

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

CHAMPAIGN COUNTY ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

**1776 E. Washington Street
Urbana, IL 61801**

DATE: May 13, 2021

**PLACE: ZOOM MEETING
Shields-Carter Meeting Room
1776 East Washington Street
Urbana, IL 61802**

TIME: 6:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: *Using Zoom in Shields-Carter Meeting Room:* Ryan Elwell, Jim Randol
Remotely via Zoom: Tom Anderson, Marilyn Lee, Lee Roberts

MEMBERS ABSENT: Larry Wood

STAFF PRESENT: *Using Zoom in Putman Meeting Room:* Lori Busboom, Stephanie Berry,
John Hall

OTHERS PRESENT: *Remotely via Zoom:* Dennis Riggs, Scott Burge, Tim Mohr

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m.

2. Roll Call and Declaration of Quorum

The roll was called, and a quorum declared present.

Mr. Elwell informed the audience that anyone wishing to testify for any public hearing tonight must identify themselves on Zoom.

3. Correspondence - None

4. Approval of Minutes – None

5. Continued Public Hearings – None

6. New Public Hearings

Case 006-V-21

Petitioner: **Stephen Mechling**

This Variance case was withdrawn by the petitioner.

Case 007-V-21

Petitioner: **Roland Mohr, via agent Tim Mohr**

Request: **Authorize the following Variance on a lot in the AG-1 Agriculture Zoning District:**

Part A: Authorize the construction and use of four proposed grain bins with a setback of 40 feet from the centerline of CR 400N and a front yard of 20 feet in lieu of the minimum required setback of 55 feet and front yard of 25 feet, per Section 5.3 of the Zoning Ordinance.

1 **Part B: Authorize the construction and use of an existing grain bin with a setback of 36**
2 **feet from the centerline of CR 400N and a front yard of 16 feet in lieu of the minimum**
3 **required setback of 55 feet and front yard of 25 feet, per Section 5.3 of the Zoning**
4 **Ordinance.**

5 Location: **A 160-acre tract in the Southeast Corner of Section 8, Township 17 North, Range 10**
6 **East of the Third Principal Meridian in Raymond Township, and commonly known as**
7 **the farmland at the northwest corner of CR 400N and CR 2000E.**
8

9 Mr. Elwell informed the audience that anyone wishing to testify for any public hearing tonight must sign
10 the witness register for that public hearing. He reminded the audience that when they sign the witness
11 register, they are signing an oath.
12

13 Mr. Elwell informed the audience that this Case is an Administrative Case, and as such, the County allows
14 anyone the opportunity to cross-examine any witness. He said that at the proper time, he will ask for a
15 show of hands or a verbal indication from those who would like to cross-examine, and each person will
16 be called upon. He said that those who desire to cross-examine will be asked to clearly state their name
17 before asking any questions. He noted that no new testimony is to be given during the cross-examination.
18 He said that attorneys who have complied with Article 7.6 of the ZBA By-Laws are exempt from cross-
19 examination. He asked if the petitioner would like to outline the nature of their request prior to introducing
20 evidence.
21

22 Mr. Tim Mohr stated that Mr. Hall is more familiar with the details of adding bins to the existing bins on
23 the property. He stated that the request under Part B in the Preliminary Memorandum states that the bins
24 are currently on the property. He said that he and his family request approval to build additional bins to
25 the west that are in line with the existing bins. He stated that the township road setback seems to be okay;
26 the issue seems to be the County setback, which is why they are asking for approval.
27

28 Mr. Elwell asked if there were any questions from the Board.
29

30 Ms. Lee asked Mr. Mohr what the diameter of the proposed bins would be.
31

32 Mr. Mohr stated that the two bins they plan on building this summer are going to be 27 feet and 30 feet.
33

34 Ms. Lee asked Mr. Mohr the diameter of the other two proposed bins.
35

36 Mr. Mohr stated 30 feet and 36 feet. He said that they are not going to be built this summer.
37

38 Mr. Randol stated that one of the pictures from Attachment D, pages one and two in the Preliminary
39 Memorandum, shows the gravel driveway being partially done and a utility pole in the middle of the gravel
40 driveway. He said he knows that there were no objections from the Township. He asked Mr. Mohr if the
41 utility pole is going to be relocated.
42

