

Charles Morris,
Chair
Town of Linden

Diane Wheatley,
Vice-Chair
Cumberland County

Jami McLaughlin,
Town of Spring Lake
Harvey Cain, Jr.,
Town of Stedman

Vacant
Wade, Falcon & Godwin



Planning & Inspections Department

MINUTES
April 16, 2019

Joel Strickland,
Acting Director

Vacant,
Deputy Director

Vikki Andrews,
Carl Manning,
Lori Epler,
Cumberland County

Stan Crumpler,
Town of Eastover

Patricia Hall,
Town of Hope Mills

Members Present

Mr. Charles Morris – Chairman
Mrs. Diane Wheatley – Vice Chair
Mr. Harvey Cain Jr.
Mr. Carl Manning
Mr. Stan Crumpler
Mrs. Jamie McLaughlin
Mrs. Lori Epler
Ms. Patricia Hall
Dr. Vikki Andrews

Members Absent

Others Present

Mr. Joel Strickland
Ms. Annie Melvin
Mr. Edward Byrne
Mrs. Dena Barner
Mr. Rob Hasty,
Assistant County Attorney

I. INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mrs. Epler delivered the invocation, and Mr. Manning led those present in the Pledge of Allegiance.

II. APPROVAL OF / ADJUSTMENTS TO AGENDA

Cases P19-18 and P19-21 would be moved to Contested Items.

Mrs. Epler made a motion seconded by Mr. Crumpler to approve the agenda. Unanimous approval.

III. PUBLIC HEARING WITHDRAWAL / DEFERRAL

There were none.

IV. ABSTENTIONS BY BOARD MEMBERS

There were none.

V. POLICY STATEMENT REGARDING PUBLIC HEARING TIME LIMITS

Mr. Strickland read the policy statement.

VI. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF MARCH 19, 2019

Mrs. Hall made a motion, seconded by Mr. Manning to approve the minutes as submitted.

Chair Morris asked if there was any discussion.

Mrs. McLaughlin said that she didn't think that the minutes were complete.

Ms. Hall asked if there was a policy on minutes.

Chair. Morris said that they have to be done and approved by the Board.

Ms. Hall asked if this Board required the minutes to be verbatim or actions taken.

Chair Morris said as disseminated based on approval of this Board.

Ms. Hall said if there's not a policy, according to Robert's Rules you are only advised to record actions taken and not the discussion, and I think what you are referring to is discussion, and unless there is a policy that this be done verbatim my motion stands.

Mrs. McLaughlin said that it was requested that the minutes for discussion be thorough and they're not.

Dr. Andrews said that because this is incomplete, we don't know what was said.

Mrs. Epler said that since it was Chair Morris's statement whatever he wanted she would support.

Mr. Morris said that he tries to remain neutral but when it comes to a vote, he will vote negative on the motion to approve.

Mr. Manning reminded the board of what Ms. Hall said that it was only required on actions that were taken in the minutes.

Chair Morris said that the motion was on the floor and asked for all in favor to say aye and those opposed to say no. The motion failed with 3 voting in favor to approve and 6 voting to disapprove the minutes as submitted.

Dr. Andrews made a motion to request the minutes be amended and presented at the next meeting, seconded by Mrs. McLaughlin.

Mr. Crumpler asked if the minutes needed to be completed before the next Board of Commissioners meeting?

Mr. Strickland replied yes.

The motion was amended to disseminate the minutes by email and voted on by individual personal email with Laverne in order to be timely for the Commissioners meeting. The motion passed with unanimous approval.

VII. PUBLIC HEARING CONSENT ITEMS

MODIFICATION TO CONDITIONAL USE DISTRICT

- A. **P07-75:** MODIFICATION OF THE PERMIT FOR AN APPROVED C(P) PLANNED COMMERCIAL/CUD CONDITIONAL USE DISTRICT FOR MINI-WAREHOUSING WITH OUTSIDE STORAGE OF MOTOR VEHICLES, RETAIL/OFFICE SPACE, SECOND FLOOR DWELLING AND CAR WASH, WITH THE PERMIT ALLOWING FOR RELIGIOUS WORSHIP FACILITY, RESTAURANT, RECREATION/AMUSEMENT INDOOR (CONDUCTED FOR PROFIT) & BARBERING AND HAIRDRESSING SERVICES/SALONS; CONSISTING OF 11.66+/- ACRES; LOCATED AT THE SOUTHERN QUADRANT OF SR 1003 (CAMDEN ROAD) AND SR 1112 (ROCKFISH ROAD); SUBMITTED BY MICHAEL G. WAGUESPACK ON BEHALF OF CAM ROCKS, LLC (OWNER).

