

Meeting Minutes of the Board of Zoning Appeals  
Tuesday, September 14, 2021 at 5:15 PM  
City Hall Council Chambers

The Board of Zoning Appeals met in City Hall Council Chambers on Tuesday, September 14, 2021 at 5:15 PM with the following Members in attendance: Ryan Gaylord, Jim Badger, Janie Salley, Don Bramblett, and Brian Murdoch. None were absent. Representing the Planning Department were Martin Livingston, Community Development Director, Nan Zhou, Planner I and Julie Roland, Administrative Assistant.

Mr. Gaylord, Chair. This meeting of the Board of Zoning Appeals has come to order; Tuesday, September 14th of 2021. My name is Ryan Gaylord, and I'm Chair of the Board of Zoning Appeals; and I'll preside over these proceedings. Notice of this meeting has been posted and provided to the media 24 hours in advance is required by the Freedom of Information Act, limited to a request for pre-litigation/mediation or an appeal to the Circuit Court, to be filed within thirty (30) days after the decision of this Board in accordance with Section 603 of the City of Spartanburg Zoning Ordinance. He went over the procedures for tonight's Meeting.

Roll call was taken – All Five Current Board Members were present and constituted a quorum; and he had each Board Member introduce themselves.

**Approval of the Agenda for the September 16, 2021 Meeting:**

Ms. Salley moved approval of the Agenda for the September 14, 2021 Meeting; and she was seconded by Mr. Badger. The motion was approved by a vote of 5 to 0.

**Disposition of the Minutes from the May 11, 2021 Meeting:**

Mr. Gaylord explained only Board Members that attended any previous month's meeting could vote on their approval.

Mr. Badger moved approval of the May 11, 2021 Meeting Minutes as presented; and he was seconded by Ms. Salley. The motion was approved by a vote of 3 -0-2, with New Board Members Bramblett and Murdoch abstained.

**No Old Business.**

**New Business:**

**VAR 21-004-00004; Variance to district standards at 1519 John B White Sr. Blvd - Owner is seeking a variance from the road frontage landscape buffer width requirements in order to maintain access to the existing driveways and parking in front of the building. (TMS # 6-21-14-064.00). One Over Properties, Owner/Applicant.**

Mr. Livingston: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board of Zoning Appeals, staff received a request for variance to district standards at 1519 John B. White, Sr. Boulevard. The owner is seeking a variance from the road frontage landscape buffer width requirements in order to maintain access to the existing driveways and parking in front of the building, TMS# 6-21-14-064.00. One over Properties is the owner and applicant. The project site is approximately 57,000 square foot lot in the B-1 zoning district. The lot currently has one-story structure that was used as a restaurant. The site is located at 1519 John B.

White, Sr. Boulevard, west side of Southport Road, east side of Hidden Hills Road. Adjacent buildings are all in commercial usage and LOD, Limited Office District from across the street.

The Property Owner is seeking a variance from the road frontage landscape buffer width requirements. The current buildable area of the lot has no road frontage buffer. Therefore, the property owner could not provide the required buffer width while maintaining access to the existing driveways and parking in front of the building. Additionally, the required buffer width would preclude use of the northeast driveway, making it too narrow for access.

According to the Road/Street Frontage Landscaping Requirements, the area to be landscaped along road/street frontages shall have an average depth of at least ten feet and a minimum depth of five and shall extend the full length of such frontage except for driveways or points of ingress or egress to and from the building site and in the visibility triangles of Section 501.8 of the Ordinance.

### **Analysis**

#### *Zoning Ordinance Consistency*

The project site has a zone designation of B-1, Neighborhood Shopping Center. Section 303.6 of the City of Spartanburg Zoning Ordinance outlines the permitted uses in the B-1 zone district. The construction of a restaurant is principally permitted. However, since the owner is seeking a variance to the Road / Street Frontage Landscape Requirements in section 505.61, a Variance must be granted by this Board. Variances may only be granted in the instances listed in Section 603.4. Section 603.4 lists nine particular instances in which the Board may grant a Variance. Of these nine, only one is applicable to this project;

**Section 603.4(3):** *To permit the use of a lot or lots for a use otherwise prohibited solely because of the insufficient area or width of the lot or lots, but in no event shall the respective area and width of the lot or lots be less than eighty percent (80%) of the required area and width.*