43 Mr. Mohr stated that the utility pole is a part of the project. He said that the power company plans to bury
44 the power line underground and that the utility pole will be eliminated. He said that he wants everything
45 clean and safe where the bins will go. He stated that there will be no overhead power line where the new
46 bins will be located once the project is finished.
47

48 Ms. Burgstrom stated that P&Z Staff received a letter via e-mail Wednesday, May 12, 2021 from Mr.
49 Mohr that was forwarded from Hank Lewis, the Raymond Township Road Commissioner. She said that

1 Mr. Lewis had stated that there were no objections to the proposed setbacks of the proposed grain bin
2 construction, and that the setbacks allow for Mr. Mohr to place the grain bins in alignment with the two
3 existing grain bins on the property. She said this would be a new Document of Record.
4

5 Ms. Lee asked Mr. Mohr if the proposed grain bins would be rented out to somebody other than the
6 property owner.
7

8 Mr. Mohr stated no, that they would be for personal use only.
9

10 Mr. Elwell asked Mr. Mohr when the two existing grain bins were erected.
11

12 Mr. Mohr stated that he thought they were established sometime in the 70s. He stated they were there long
13 before he was.
14

15 Mr. Elwell asked if there were any other questions from the Board and staff. He asked if there was anyone
16 who wanted to cross-examine the witness. He asked Ms. Burgstrom if there was anyone via Zoom to let
17 him know.
18

19 Ms. Burgstrom asked Mr. Riggs if he would like to cross-examine the witness or if he had testimony that
20 he would like to talk about later after Mr. Mohr’s cross-examination.
21

22 Mr. Riggs stated that he was doing fine and was just listening in.
23

24 Mr. Elwell stated that he did not see anyone else seeking to cross-examine this witness. He asked if anyone
25 else would like to testify in Mr. Mohr’s case, and there was no one.
26

27 **Mr. Randol moved, seconded by Mr. Roberts, to accept the Preliminary Summary of Evidence and**
28 **Documents of Record and move forward to the Findings of Fact.**
29

30 Mr. Elwell requested a roll call vote.
31

32 The vote was called as follows:

33	Lee- yes	Randol- yes	Roberts- yes
34	Anderson- yes	Elwell- yes	Wood - absent

35
36 **The motion passed.**
37

38 Mr. Elwell stated that he would be reading the Findings of Fact from Attachment E, page nine of the
39 Preliminary Memorandum.
40

41 **FINDINGS OF FACT FOR CASE 007-V-21**
42

43 **From the documents of record and the testimony and exhibits received at the public hearing for**
44 **zoning case 007-V-21 held on May 13, 2021, the Zoning Board of Appeals of Champaign County**
45 **finds that:**
46

- 47 **1. Special conditions and circumstances DO exist which are peculiar to the land or**
- 48 **structure involved, which are not applicable to other similarly situated land and**
- 49 **structures elsewhere in the same district.**

1 Mr. Randol said that the special conditions and circumstances DO exist which are peculiar to the land or
2 structure involved, which are not applicable to other similarly situated land and structures elsewhere in
3 the same district because: the two existing grain bins were installed before the zoning was in effect, and
4 there were no objections by Mr. Lewis, the Raymond Township Road Commissioner. He said that Mr.
5 Mohr just wants to add additional grain bins in alignment to the existing bins, so that it makes the lot area
6 more useable for the size of today’s equipment.

7
8 **2. Practical difficulties or hardships created by carrying out the strict letter of the**
9 **regulations sought to be varied WILL prevent reasonable or otherwise permitted use**
10 **of the land or structure or construction.**

11
12 Mr. Randol said that practical difficulties or hardships created by carrying out the strict letter of the
13 regulations sought to be varied WILL prevent reasonable or otherwise permitted use of the land or
14 structure or construction because: without the variance, there would be less room for equipment to get
15 around between the shed and the existing bins, and if Mr. Mohr and family had to move the new bins
16 further away from the road, it could make it impossible with the size of equipment now.

17
18 **3. The special conditions, circumstances, hardships, or practical difficulties DO NOT**
19 **result from actions of the applicant.**

20
21 Mr. Randol said that the special conditions, circumstances, hardships, or practical difficulties DO NOT
22 result from actions of the applicant because: the bins were put in prior to adoption of the Zoning
23 Ordinance; the proposed location is in an area where it would make it easier for farm machinery to work
24 adjacently; and it will not have any influence on visibility at the intersection.