In Case P07-75, the Planning and Inspections Staff recommends approval of the modification to the C(P) Planned Commercial/CUD Conditional Use District to add the additional permitted uses of religious worship facility, restaurant, recreation/amusement indoor (conducted for profit) & barbering and hairdressing services/salons and find this recommendation to be consistent with the Southwest Cumberland Land Use Plan (2013) which calls for "heavy commercial" at this location, all of the requested additional uses are allowed within the C(P) Planned Commercial district which is classified as "heavy commercial" zoning and further find approval of this request is reasonable and in the public interest because the modification requested is in harmony with the surrounding zoning and existing land uses.

In Case P07-75, Mrs. Epler made a motion, seconded by Mr. Manning to approve the modification to the C(P) Planned Commercial/CUD Conditional Use District to add the additional permitted uses of religious worship facility, restaurant, recreation/amusement indoor (conducted for profit) & barbering and hairdressing services/salons and find this recommendation to be consistent with the Southwest Cumberland Land Use Plan (2013) which calls for “heavy commercial” at this location, all of the requested additional uses are allowed within the C(P) Planned Commercial district which is classified as “heavy commercial” zoning and further find approval of this request is reasonable and in the public interest because the modification requested is in harmony with the surrounding zoning and existing land uses. Unanimous approval.

REZONING CASES

- B. P19-16.** REZONING OF 0.20+/- ACRE FROM R6A RESIDENTIAL TO C(P) PLANNED COMMERCIAL OR TO A MORE RESTRICTIVE ZONING DISTRICT, LOCATED AT 1100 HONEYCUTT ROAD; SUBMITTED BY MARK RECONNU ON BEHALF OF GINA’S PROPERTY HOLDINGS, LLC (OWNER) & TERRY C. FAIRCLOTH, PLS (AGENT).

In Case P19-16, the Planning and Inspections Staff recommends approval of the rezoning from R6A Residential to C(P) Planned Commercial and find: a) The approval is an amendment to the adopted current North Fayetteville Land Use Plan (2003) map; and that the Board of Commissioners should not require any additional request or application for amendment to said map for this request; b) The following change in conditions was considered in amending the zoning ordinance (zoning map) to meet the development needs of the community: the subject property meets most of the location criteria for “heavy commercial” as defined in the Land Use Policies Plan (2009), and will be recombined with the western adjacent property to provide sufficient area for pedestrian and vehicular movement, buffering and landscaping for a commercial development; c) And, this rezoning approval is reasonable and in the public interest because the district requested is in harmony with the adjacent existing land uses and zoning and approval of this request will allow the development of a currently vacant property.

In Case P19-16, Mrs. Epler made a motion, seconded by Mr. Manning to approval of the rezoning from R6A Residential to C(P) Planned Commercial and find: a) The approval is an amendment to the adopted current North Fayetteville Land Use Plan (2003) map; and that the Board of Commissioners should not require any additional request or application for amendment to said map for this request; b) The following change in conditions was considered in amending the zoning ordinance (zoning map) to meet the development needs of the community: the subject property meets most of the location criteria for “heavy commercial” as defined in the Land Use Policies Plan (2009), and will be recombined with the western adjacent property to provide sufficient area for pedestrian and vehicular movement, buffering and landscaping for a commercial development; c) And, this rezoning approval is reasonable and in the public interest because the district requested is in harmony with the adjacent existing land uses and zoning and approval of this request will allow the development of a currently vacant property. Unanimous approval.

- C. P19-17.** REZONING OF 3.33+/- ACRES FROM RR RURAL RESIDENTIAL TO C(P) PLANNED COMMERCIAL OR TO A MORE RESTRICTIVE ZONING DISTRICT, LOCATED AT 6585 ROCKFISH ROAD, SUBMITTED BY GERALD & BETTY HUNNICUTT ON BEHALF OF HUNNICUTT CORPORATION (OWNERS) AND MARK CANDLER ON BEHALF OF ALHOBISHI CONVENIENCE STORES & RENTALS (AGENT).