The Board must utilize **Section 603.3(A)(2)** and determine if the proposal meets all the criterion for approval. To hear and decide appeals for Variance from the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance when strict application of the provisions of the Ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship. A Variance may be granted in an individual case of unnecessary hardship if the Board makes and explains in writing the following findings:

- a. There are extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property;
- b. These conditions do not generally apply to other properties in the vicinity;
- c. Because of these conditions, the application of the Ordinance to the particular piece of property would effectively prohibit or unreasonably restrict the utilization of the property; and
- d. The authorization of a Variance will not be of substantial detriment to the adjacent property or to the public good, and the character of the district will not be harmed by the granting of the Variance.
- e. In granting a Variance, the Board may attach to it such conditions regarding the location, character, or other features of the proposed building, structure, or use as the Board may consider advisable to protect established property values in the surrounding area or to promote the public health, safety, or general welfare.

### **Findings**

- a. ***There are extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property;***  
The existing site has no road frontage buffer and the existing building is +/- 26 feet from the property line. The required Street/Road Frontage Landscape Requirements would cause the property owner unable to maintain the existing driveways and to lose the existing parking lots (including the

handicap parking lots) in front of the building. In addition, the required buffer width would impede the use of the northeast driveway, making it too narrow for driveway access.

**b. *These conditions do not generally apply to other properties in the vicinity;***

With the exception of the two corner parcels, none of the sites on the south side of the road between Hidden Hill Road and Highway 295 appear to provide the required road/street frontage landscape.

**c. *Because of these conditions, the application of the Ordinance to the particular piece of property would effectively prohibit or unreasonably restrict the utilization of the property; and***

Without a variance, the owner will not be able to maintain access to the existing driveways and parking in front of the building. In addition, the required buffer width would preclude use of the northeast driveway, making it too narrow for access.

**d. *The authorization of a Variance will not be of substantial detriment to the adjacent property or to the public good, and the character of the district will not be harmed by the granting of the Variance.***

Granting this variance will not have a negative impact to the adjacent property or to the public good, and the character of the district. The proposed site renovations include roadside landscaping which the site currently does not have. The property owner is proposed to maximize the width of the roadside landscaping/buffering that can be provided while maintaining access to the existing driveways and front parking area. Additional landscaping has been added to the front of the building where the required buffer width cannot be provided. The total landscaped area required based on the ordinance is +/- 1,720 SF, the proposed landscaped area in front of the building is +/- 1,790 SF, which exceeds the area required by the ordinance.

**e. *In granting a Variance, the Board may attach to it such conditions regarding the location, character, or other features of the proposed building, structure, or use as the Board may consider advisable to protect established property values in the surrounding area or to promote the public health, safety, or general welfare.***

In the event the Board finds that the Variance finding can be met and the project approved, conditions of approval are attached to this report. The Board may choose to approve or amend them based on the outcome of this proposal.

**Summary and Recommendation**

The proposed project meets all the required Findings for approval of the Variance. Staff recommends approval based on the Findings listed above.

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR PROJECT ON PROPERTY AT:  
1519 John B White Sr. Blvd.**

1. If one or more of the following conditions is not met with respect to all its terms, then this approval may be revoked.
2. All setbacks excluding the street side yard setback shall meet the setback requirements in the City of Spartanburg Zoning Ordinance, where the maximum building coverage is N/A, front yard setback is 25 feet, rear setback is 10 feet, and the interior side setback is 5 feet from the property line.
3. The use shall meet the standards and shall be developed within the limits established by Chapter 501.10 of the Spartanburg Municipal Code as to the emission of noise, odor, smoke, dust,

vibration, waste, fumes or any public nuisance arising or occurring incidental to its establishment or operation.

4. The applicant shall acquire a new plat showing the new side yard setbacks prior to construction.

5. The applicant shall be responsible for the completeness and accuracy of all forms and supporting material submitted in connection with any application. Any errors or discrepancies found therein may result in the revocation if any approval or permits issues in connection therewith.

6. The development of the site shall be in substantial accordance with the approved plans submitted and on file in the Spartanburg City Planning Department. All aspects of construction must be completed prior to use. Major modifications to plans or exceptions to completion may be granted only by the City authority which approved the project.

7. All requirements of the Building, Fire, Water and Streets and Stormwater Departments shall be completed prior to building occupancy permit issuance and continuously maintained thereafter.

8. Site Pre-construction meeting with the City of Spartanburg Storm Water Manager, Jay Squires, is required prior to site disturbance. Building pre-construction meeting with City of Spartanburg Building Official, Buddy Bush, required prior to vertical construction.