25
26 **4. The requested variance IS in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the**
27 **Ordinance.**

28
29 Mr. Randol said that the requested variance IS in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the
30 Ordinance because: the location of the bins would allow the storing operation to work more efficiently.

31
32 **5. The requested variance WILL NOT be injurious to the neighborhood or otherwise**
33 **detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare.**

34
35 Mr. Randol said that the requested variance WILL NOT be injurious to the neighborhood or otherwise
36 detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare because: there have been no objections from the
37 Township, Fire Protection District, or any of the neighbors.

38
39 **6. The requested variance IS the minimum variation that will make possible the**
40 **reasonable use of the land/structure.**

41
42 Mr. Randol said that the requested variance IS the minimum variation that will make possible the
43 reasonable use of the land/structure.

44
45 **7. NO SPECIAL CONDITIONS ARE HEREBY IMPOSED.**

46
47 Mr. Elwell said that NO special conditions are hereby imposed.

48
49 Mr. Elwell stated that there are no other Documents of Record to add.

1 Mr. Elwell entertained a motion to adopt the Summary of Evidence, Documents of Record, and Findings
2 of Fact, as amended.

3
4 **Mr. Roberts moved, seconded by Mr. Anderson, to adopt the Summary of Evidence, Documents
5 of Record, and Findings of Fact, as amended.**

6
7 Mr. Elwell asked for a roll call vote.

8
9 The vote was called as follows:

10	Randol – yes	Roberts– yes	Anderson – yes
11	Lee – yes	Elwell- yes	Wood - absent

12
13 **The motion passed.**

14
15 Mr. Elwell told Mr. Mohr that the full board is not present. He said that that four affirmative votes are
16 required for approval of his case. He said that there are two options: they can continue with the case today
17 and vote today, or if Mr. Mohr chooses, they can postpone this case to a later date so that a full board is
18 present. He said to keep in mind that Mr. Mohr did receive all five affirmative votes for the Findings of
19 Fact. He asked Mr. Mohr if he would like to continue today with the case.

20
21 Mr. Mohr stated yes, that would be great.

22
23 Mr. Elwell entertained a motion to move to the Final Determination.

24
25 **Mr. Randol moved, seconded by Mr. Roberts, to move to the Final Determination.**

26
27 Mr. Elwell asked for a roll call vote.

28
29 The vote was called as follows:

30	Roberts – yes	Anderson – yes	Lee – yes
31	Randol– yes	Elwell – yes	Wood - absent

32
33 **The motion passed.**

34
35 Mr. Elwell stated he would be reading off page 10 of 10, Attachment E, of the Preliminary Memorandum.

36
37 **FINAL DETERMINATION FOR CASE 007-V-21**

38
39 **Mr. Randol moved, seconded by Ms. Lee, that the Champaign County Zoning Board of Appeals
40 finds that, based upon the application, testimony, and other evidence received in this case, that the
41 requirements for approval in Section 9.1.9.C HAVE been met, and pursuant to the authority
42 granted by Section 9.1.6.B of the Champaign County Zoning Ordinance, the Zoning Board of
43 Appeals of Champaign County determines that:**

44
45 **The Variance requested in Case 007-V-21 is hereby GRANTED to the petitioner, Roland Mohr,
46 via agent Tim Mohr, to authorize the following:**

47
48 **Part A: Authorize the construction and use of 4 proposed grain bins with a setback of 40
49 feet from the centerline of CR 400N and a front yard of 20 feet in lieu of the minimum**

1 required setback of 55 feet and front yard of 25 feet, per Section 5.3 of the Zoning Ordinance.

2
3 **Part B: Authorize the construction and use of an existing grain bin with a setback of 36 feet**
4 **from the centerline of CR 400N and a front yard of 16 feet in lieu of the minimum required**
5 **setback of 55 feet and front yard of 25 feet, per Section 5.3 of the Zoning Ordinance.**
6

7 Mr. Elwell asked for a roll call vote.

8
9 The vote was called as follows:

10 Anderson – yes	Lee – yes	Randol – yes
11 Roberts – yes	Elwell – yes	Wood - absent

12
13 **The motion passed.**
14

15 Mr. Elwell told Mr. Mohr that his case has been approved and is one step closer to getting the proposed
16 four new grain bins. He said that staff would reach out soon.
17