In Case P19-17, the Planning and Inspections Staff recommends approval of the rezoning from RR Rural Residential to C(P) Planned Commercial and find this recommendation to be consistent with the Southwest Cumberland Land Use Plan (2013) which calls for “heavy commercial” at this location, C(P) Planned Commercial is classified as a “heavy commercial” zoning district and further find approval of

the request is reasonable and in the public interest because the district requested is in harmony with surrounding zoning and existing land uses.

In Case P19-17, Mrs. Epler made a motion, seconded by Mr. Manning to approve the rezoning from RR Rural Residential to C(P) Planned Commercial and find this recommendation to be consistent with the Southwest Cumberland Land Use Plan (2013) which calls for “heavy commercial” at this location, C(P) Planned Commercial is classified as a “heavy commercial” zoning district and further find approval of the request is reasonable and in the public interest because the district requested is in harmony with surrounding zoning and existing land uses. Unanimous approval.

- D. **P19-20:** REZONING OF 1.25+/- ACRES FROM A1 AGRICULTURAL TO C(P) PLANNED COMMERCIAL OR TO A MORE RESTRICTIVE ZONING DISTRICT; LOCATED ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF NC HWY 13 (GOLDSBORO ROAD), EAST OF SR 1863 (PEMBROKE LANE); SUBMITTED BY MAMTA PATEL ON BEHALF OF EARTH PETROLEUM V, INC. (OWNER) & DENVER MCCULLOUGH (AGENT). (EASTOVER)

In Case P19-20, the Planning and Inspections Staff recommends approval of the rezoning from A1 Agricultural to C(P) Planned Commercial and find this recommendation to be consistent with the Eastover Land Use Plan (2018) which calls for “commercial” at this location, C(P) Planned Commercial is designated as a “commercial” district in the text of the plan and further find approval of the request is reasonable and in the public interest because the district requested is in harmony with surrounding zoning and existing land uses.

In Case P19-20, Mrs. Epler made a motion, seconded by Mr. Manning to approve the rezoning from A1 Agricultural to C(P) Planned Commercial and find this recommendation to be consistent with the Eastover Land Use Plan (2018) which calls for “commercial” at this location, C(P) Planned Commercial is designated as a “commercial” district in the text of the plan and further find approval of the request is reasonable and in the public interest because the district requested is in harmony with surrounding zoning and existing land uses. Unanimous approval.

VIII. PUBLIC HEARING CONTESTED ITEMS

REZONING CASES

- E. **P19-19:** REZONING OF 4.63+/- ACRES FROM A1 AGRICULTURAL TO R20 RESIDENTIAL OR TO A MORE RESTRICTIVE ZONING DISTRICT, LOCATED AT 3425 SOUTH RIVER SCHOOL ROAD; SUBMITTED BY PAMELA WILLIAMS (OWNER) & SCOTT BROWN, PE ON BEHALF OF 4D SITE SOLUTIONS, INC (AGENT).

Mr. Byrne presented the case information and photos.

In Case P19-19, the Planning and Inspections Staff recommends denial of the rezoning from A1 Agricultural to R20 Residential; however, staff does recommend rezoning from A1 Agricultural to R40 Residential and find that this recommendation is consistent with the 2030 Growth Vision Plan (2009) which calls for “rural areas” at this location, R40 Residential allows for the low density and larger lots desired within the “rural area” designation and further find approval of this recommendation of R40 Residential is reasonable and in the public interest because the district is more in harmony with existing lot sizes, land uses and surrounding zoning.

Note: The requested R20 Residential district is also consistent with the 2030 Growth Vision Plan (2009) designation of “rural areas”, however the R40 Residential district is more compatible with the lack of public sewer and existing lot sizes in the general area.

There were people present to speak in favor and in opposition.

Ben Stout spoke in favor. Mr. Stout stated that he realized some of the concerns were regarding the soils, he said he had a soil evaluation done and presented the Board with the results of the soil evaluation (exhibit A). Mr. Stout suggested that the Board look through the evaluation that was done. Mr. Stout said that the project would consist of nice homes with large lots, it is on County water and he spoke to the Eastover Sanitary District (ESD) about any concerns they might have and they are excited about development in that area. They are adding another tank to the area in anticipation of the growth they are expecting. The report shows that the soils are all class A soil.

Scott Brown spoke in favor. Mr. Brown stated that there is R20 in the general area and was aware of the recommendation for denial and staff's recommendation for R40. Public water is available. Not asking for anything out of the ordinary.