Slides were also shown in order to better illustrate the request.

**Board Questions for Staff:**

Mr. Bramblett asked Mr. Livingston to go back to the slide regarding the power lines with the for sale sign. Down at the bottom, you see it right there where you have the cursor. You have a tree, and there's just one just below that. Are those two a buffer for the business farther down.

Mr. Livingston: No, I think those are the properties for the other side, but I think those trees are on the other side.

Mr. Bramblett: I mean, they're not for this property, but are they for an adjoining business.

Mr. Livingston: Yes. They are for the adjoining business.

Mr. Bramblett: So, they have a little bit of a buffer. Then the next frame with the maps or the plans. Okay, the pink.

Mr. Livingston: Yes.

Mr. Bramblett: Okay. This one. There's a heavy line in the middle of the property across next to the sidewalk, is that just a heavy line.

Mr. Livingston: oh, no. It's not landscaping.

Mr. Bramblett said that was clarity. Thank you.

Mr. Gaylord asked Mr. Livingston, could you speak a little bit to the B-1 zone district.

Mr. Livingston: B-1 is typically more residential, more commercial development associated with nearby residential, as typically would. B-1, it's typically a neighborhood shopping district. The majority of this

corridor has been developed as B-1. Certainly, it's beyond the limited commercial. It's one of the zoning requirements that allows for a lot of other commercial uses, as well, restaurants. There are other restaurants in this corridor, as well. As you go further east towards downtown, you see more limited commercial and less residential zoning. That's primarily because the residential are closer to those commercial buildings. You don't see that here in this area of the B-1 zoning. It's a large facility behind this one, as well. So, there's huge parking spaces in this area.

Ms. Salley asked that there really was not going to change the zoning; and if not she thought it would beautify the area.

Mr. Livingston: It will. As a matter of fact, this development and the adjacent developments don't have any landscaping, street frontage landscaping. Our ordinance requires that any new developments, including major improvements that include 50% of the value or more of the property, be updated. So their parking requirements are updated. Their landscaping requirements are updated. Their dumpster requirements are updated. So they're trying to meet all of those requirements.

Mr. Badger said it appears from the proposal with the landscaping, as Ms. Salley mentioned, the landscaping that is going to be added will be approximately the same square footage. It'll be on the front of the building, and the owners will still be able to maintain the same number of parking spaces.

Mr. Livingston: Yes.

Mr. Badger That's true. Okay.

Mr. Gaylord You all, please pardon me. I should have mentioned that as we address a question, if you'll introduce yourself, so we've got a statement on the record of who's speaking. I forgot to do it, too. So please forgive me.

Mr. Badger I'm sorry.

Mr. Gaylord asked were there any other questions for Mr. Livingston. There were no other questions.

Mr. Gaylord said I believe we have at least a representative for the applicant here. And so if you'd like to be heard, we'd certainly be happy to entertain. Yes, sir, and could you please state your name.

Christian Crear: Good afternoon. My name is Christian Crear. I'm with Arbor Land Design; and he was sworn. He said so, essentially, as Mr. Livingston mentioned, we will be providing the required amount of plant material, including trees and shrubs, that's required by the ordinance. In this case, the existing site has perpendicular parking in front of the building. We've done everything that we possibly can to try to, again, maintain both access points, provide the landscaping that's required by the ordinance and maintain that access. So what we have done is we've provided the minimum width access there, which I believe is the 18 feet. We have staggered or slanted the parking spaces in order to accommodate that access. I do want to point out one of the questions previously was; if that bold area above was going to be landscaped area, it was not shown. Excuse me. It is to be landscaped. However, it is within the right of way. So, technically, we did not count that towards our square footage that we're providing landscaped area for. In that sense, we are exceeding the buffer.

Mr. Bramblett asked if there will be a line of bushes there.

Mr. Crear: Yes, sir. We just did not count that towards the amount that we're requiring because it was beyond the property line.

Mr. Bramblett I see. That's even better.

Mr. Crear: Obviously, the owner has an interest in gaining as much curb appeal as possible. That's the intent. We take pride in our designs and what we do, and we look forward to enhancing that corridor, and we hope that that will continue to flow through as other parcels are redeveloped; but this is a common challenge with any infill project. So, with that, we just request your approval of the variance and be happy to answer any questions.

**Board Questions for the Applicant:**

New Board Member Mr. Murdoch asked are you going to have a drive-through.

