due to his shop. Operations are run every day in the structure, many nights until 4 am with the lights on. They love their home, they love what Collierville stands for and we stand with the Town to have this shop removed from the property as it is an eyesore for all to see and it has no resemblance of the house structure. This has been so emotionally draining to her and her husband and they are exhausted with the lengths that Mr. Bommarito has inflicted with his will to devalue and destroy their well-being and their personal home. The Ordinances are very clear, they are for all people. She cannot believe what he has put them through over this shop in the past year. Her husband is not in

good health, and this noncompliance with this shop has put his health in danger. She thanked the commissioners and asked them to please confirm the staff's decision and have him remove this structure immediately from his and her front yard and stop all the activity of coming and going from there.

Chairman Luttrell asked the applicant to come forward and address the comments just made.

Mr. Bommarito stated that he never had any intent to cause them ill-will or stress. The building is extremely far from the fence line where there would be no potential fire damage. You can look at the building that they have and it is much closer than his is. This should not be a war between neighbors and they have stopped speaking to him and it shouldn't be that way. He showed a picture of a green metal shed at their house and there are no permits on it. He is not the biggest tax payer in Town and he doesn't own hundreds of thousands of acres in Town. He hates that Mr. Cartwright is ill and this would be a hardship to have to tear this shed down. If Mr. Cartwright were to take a picture front his front door, versus his porch, we are talking minor feet that he cannot see this shed. He would be willing to screen it with landscaping so that they cannot see it. He planted 12 pine trees there and the drainage has always been an issue and he does not feel that he has created any more of a problem with extra water flowing onto their property. The minimum side yard setbacks have changed over the years. Their building is 10 to 12 feet from his property line. There have been no buildings removed at the request of building inspectors. He is not running any business out of this shed. His son has a TV in there and the shed has WIFI for that reason. He doesn't have any bright lights running after dark over there anymore. He would like to be able to finish the shed to make it match the house and put in landscaping to make it match.

Hearing no further questions or discussion, Chairman Luttrell called for a motion.

Motion by Commissioner O'Hare, to approve all three motions as shown in the staff report as follows:

To approve variances from §151.025(D)(1)(a) and §151.025(D)(1)(d) of the Zoning Ordinance to allow a third residential accessory structure at 920 Bray Station Road, with the total combined floor area of all residential accessory structures to not exceed 32.2% of the size of the home, with the condition that a building permit be obtained.

To approve variances from §151.025(D)(1)(b) and §151.025(C)(8) of the Zoning Ordinance to allow a residential accessory structure at 920 Bray Station Road to be within a required side yard (and located 29 feet from the north/side property line) and within the established front yard (beyond the front building line), with the condition that a building permit be obtained.

To approve variance §151.025(D)(1)(e) of the Zoning Ordinance to allow a residential accessory structure at 920 Bray Station Road, to not be constructed in a like manner to the principal building in terms of architectural style, roof style, and building materials, with the condition that a building permit be obtained.

Chairman Luttrell stated that he dislikes it when applicants come before the BZA and ask for forgiveness instead of permission. When that happens, he stills tries to look at the merits of the request, but it doesn't go over well. The side yard setback is the standard. Seeing these pictures does disturb him since the neighbor can see this structure in the front yard. Whatever paper the work the applicant needed to do to get this permit was not done and he is asking for forgiveness on things he didn't do on two separate things. He was denied a building permit, and the personal aspect between neighbors is unfortunate. He hopes that once we get past this step they can work things out. Based on the facts before him, he does not think that he can vote in favor of any of these 3 motions that will allow him to keep the structure as is.

Commissioner Oakes explained that all the issues listed in the staff report are not good, and he did not follow any of the rules in order to grant a variance. He does not think that he can vote in favor of any of these motions for approval of the variances.

Chairman Luttrell stated that he does not see that there is a true hardship per the first standard in the criteria for a variance. The structure could have been built elsewhere on the property.

Commissioner Oakes explained that there are too many variances that are needed, and he cannot support any of them as they would set a bad precedent. It is not the BZA's purview to settle disputes between neighbors.

Commissioner O'Hare stated that there are no hardships that he can see and he would have to vote no.

Commissioner Frasier agreed and stated that the location, materials, and square footage of all the combined structures are all in violation of the Town's ordinances.

Hearing no further discussion, Chairman Luttrell called for the votes on each motion separately, and Commissioner O'Hare consented to handling the votes on the motions that way.

Motion number 1:

Seconded by Commissioner Oakes, to approve variances from §151.025(D)(1)(a) and §151.025(D)(1)(d) of the Zoning Ordinance to allow a third residential accessory structure at 920 Bray Station Road, with the total combined floor area of all residential accessory structures to not exceed 32.2% of the size of the home, with the condition that a building permit be obtained.

Roll Call:

Oakes - no, O'Hare – no, Frazier – no, Luttrell – no.

Motion Failed.

Hearing no further comments, Chairman Luttrell asked Mrs. Michael to call the roll for Motion number 2:

Seconded by Commissioner Frazier, to approve variances from §151.025(D)(1)(b) and §151.025(C)(8) of the Zoning Ordinance to allow a residential accessory structure at 920 Bray Station Road to be within a required side yard (and located 29 feet from the north/side property line) and within the established front yard (beyond the front building line), with the condition that a building permit be obtained.

Hearing no further comments, Chairman Luttrell asked Mrs. Michael to call the roll for Motion number 3:

Roll Call:

Oakes - no, O'Hare – no, Frazier – no, Luttrell –no.

Motion Failed.

Seconded by Commissioner Frazier, to approve variance §151.025(D)(1)(e) of the Zoning Ordinance to allow a residential accessory structure at 920 Bray Station Road, to not be constructed in a like manner to the principal building in terms of architectural style, roof style, and building materials, with the condition that a building permit be obtained.

Hearing no further comments, Chairman Luttrell asked Mrs. Michael to call the roll.

Roll Call:

Oakes - no, O'Hare – no, Frazier – no, Luttrell –no.

Motion failed.

OTHER BUSINESS

Chairman Luttrell asked if there was any other business.

Mr. Groce explained that the number of public meetings are on the rise, but there is not currently a BZA meeting scheduled for November. If there are any changes, staff will let the board know. There will be some upcoming website training opportunities soon. He reminded the commissioners to reapply for 2021 if they are interested in serving another year.

Hearing no further business, Chairman Luttrell adjourned the meeting at 6:26 pm.

Secretary David Frazier