18
19 **Case 008-AT-21**

20 Petitioner: **Zoning Administrator**

21 Request: **Case 008-AT-21 Petitioner: Zoning Administrator Request to amend the Champaign**
22 **County Zoning Ordinance by amending the requirements for Section 5.2 by adding**
23 **“Agronomic Research and Training Facility” as a Special Use Permit in the AG-1**
24 **Agriculture and AG-2 Agriculture Zoning Districts as detailed in the full legal**
25 **description in attachment A of the memorandum.**

26 Location: **Unincorporated Champaign County**
27

28 Mr. Elwell informed the audience that anyone wishing to testify for any public hearing tonight must sign
29 the witness register for that public hearing. He reminded the audience that when they sign the witness
30 register, they are signing an oath.
31

32 Mr. Elwell asked the petitioner if he would like to make a statement regarding his request.
33

34 Mr. Hall, Zoning Administrator, stated that back in March 2021, P&Z Staff received an inquiry about a
35 private company wanting to do an innovation farm. He said that although Champaign County is full of
36 innovation farms, as in where seed research companies do seed research. He said this particular research
37 company does not want to do seed research, they want to research the effects of their fertilizer products
38 on their crops; but in addition to that research, they want to have a very large visitor training center. He
39 said it was originally proposed to have an occupancy of somewhere around 600 persons; now they’re
40 referring to it more as having a 400-person occupancy. He said that anyone familiar with county zoning
41 knows that we don’t allow large assembly uses like that out in the rural areas. He said in this case it makes
42 sense, they’re wanting to bring in people from all over the world to visit this research facility and find out
43 about their products. He said that in addition to the research and the visitor training facility, they also want
44 to have a digital hub, which is more or less a large office area full of computers where they reach out
45 around the world to help their clients utilize their products more effectively and also coordinate research
46 around the world. He said that it sounds like an interesting project, but there was no way for them to
47 authorize it in the Zoning Ordinance. He stated that in Champaign County, we have a lot of agriculture
48 research done on U of I property, but that it doesn’t have to comply with county zoning because it is State
49 property. He said that we need to amend the Ordinance and we came up with this “Agronomic Research

1 Training Facility” land use. He said we don’t really expect to see many of these, but we have a live
2 prospect in the fact they want to start as soon as possible. He stated that we reviewed this at ELUC, and
3 ELUC said to proceed. He said this is the simplest text amendment that he has ever seen; all we’re doing
4 is adding this use in the Table of Uses as a Special Use Permit in the AG-1 and AG-2 Districts. He stated
5 that we’re not proposing any special conditions like the Board has done with many event centers, and that
6 they are familiar with the kinds of issues that come along with uses with large groups of people. He said
7 there need to be large parking areas, an adequate septic system, and things like that. He said there is
8 nothing that we need to call out as a special condition, but if the Board sees differently, we can add those.
9 He stated that it is starting out as the simplest text amendment he has ever seen, and he hopes it can stay
10 that way, but we will see what happens. He said that is all he has right now.

11
12 Mr. Randol asked if this is for multiple fertilizer manufacturers or one particular company.

13
14 Mr. Hall stated that the one live prospect they have is one business; they are an international corporation,
15 so they have lots of subsidiaries. He said that nothing in this text amendment would limit it to that, as long
16 as it is a Special Use Permit; he doesn’t foresee that it would bring any concerns that we would need to
17 deal with at this point.

18
19 Ms. Lee asked where they plan to locate this.

20
21 Mr. Hall stated that with the text amendment, we are dealing with the theoretical Agronomic Research
22 Training Facility; once the text amendment is adopted, you’ll see the Special Use Permit for the one that
23 is proposed. He stated that for right now, it is in the AG-1 District and it is more than a mile and one-half
24 from any municipality; that is our prime zoning area, the area we are most concerned about. He said on
25 the other hand, this is a facility that is intended to support agriculture. He said from a zoning sense it is a
26 good thing, but it can’t simply be considered agriculture, so we do need to make this text amendment.

27
28 Ms. Lee stated on page five of 11 in the Preliminary Memorandum, it is talking about the traffic and that
29 it establishes to lessen and avoid congestion in the public streets. She said with having 400 to 600 people
30 come, she would think there’s going to be some traffic. She said she doesn’t think that the statement of
31 the proposed amendment is “not directly related” to this purpose; she thinks that’s sort of a little bit in
32 conflict.