Mr. Crear: No, we will not.

Mr. Gaylord Let's do this. Let's ask questions of Mr. Crear to the extent you're able to answer them, fine; and if we need to then bring somebody else up to answer additional questions. That way, we'll create a clear order of the presentation.

Mr. Crear: Very well.

Mr. Badger asked about the slanted parking out in front, that's six parking for handicap.

Mr. Crear: It is six spaces.

Ms. Monica Baretta, with LMG Architects with the Design Team said I can answer if you want me to.

Mr. Crear: I know that that is existing ADA accessible parking. We will certainly meet the ADA requirements and provide ADA access. We typically try to do that as close to the access to the building as possible. And I'll defer again to Monica, who was with the architect and the owners' representative to answer that.

Ms. Salley: I feel comfortable with the landscaping that you're presenting.

Mr. Gaylord asked Mr. Crear, have you had the opportunity to review and are you aware of the conditions of approval as recommended by the city.

Mr. Crear: Yes, I have.

Mr. Gaylord said and as far as you are aware, the applicant is comfortable with those conditions as stated.

Mr. Crear: Yes.

Mr. Gaylord: Okay. Thank you. Any other questions for Mr. Crear. Mr. Crear, I believe we will excuse you for the moment.

Mr. Gaylord said do we have any other people here to speak on behalf of and in support of the application. And if you would please state your name and address for the record.

Monica Baretta: I'm with LMG Architects in Greenville, S.C. and was sworn. She said they designed the building.

Mr. Gaylord: Thank you, ma'am. Well, Ms. Baretta, if there's anything you'd like to say about the project, we certainly are all ears. And if not, I think we at least have a couple questions of you.

Monica Baretta: Okay. So I do want to point out, I'll go over here and show you, this actually will all be green area, as well. So I want to make that clear. So there will also be a buffer this way, as far as open space. This is outdoor dining here, and then there'll be what we call the yard, which will be a green area for kids and families to be outside and being enclosed with a see-through fence. That's something that I think is a positive thing towards the project, as well. I can speak to the six spaces on the front. Those are actually takeout spaces. The main entry to the building is actually on the backside. If you can scroll up a little bit, all of those ADA spaces are, if you see the little ramps here. There'll be about ... I think there's four spaces there, and here's the entry to the building. So there'll be a good access for ADA there. The whole gist behind the front part was that it's great for takeout, to keep takeout people from getting in the way of other people who are staying to eat at the restaurant. So it's a quick pull in, the takeout is right there to the south of that larger tree. And then they can get out of the way quickly. So that's why we really wanted that access to be maintained. Have any other questions.

**Board Questions:**

Mr. Murdoch: You pointed at the white box. Okay. So you said that's the outdoor space.

Ms. Baretta: Yes.

Mr. Murdoch: Okay. So in the front, that is closest to the John B. White Boulevard.

Ms. Baretta: Yes, sir.

Mr. Murdoch asked about the long, narrow, white box and the two white boxes below that area.

Ms. Baretta said oh, no, sir. This is the restaurant. All this, this will all be an open green area.

Mr. Murdoch: Oh, okay.

Ms. Baretta: Yeah. So all of this will be open. It doesn't look like it, but this is outdoor dining, which will be covered.

Mr. Murdoch: So the reason I asked about a drive-through is just to see how your egress would flow. About your flow of traffic through there, and with the landscaping getting in the way or anything, but you say you don't think you'll have a drive-through.

Ms. Baretta: No drive-through. It will just be a takeout where people can park and walk up to the window.

Mr. Gaylord: Any other questions of Ms. Baretta. There were no other questions. Mr. Gaylord asked is there anybody else that's here and desires to speak in favor of the application.

Joshua Howard: My name is Josh Howard. I'm one of the owners of the building, from Greenville, SC and he was sworn.

Mr. Howard: The only thing I want to say is just thank you for considering this. We're looking forward to bringing this project to Spartanburg. It's exciting for us. The request we make here is going to be very helpful to the flow of traffic through here. It's important to us to maintain those two access points, and this allows us to do that. We do appreciate the staff's support on it, and we appreciate you guys' consideration. Thank you for your time.

Mr. Gaylord asked Is there anyone else that's here to speak on behalf of, in support of the applicant.

