

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

**MINUTES
BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
REGULAR MEETING
August 13, 2025**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Leon Meyers, Chair
Beth Bronson, Vice Chair
Jeff Scott, Member
Greg Niemiroski, Member
Kyle Myers, Alternate

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Nathan Robinson, Member
Holly Fraccaro, Alternate

APPLICANTS: David Cates

PUBLIC: James McHale
Tammy McHale

STAFF PRESENT: Cy Stober, Director, Planning and Inspections
Jack Moran, Planner I
Hathir Pfau, Permit Development Technician
James Bryan, Staff Attorney

AGENDA ITEM 1: CALL TO ORDER

Leon Meyers called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM

AGENDA ITEM 2: CONSIDERATION OF ADDITIONS TO AGENDA

Leon Meyers: I'll call the meeting to order. Any changes to the agenda?

Cy Stober: No.

AGENDA ITEM 4: PUBLIC CHARGE

AGENDA ITEM 5: Potential BOA Conflict of Interest Statement

Leon Meyers: Okay. I am going to read this, public charge. The Board of Adjustment pledges to the citizens of Orange County its respect, and the Board asks citizens to conduct themselves in a respectful, courteous manner, both with the Board and with fellow citizens. At any time, should any member of the Board or a citizen fail to observe the public charge, the, I'll ask the offending person to leave the meeting until that individual regains personal control. Should decorum fail to be restored, we'll recess the meeting until a genuine commitment to this public charge can be observed. The Board of Adjustment is a quasi-judicial administrative body established in accordance with the provisions of local regulations and State law to perform specified functions essential to the County's planning program. Action(s) taken by the board are based solely on competent, substantial, and material evidence presented during an advertised public hearing. As detailed within 2.12.2 of the UDO, the Board chair reserves the right to exclude evidence and testimony that is deemed incompetent, irrelevant material, or unduly repetitious and, therefore, fails to reasonably address the issues

1 before the Board of Adjustment. While there's no time limit on the presentation of evidence, the
2 Board asks that presentations be consistent with established policies, rules of procedure, and
3 acceptable levels of decorum to ensure a fair and equitable hearing for all parties. It is the duty of
4 every Board member to avoid both conflicts of interest and appearances of conflict. Board
5 members having any conflicts of interest or appearances of conflict with respect to matters before
6 the board should identify the conflict or appearance of conflict and refrain from undue participation
7 in the matter involved. As a reminder, General Statute 160(d)-109 establishes the following
8 standard: A member of any Board exercising quasi-judicial functions pursuant to this chapter shall
9 not participate in or vote on any quasi-judicial matter in a matter that would violate affected
10 persons, constitutional rights to an impartial decision maker. Impermissible violations of due
11 process include, but are not limited to, the following: A member having a fixed opinion prior to the
12 hearing on a matter that is not susceptible to change, undisclosed ex-parte communications, a
13 close familial business or other associational relationship with an affected person, or a financial
14 interest in the outcome at the matter at hand. Are there any Board members who need to declare
15 a conflict or an appearance of conflict on matters before the Board tonight?
16

17 Beth Bronson: No.

18
19 **AGENDA ITEM 3: APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

20
21 Leon Meyers: Thank you. Then, back to the top, we have minutes from the most recent meeting. Board
22 members, you have those in your package. Any questions, corrections? A motion to adopt the
23 minutes would be in order.
24

25 Greg Niemiroski: So moved.

26
27 Beth Bronson: Second.

28
29 Leon Meyers: Any discussion? All in favor, please say aye.
30

31 **MOTION** was made by Greg Niemiroski. Seconded by Beth Bronson.
32

33 **VOTE:** Unanimous. All in favor.
34

35 Leon Meyers: All right. The minutes are approved, and we will move to tonight's hearing. Do we have anybody
36 signed up to speak, apart from the applicant?
37

38 Cy Stober: No.
39

40 Leon Meyers: Okay. Then, for the case, let's see, we need to swear witnesses in? Good. Anybody here intends
41 to testify, please come forward, and be sworn.
42

43 Hathir Pfau: Do you swear and affirm that the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and
44 nothing by the truth, to the best of your knowledge?
45

46 Staff: I do.
47

48 Applicants: I do.
49

50 Leon Meyers: All right, then, staff, please present the case.

1
2 **AGENDA ITEM 6: CASE: A-4-25 - To review and hold a quasi-judicial hearing for a Variance request (Case**
3 **Number BA25-0002).**
4

5 **Request has been submitted by property owners Michael and Tammy McHale. The applicants**
6 **have applied for a Variance to allow for a 30' front building setback (a 10' reduction in the**
7 **required 40') from the Eno Cemetery Road right-of-way. The .47-acre site is located on**
8 **Orange County PIN 9857-65-5080, at 4310 Eno Cemetery Road, Cedar Grove NC, 27231, and**
9 **lies within the Cedar Grove Township of Orange County.**