33
34 Mr. Hall stated yes, there are traffic issues any time that you have that many people, and in this instance,
35 they’re already talking with the relevant highway jurisdiction about how to deal with that. He said he
36 thinks the intent of the information on pages four and five of 11 in the Preliminary Memorandum is that
37 in approving the Special Use Permit, this Board will deal with whatever traffic issues there are. He said
38 just like in any zoning case, if you disagree with that, we can discuss changes to make it more agreeable.

39
40 Mr. Anderson asked if the basic issue here is whether you can take prime farmland, build a bunch of
41 buildings on it, bring some people in, and justify the loss of this prime farmland.

42
43 Mr. Hall stated that most of the AG-1 is best prime farmland, so he would say it’s not simply the use of
44 best prime farmland, but what Ms. Lee mentioned, bringing all this traffic out on rural roads. He said all
45 these issues that come up in event centers are really at play here when we’re talking about this kind of a
46 research facility. He said an event center is not really intended to support agriculture, and this use is
47 intended to support agriculture by furthering the research of any company that happens to be at issue. He
48 said he wants to make sure they understand that this would only allow agronomic research and training
49 facilities, it won’t allow any kind of other training facility. He said in the case and instance that has been

1 proposed, they're looking at this as their flagship innovation farm; at this point, they're also intending to
2 have corporate board of directors' meetings at this location. He said that this is not going to open the AG-
3 1 District to corporate headquarters, it's only going to open it up for agronomic research and training
4 facilities. He stated he hopes this answers their questions.
5

6 Ms. Lee asked how large of a building they're planning to build.
7

8 Mr. Elwell asked Mr. Hall if this was for just the text amendment and not the specific case.
9

10 Mr. Hall stated if you can imagine a building big enough to house a 400-person assembly room with
11 associated corporate offices and the digital hub he referred to, it will be quite a large building. He said he
12 thinks the visitor area is probably no larger than many of the large pole barns being put up right now by
13 some of our more successful farmers; those are very large buildings and he thinks they are probably in
14 line with the size of this training hall.
15

16 Mr. Anderson stated he feels a certain obligation to protect the AG-1 land. He asked if the outfit that was
17 suggested to the staff could not find some land in the area that was not AG-1 and plan to build their
18 institution there.
19

20 Mr. Elwell asked Mr. Hall if this was outside the scope of this particular case.
21

22 Mr. Hall stated if the ZBA thinks that the AG-1 District should be protected from uses like this, you can
23 make that your recommendation. He said that his view is that the AG-1 District is there for farming and a
24 use like this is there to support farming. He said from his position as Zoning Administrator, he thinks that
25 telling them to go somewhere other than AG-1 certainly wouldn't be his role. He said it's not clear to him
26 that it would be necessary in order to achieve our own Land Resource Management Plan. He said he
27 doesn't see this use on best prime farmland in the AG-1 District being a problem. He stated that he is not
28 a farmer, he is not an agronomic researcher, but if he's going to buy 300 acres of land and then invest in
29 it with a training facility, he doesn't really want to be real close to a municipality, and so once you get out
30 past that mile and one half, it's going to be AG-1. He said his naive understanding of agriculture is that it
31 is the best place to do agronomic research. He said with the exception of the research plots on the U of I
32 campus next to the library, they're on urban land but they've been there forever.
33

34 Mr. Randol stated he lives in Scott Township and he said they have numerous seed research farms in Scott
35 and Colfax Townships. He said if they're going to do agriculture research, you need farmland to do that
36 on; fertilizer would be no different than seed corn, soybean, or wheat. He said they are going to have to
37 plant that crop to use the different fertilizers on the field to see the effects of it on crops. He said it's still
38 farming in his opinion.
39

40 Mr. Hall stated that the pure farming part of this, wherein they plant seed and they watch it grow, and then
41 they harvest the product for whatever purpose, that is agriculture. He said the only thing that isn't
42 agriculture is the training, wherein they bring in these large groups and the digital hub where they have
43 people working every day. He stated he doesn't want to focus too much on the actual proposal, but it's
44 the only agronomic training and research facility that he knows of, so he will talk a lot about it. He said
45 more than half of the building area would not be considered agriculture use, and that is why we need to
46 amend the Ordinance. He said that they could be out there right now planting their crops today if they
47 wanted to, because that is agriculture.
48

49 Mr. Elwell asked if there were any other questions from the Board.

1 **Mr. Roberts moved to proceed.**

2
3 Mr. Anderson asked of these laboratory research institutions scattered around, do they use graduate
4 students or faculty from the U of I to help with their program.