Mr. Manshing So of 1529 C John B White Sr. Boulevard came forward and was sworn. He asked about whether there would be a "U" turn or something regarding safety reasons. He said if he was not misunderstood, when they come from in here and the car go out here, there's no fill. If there are any cars that has an accident or something happens, they cannot go out. There's no access to go out. So there's no two lanes to come into entrance. So kind of dangerous to that area, and they usually right now, from this lot, there's a lot of cars driving and going the back way into the shopping mall. So there's not a good flow for traffic in the parking. I don't know what they say the main entrance of the restaurant is, but the parking will become the back. The back of the building is like a hill. So there's no U-turn or anything in the back of the way. I don't know how they say, but I know this. There's no way they can make a U-turn or whatever it is. There's no access in the back. So that's what happened. The lot is kind of high. The backyard over there is kind of swooped down. So there's no U-turn on the back here or they can access. Anything happen over here, people cannot go out is what I want to say.

Mr. Gaylord: All right. Well, I was recognizing people who are speaking in support of the applicant, but it seems that your comment is opposed to the application, which would be the people to be recognized next. I don't think there's anybody else here speaking in support of the application. Now, people who are speaking in opposition to an application, as you have, then it awards the applicant the opportunity to come in and provide any rebuttal statement or explanation as they may see warranted. I appreciate you. Is there anything else.

Mr. So: I say there's nothing to do about just for safety reason because I'm right behind that space. So I know they always have problem parking in traffic. Once they had accident, somebody was fighting each other at the corner of the entrance. They would have troubles. That's what happened. They can't go nowhere.

Mr. Gaylord asked Mr. So; I guess one question I'd have of you, in looking at it, of course, the primary issue that we're here to consider this evening is whether there should be an additional setback for landscaping from the road, which would leave with only a single entrance in and out, as opposed to two. Do you think that that makes the situation any better.



Mr. So: You're talking about landscaping, basically just more fancy-looking is, but, I mean, for fire or anything happen like this, it doesn't work that way. The parking space on that side over there is not really working because most the traffic is back and forth. So I don't know, and really have a measure of the landscape, and there's a lot of trees over here. They probably have to clean it all out. And the parking lot, there's a lot of holes on it, lot of potholes.

Mr. Gaylord I get a strong sense that a lot of those things are going to change. Of course, I'd let these folks speak to that, but I guess the question I've got for you is, at this point, this property has two access points, or at least-

Mr. So: That access, but that is not very safe for getting in and out. You look at that patio over there. You think it's possible for two cars or one car. If one car comes in, he's going to parking, and they keep going that way for parking, and the back of the car want to go out to the front entrance, same spot to go out, leaving the area, and you have accident right in front of there.

Mr. Gaylord said I guess my question, if you'd allow me to ask, it would be that, if we take this property and go from two access points to a single access point, your concerns as I've heard them expressed are that there's limited ability to get in and out of the parking lot. Would reducing two to a single access point make that any better.

Mr. So did not think there would be enough visibility.

Mr. Gaylord said he would open the public comment portion at this time; and he asked if there was anyone else who wished to speak either in favor of the request, or in opposition to the request to come forward and state your name and address for the record. No one else came forward. Mr. Gaylord closed the public hearing.

Mr. Gaylord: So, if anybody from the applicant would care to address any of the concerns expressed about the project, we certainly would welcome you up and allow you to address any of those.

Mr. Crear said Yes; we feel like this is improvement. We feel like the two access points does help circulation and flow. From a visibility standpoint; we will meet all of the SCDOT site triangle distance requirements and everything that is required for ingress and egress to an existing highway. We are maintaining two-way traffic at the entrance there. Again, we feel like separating those flows, almost like a mixed use development where you've got some industrial and some commercial use, but typically separating those two traffic flow patterns, as opposed to connecting them and requiring them to use the same access; actually works to the negative. That typically hurts your traffic flow.

Mr. Gaylord: Mr. Crear, I mean, in my direct understanding, that as we look at this diagram, the access point to the left is going to be primarily for ingress or, excuse me, coming into the property, and the access point to the right would be for exit.

Mr. Crear: Correct. With respect to fire safety and things like that, this project will be submitted to the State Fire Marshall's Office for review and approval before we ever move into the construction phase. So I don't believe there's a concern there, either.

Mr. Gaylord: All right. Any questions for Mr. Crear. All right. Thank you, Mr. Crear.

Mr. Crear. Thank you.

**Board Questions/Deliberation:**

Mr. Gaylord said the Board would now move into Deliberation on the project, and have discussion. In the event that anybody cares to make any motion with regard to the requisite Findings for approval of the application and to approve the application or alternatively to deny it, certainly please feel free to make a motion at any point.