Mr. Crumpler asked Mr. Brown if there were going to be ditches.

Mr. Brown said there will be curb and gutter.

Mr. Crumpler asked where the water was going from the road.

Mr. Brown said they haven't designed it yet, but it would naturally drain to the rear.

Chair Morris reminded the Board that this case was a straight rezoning, it is not about what their plans are.

Mark Williams spoke in opposition. Mr. Williams stated that his property was south of the subject property. The property was previously owned by the Williams family. Mr. Williams said that there is not a Williams today that wants the subject property developed. The people that bought property on A1 land because they wanted to live a rural life are going to be cheated for tax dollars.

Danielle Lipford spoke in opposition. Ms. Lipford stated that she owns the turkey farm and said as livestock owners she and her family oppose the rezoning from anything other than A1 zoning.

Jodie Brown spoke in opposition. Ms. Brown stated that she and her husband purchased their home after a five-month search which is across from the subject property. Their search was not about a house it was about a quality of life and the shared values of the agricultural community.

Keith Jackson spoke in opposition. Mr. Jackson stated that he lived two parcels down from the subject property. Mr. Jackson said that for well over one hundred years families have farmed the land, lived on the land, and passed it down for generations. This area is one of the most rural areas of the County. The requested rezoning shows no concern for adjacent property owners.

Ben Stout spoke in rebuttal. Mr. Stout said that he understands the concerns, sounds like there is a lot of family history and he respects that. Ms. Williams was upset with the friction that this has caused. Mr. Stout said they want to do a nice development and want to do the right thing.

Public hearing closed.

Mr. Crumpler made a motion to approve R40 but Mr. Crumpler then withdrew the motion because there was more discussion.

Mrs. Epler said that Eastover water is there, we know how those small municipalities utilities work, if they don't get the density it won't support the system. That area is growing, more and more people don't want to be in a municipality, and they would rather be out in the County. This area has great school districts, it is a desired area. The property owner, regardless of their motives, deserves a return on their investment. Just like anyone else does. But also feels for the opponents who live in the area it's a hard decision.

Mr. Crumpler said that R40 would be the best that he would be willing to see, he doesn't think that the people who are going to buy have ever been around a turkey or chicken farm, or pesticides.

Mr. Manning said that if we rezone to R20 or R40, the applicant has said that is not cost effective for them, if we leave it like it is it's likely to come back at another R40.

Chair Morris said it wouldn't be back for a year.

Mr. Manning said this was a really tough decision.

Ms. Hall asked what the closest municipality to the area.

Chair Morris said Wade.

Mrs. Epler asked Mr. Stout if he could not live with R40.

Mr. Stout said they would be open to whatever suggestions were made as long as it's in line with the Land Use Plan.

Mrs. Epler directed a question to Mr. Hasty, Mrs. Epler believes the property is still owned by Mrs. Williams, if the property was rezoned is the application in such an order that rezoning to R40 will be legal.

Mr. Hasty said he could research that, but it could be pulled before going to the Board of Commissioners.

Mrs. Epler made a motion to follow staff recommendation and recommend R40 rezoning. The motion did not pass for lack of a second.

In Case P19-19, Chair Morris made a motion to deny the rezoning from A1 Agricultural to R20 Residential; seconded by Mrs. McLaughlin. Although the request is consistent with the 2030 Growth Vision Plan which calls for "Rural areas" at this location; and further find that denial of the rezoning is reasonable and in the public interest because the request of R20 Residential is not consistent with existing lot sizes and surrounding zoning. Unanimous approval.

- F. **P19-18.** REZONING OF 4.60+/- ACRES FROM A1 AGRICULTURAL TO C(P) PLANNED COMMERCIAL OR TO A MORE RESTRICTIVE ZONING DISTRICT; LOCATED ON THE NORTH SIDE OF SR 1832 (MURPHY ROAD), EAST OF SR 1833 (SANDEROSA ROAD); SUBMITTED BY CAROL LESLIE HUDSON, JILLIAN LESLIE POPE & NEILL FRANKLIN LESLIE JR. ON BEHALF OF NEILL F. LESLIE HEIRS (OWNER) AND JOHN & LINDA SANDERSON (AGENT). (EASTOVER)

Mr. Byrne presented the case information and photos.