5
6 Mr. Hall stated that is a good question, he doesn't know. He said that he has seen some information
7 suggesting that proximity to the U of I and the U of I airport were two factors that were considered in this
8 location. He stated he thought if we did not have the U of I here in Champaign County, the county would
9 not have been seen as such an ideal location for this use. He said he has seen information suggesting that.

10
11 Mr. Anderson stated that this area is noted for the most outstanding agriculture soil in the world. He said
12 one of the duties of this Board is to protect that land, and he hasn't felt that tonight.

13
14 Mr. Hall stated that he wanted to point out that Section Four of the Land Resource Management Plan is
15 titled Agriculture. He said that this Land Resource Management Plan goal is to protect agriculture in the
16 county. He said one part of that is protecting our best prime farmland soils, but soils are only one part of
17 it. He said protecting agriculture and letting it thrive is the overarching goal. He said that in his opinion, a
18 use like this in the AG-1 District is completely copasetic with the Land Resource Management Plan.

19
20 Mr. Elwell stated he also sees this as not only potentially impacting Champaign County, but our global
21 community as well.

22
23 Mr. Elwell stated that it sounded like Mr. Roberts made a motion earlier and asked if he would repeat that.

24
25 **Mr. Roberts stated that he thought making a motion to proceed would be in order.**

26
27 Mr. Elwell stated he would love for Mr. Roberts to make that motion.

28
29 Mr. Hall stated he would like to interrupt and place an idea out there. He said that he knows that this seems
30 like a simple text amendment, and that time is of the essence. He said that if the Board wanted to sleep on
31 this for a day and come back on May 27, 2021, it would not slow it down. He said the Board wouldn't
32 risk the chance of waking up tomorrow and think "oh man, I forgot to ask that question." He stated that
33 it's the Board's call if they are ready to dispense of this tonight. He said if they would like to think about
34 it for a day, they have that ability since there is one more meeting in May. He said they could finish it at
35 that time, and they could get it to the June ELUC meeting. He stated again, if the Board is ready to
36 complete this tonight, that is their call.

37
38 **Mr. Randol moved, seconded by Ms. Lee, that they sleep on it until their next meeting and that way**
39 **what little discussion they've had tonight, there might be more questions that come to mind that can**
40 **be answered in a couple of weeks.**

41
42 Mr. Elwell asked Mr. Randol if the date is May 27, 2021 for the next meeting.

43
44 Mr. Randol stated yes.

45
46 Mr. Elwell asked Ms. Lee if she was okay with that.

47
48 Ms. Lee stated yes, she was okay with that.

49

1 Mr. Randol stated that Mr. Roberts still has motion on the floor.

2

3 Mr. Elwell stated he never received a second on that motion.

4

5 Mr. Randol stated okay, and withdrew his motion.

6

7 Mr. Elwell requested a roll call vote.

8

9 The vote was called as follows:

10	Anderson- yes	Lee- yes	Randol- yes
11	Roberts- yes	Elwell- no	Wood - absent

12

13 **The motion passed.**

14

15 **7. Staff Report**

16

17 Mr. Hall said for those not in the Shields-Carter meeting room, there is a new person on staff today,
18 Stephanie Berry; she is our new Zoning Technician. He said Lori is helping train her, Stephanie is here
19 tonight observing and sometime soon, Stephanie will be doing minutes for the meetings.

20

21 **8. Other Business**

22

23 **A. Review of Docket**

24

25 No one reported absences. Mr. Wood had said previously that he would be absent for the May meetings.

26

27 **9. Audience participation with respect to matters other than cases pending before the Board**

28

29 None

30

31 **10. Adjournment**

32

33 Mr. Elwell entertained a motion to adjourn the meeting.

34

35 **Mr. Roberts moved, seconded by Ms. Lee, to adjourn the meeting.**

36

37 Mr. Elwell requested a roll call vote.

38

39 The vote was called as follows:

40	Lee- yes	Randol- yes	Roberts – yes
41	Anderson- yes	Elwell - no	Wood - absent

42

43 Mr. Elwell said the motion carried.

44

45 The meeting adjourned at 7:16 p.m.

46

47 Respectfully submitted,

48

49 Secretary of Zoning Board of Appeals