Mr. Bramblett: In the City Ordinance about landscaping, the rear of the property, I went out there, and the property's in pretty bad shape, but that's okay because they're going to fix it, but I'm just curious along the back is a chain link fence, and that is in front of the row of buildings, businesses behind me. So is there any requirement to have any landscaping along the back of the fence.

Mr. Livingston said there is not a requirement that I'm aware of between two commercial properties.

Mr. Bramblett: Okay.

Mr. Livingston: There is a requirement between commercial and residential to landscape between the two.

Mr. Gaylord asked Is there a motion perhaps to adopt the Findings of the City with regard to the Findings, A, B, C, D, that there are extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property, that these conditions do not generally apply to other properties in the vicinity, because of these conditions, the application of the ordinance, the particular piece of property would effectively prohibit or unreasonably restrict the utilization of the property, and the authorization of a variance will not be of substantial detriment to the adjacent property or to the public good, and the character of the district will not be harmed by the granting of the variance. Now, the City has answered those questions in the affirmative. Is there a motion and a second perhaps to adopt the Findings of the City with regard to those four questions.

Mr. Murdoch moved to approve the request presented from the City; and he was seconded by Mr. Badger.

Mr. Gaylord: All right. All in favor of accepting the Findings of the City with regard to those requisite questions that is A through D, please say, "Aye."

The motion as approved by a vote of 5 to 0.

Mr. Gaylord said is there then a motion and a second to approve the application for the variance.

Ms. Salley moved to approve the application for the Variance, subject to the Conditions of Approval as presented by Staff; and she was seconded by Mr. Bramblett. The motion was approved by a vote of 5 to 0.

Mr. Gaylord said I'm sure the City will be in contact with some documentation for you.

**Nomination and election of Chair and Vice-Chair for the 2021-2022 Calendar year.**

Ms. Salley: I'd like to nominate Mr. Ryan Gaylord again for the Chair; and she was seconded by Mr. Badger. There were no other nominations for Chair.

Mr. Gaylord: Well, thank you. I appreciate that. I will not vote, but all in favor, please say, "Aye."

The motion was approved by a vote of 4 to 0, with Mr. Gaylord abstained from the vote.

Mr. Gaylord: Are there any nominations for Vice-Chair for this coming year term.

Mr. Murdoch nominated Ms. Salley as Vice-Chair.

Ms. Salley: I appreciate the nomination, but I will have to decline at this moment until I see where everything is going for me in the November election.

Mr. Gaylord: I understand. Are there any other motions perhaps for Vice –Chair.

Mr. Gaylord: Well, I'm going to nominate Mr. Bramblett for Vice Chair if he will accept. Certainly, he has experience sitting in this seat.

Mr. Bramblett said he would accept the nomination.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Bramblett. The motion was approved by a vote of 4 to 0, with Mr. Bramblett abstained from the vote.

**Staff Announcements:**

Ms. Roland: We want to welcome our two New Board Members. Welcome back to Don after being off for a year or two, and we certainly want to welcome Brian Murdoch, our newest Member, as well, and appreciate your willingness to serve. We do still have two vacant BZA positions; so if you all do know of anybody willing to serve that lives in the City, the City Clerk's email is on there, if they want to fill that out or they can also send it to me, and I can get it forwarded to her.

Update on 2021 online Continued Ed training, I think everybody is up-to-date that's here. Then we've got a New Board Member. I'm going to be working with Mr. Murdoch to get him trained within a year for New Board Member Training. Don, you've got your choice within a year of doing New Board Member again, or you can take Continued Ed. There was a Jeff Shacker flyer at the bottom of everybody's packet. That's real good, I hear. He's going to be in Greenville, and all of you all are welcome to go. It's going to be in October. Right now, they've got it in person. If you'll let me know if you want to go, I'll get you registered. I've already gotten a couple of other Board Members from other Boards registered for that, it would be a good way to get three Continued Ed Credits.

Mr. Livingston said tonight is the meeting for the Comp Plan presentation. If you're interested in attending, we should have sent that out to you, everyone. If you have not received, we'll try to get it to you again this week, but we do have other opportunities to participate in the Comprehensive Planning

process. That's coming up October 7th through the 9th, and then we'll also post the video to Facebook and the City web page as well.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:15 P.M.

  
Ryan Gaylord, Chair

Minutes edited by Julie Roland