In Case P19-18, the Planning and Inspections Staff recommends approval of the rezoning from A1 Agricultural to C(P) Planned Commercial and find: a)The approval is an amendment to the adopted current Eastover Land Use Plan (2018) map; and that the Board of Commissioners should not require any additional request or application for amendment to said map for this request; b) The following change in conditions was considered in amending the zoning ordinance (zoning map) to meet the development needs of the community: the subject property is only a small portion of a large parent tract that was designated as "rural density residential" due to its size and is located at an intersection primarily designated as "mixed use" which allows a mixture of commercial uses; c) And, this rezoning approval is reasonable and in the public interest because the district requested is in harmony with the adjacent existing land uses and surrounding zoning.

Public hearing opened.

Mr. John Sanderson spoke in favor. Mr. Sanderson stated that their plan is to have a new construction

office built; the entire company would be there. The back of the lot will be cleared, it will be presentable. We sell top soil, chip bricks, things for people's yards. The Eastover Overlay will fit what we need to do.

Mrs. Linda Sanderson spoke in favor. Mrs. Sanderson stated that Mr. Sanderson had the money to do what he needed to do with the property if approved.

Mr. Raymond Ashmore spoke in opposition. Mr. Ashmore stated his property abuts the subject property and his concerns were with dust, air and noise pollution, and traffic.

Mr. Sanderson spoke in rebuttal. Mr. Sanderson said that he has owned Sanderson Construction Company for twenty-seven years, they take a lot of pride in their company. Everything that they have done has been done with quality, value, and safety for the community.

Mr. Crumpler said to Mr. Sanderson that there was wooded area on Mr. Ashmore's property, so he didn't see any reason for him to have to clear that, with the separation between the properties he probably won't see a lot.

Mr. Sanderson said that they must do a twenty-foot buffer, that's what the County calls for.

In Case P19-18, Mr. Crumpler made a motion, seconded by Mr. Cain to approve the rezoning from A1 Agricultural to C(P) Planned Commercial and find: a) The approval is an amendment to the adopted current Eastover Land Use Plan (2018) map; and that the Board of Commissioners should not require any additional request or application for amendment to said map for this request; b) The following change in conditions was considered in amending the zoning ordinance (zoning map) to meet the development needs of the community: the subject property is only a small portion of a large parent tract that was designated as "rural density residential" due to its size and is located at an intersection primarily designated as "mixed use" which allows a mixture of commercial uses; c) And, this rezoning approval is reasonable and in the public interest because the district requested is in harmony with the adjacent existing land uses and surrounding zoning. The motion passed with Dr. Andrews voting in opposition.

- G. **P19-21.** REZONING OF 45.41+/- ACRES FROM A1 AGRICULTURAL TO C(P) PLANNED COMMERCIAL OR TO A MORE RESTRICTIVE ZONING DISTRICT, LOCATED AT 3974 PEMBROKE LANE; SUBMITTED BY MAMTA PATEL ON BEHALF OF EARTH PETROLEUM CORPORATION OF NORTH CAROLINA III, INC. (OWNER) & DENVER MCCULLOUGH (AGENT). (EASTOVER)

Mr. Byrne presented the case information and photos.

In Case P19-21, the Planning and Inspections Staff recommends approval of the rezoning from A1 Agricultural to C(P) Planned Commercial and find this recommendation to be consistent with the Eastover Land Use Plan (2018) which calls for "commercial" at this location, C(P) Planned commercial is designated as a "commercial" district in the text of the plan and further find approval of the request is reasonable and in the public interest because the district requested is in harmony with surrounding zoning and existing land uses.

Mr. Denver McCullough spoke in favor. Mr. McCullough said he is present representing Mr. Ricky Patel who is out of town. Mr. McCullough said that everything is in the beginning stages. Mr. Patel wants to put an RV site on the subject property there is water, but sewer is a problem, that's being investigated right now with Eastover and PWC.

Michael Cavanar we are in the early stages, we have a soil scientist out there right now and we are waiting on the results for that.

Mr. Bill Maxwell spoke in opposition. Mr. Maxwell stated that he was for progress, not completely sold on the idea but feels there need to be more plans.

Mr. Steven O'Connor spoke in opposition. Mr. O'Connor was present on behalf of the owners of the two parcels directly across the street from the subject property. Mr. O'Connor stated that his client sought a rezoning themselves and were pushed hard by Planning Staff to apply for C(P) / Conditional Zoning instead of C(P). It was suggested that C(P) would be denied otherwise that they must apply with conditions. So, they followed the suggestions of staff and was approved with conditions. Now the applicant is seeking to rezone agricultural land to C(P). His client doesn't have a problem with commercial zoning, they have an issue with C(P) zoning without conditions. They are concerned that zoning without the conditions, all the uses could be utilized. Some of the uses available would kill the value of his client's property the he has invested a lot of money into. They are asking that the applicants have a conditional use requirement.

Mr. Nisit Shah spoke in opposition. Mr. Shah said he and his partner have invested a significant amount of money in their property located directly across the street from the subject property they are asking that the applicants have the same guidelines applied to them that they had when they rezoned their property.

Mr. Rahul Anjaniya spoke in opposition. Mr. Arganey said he owns the property across the street from the subject property. Mr. Arganey said the same thing that the previous speakers said. Just wants to make sure the right business comes in.

Mr. Kim Nazarchzk spoke in opposition. Mr. Nazarchzk stated that this was the gateway to Eastover and would like to see it developed in an organized manner. They know that commercial is coming and have no objections to commercial but would like to see conditional zoning applied.

Mr. P. Singh Sandhu spoke in opposition. Mr. Sandhu stated that he had to have conditional zoning and feels the applicant should have the same thing imposed on him.

Mr. McCullough spoke in rebuttal and said that times change and feels that because one side has conditional zoning doesn't mean the other side has to. Yes, they may have spent a lot of money on their property, but they are going to make a lot of money. The sewer situation is not compatible, but it will have to be taken care of by Eastover and PWC, which is being investigated right now. Once that's done it will be suitable.

Public hearing closed.

Chair Morris asked what use restrictions and conditions were placed on this application.

Mrs. Epler said that the applicant is relegated to what they had planned. They had to present a site plan with uses, hours of operation, and number of employees.

Mr. Byrne said they had approval for a restaurant, hotel, convenience store, and signage for a billboard. Mr. Byrne explained why conditional zoning was not required.

Mr. Crumpler made a motion to deny the request.

Dr. Andrews asked for discussion.

Dr. Andrews said that her concern was that whatever they do wouldn't hold the petitioner to a similar threshold.

In Case P19-21, Mr. Crumpler made a motion, seconded by Mrs. Epler to deny the rezoning from A1 Agricultural to C(P) Planned Commercial, although the request is consistent with the Eastover Land Use Plan (2018) which calls for "commercial" at this location and C(P) Planned commercial is designated as a "commercial" district in the text of the plan and further find denial of the request is reasonable and in the public interest because the district requested would allow heavy commercial uses to be developed on a large tract that could place a burden on public utilities that are already at capacity. Unanimous approval.

IX. DISCUSSION

- Mr. Strickland thanked Mr. Manning for being at the Board of Commissioners meeting on Monday night, and thanked the Planning Board for their participation attending the meetings.
- Mr. Crumpler said that the Interlocal Agreement came back up in Eastover and it passed. Mr. Crumpler said that they didn't have much of a choice but to pass it. There was a meeting, and the same exact one was brought back to us to vote up or down on and it was indicated that there would be consequences with a down vote for the Town and when asked what the consequences were we were told they didn't know, but there would be some.

Chair Morris said that Linden was told that they would not have representation on the board if it wasn't approved.

Mrs. McLaughlin said that Spring Lake still has not approved theirs, she felt that they were bullied into signing it, but Spring Lake will be one of the last to look at it. The process and the way this have been put together is flawed, there's not much about the way this has been presented that is right.

Chair Morris said that according to the new Interlocal Agreement his term has expired, and Mr. Cain's term has expired. They would remain on the Board until replacements are found.

Mrs. Wheatley asked if they could send a request to the Commissioner's to ask if Chair Morris could be extended. Mrs. Wheatley went on to say that she doesn't understand why this has become so contentious, it should have been a simple document, we should have all been included. None of us are getting anything out of this, it's not a powerplay, we're workers, volunteer workers. We do a lot and take a lot off of the Commissioners' by making the decisions that we make and sending the best decisions that can go forward. From there, their job is made a little easier.

Chair Morris said the way the statutes are, as an appointed board member, until they appoint someone to replace us, we remain in place.

Dr. Andrews asked where we were in the hiring process for a new Director.

Chair Morris said they are waiting for the agreement to be signed.

Mrs. McLaughlin said that she hopes that the process for hiring a Director is a little more transparent than this whole Interlocal Agreement has been.

X. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:49 pm.