10
11 Jack Moran: All right. Good evening, Board. I'll just skip ahead to Agenda Item 6, the variance request that is
12 before you tonight, Case No. BA25-0002. The applicant is David Cates, on behalf of the property
13 owners, James and Tammy McHale. Like I said, this is a variance request for an unaddressed
14 parcel off of Eno Cemetery Road, which as many of you may know is adjacent to Lake Orange.
15 This one is kind of unique to the other ones that you may be familiar with. It's a variance request
16 for the front setback, as opposed to the reservoir buffer, which I think is what the previous ones
17 have been for. So, moving into the UDO sections that are affected, 6.13.4 and 4.2.9 give us the
18 reservoir setbacks. There is a provision for an administrative reduction in those setbacks with
19 coordination with the County Engineer and Environmental Health. There are some restrictions for
20 septic size, limiting it to 20,000 square feet, and then the provision of a maximum of four
21 bedrooms. So, with those allowances met, staff determined a 75-foot reservoir setback would be
22 appropriate. And that was working with County Engineer and Environmental Health. With that
23 reduction, the applicant is still requesting a variance from the minimum required 40-foot front
24 setback to 30 feet. So, here are all of the properties around Lake Orange, the ones that are within
25 the septic setback and the reservoir setback there. As I'm sure you're familiar, there's a lot of
26 nonconforming structures out there. You've heard a lot of variances. This one is that orange
27 arrow, if you can see it, just at the tip of the peninsula there. It's kind of a unique lot, just in the
28 size. It's one of the smallest lots around Lake Orange. It's just point-four-seven acres in size. So,
29 even with the administrative reduction through the ordinance, and working with the County
30 Engineer and Environmental Health for that reduction in the reservoir setback for the septic and the
31 structure, the front setback would still come into play. Here is the site plan, which I will ask David
32 to come up and talk you through further the rationale behind the variance and what you're seeing
33 here on the site plan. If you have any questions about that part of the presentation? Otherwise, I'll
34 ask David to come up here.
35

36 Beth Bronson: Could you just clarify? You said two bedrooms are being requested, but four is permissible? Is
37 that what you said?
38

39 Jack Moran: Yes. So, the administrative reduction, four would be the maximum, two is what's proposed for this.
40

41 Leon Meyers: Any other questions, Board members?
42

43 Beth Bronson: This is an acquired lot adjacent to the other owned lot?
44

45 Jack Moran: Yes. They own both of them.
46

47 Beth Bronson: Thank you.
48

49 David Cates: Good evening. I don't know if it was stated, but this lot was originally created in 1976 as part of the
50 creation of all the lots around the lake; so, that's what allowed it to take advantage of the

1 administrative reduction as well as the other things that they mentioned about the number of
2 bedrooms and the septic size. When I was speaking with the planning staff the other day, I said,
3 "This is the worst lot in Lake Orange," and they said, "Well, the second worst." So, the other one is
4 pretty bad, I'll have to admit, but it's landlocked, or lake-locked, I guess you would say, and this
5 one does have road frontage. We also noticed, interestingly enough, the house that's directly
6 across the street, I probably should have included it, but it's actually within 31 feet of the right of
7 way. I don't know the provenance of how that house got there, but it's within the 40-foot. It must
8 have gotten some sort of variance or reduction at some point in time in the past, but this structure
9 will look very much in keeping with the house across the street. I don't know if you all had an aerial
10 image that we could pull up, but, if you all want to see that, we can show it to you. So, what I did
11 was I started laying out all the different setbacks, and since we're going to mainly be talking about
12 the front setback, that's this 40-foot setback right here. And then, in conjunction with that is the 20-
13 foot side setback on both sides. And then, when you overlay the adjacent properties' wells with
14 their 50-foot well setbacks, that's what this line is. And the well also has to be 50 feet from the
15 reservoir, so, that's what this line is. But here is the 75-foot administratively reduced reservoir
16 setback, and then here is the 100-foot sewer setback, and then in conjunction with that, you have
17 to have a 5-foot setback from the structure to the septic field, so, that reduces the septic
18 additionally. So, in reality, if you look at this dotted line and follow this around, that's really the only
19 buildable area. And this structure we're proposing, it's only 25 feet wide; so, that's if we're allowed
20 to get the 30-foot setback. It's only a 750-square-foot building. That's with the proposed setback,
21 so, it's not an unreasonable-size structure.

22
23 Leon Meyers: Questions, Board members?

24
25 Kyle Myers: So, can you just confirm that the yellow shape is the structure we're talking about?

26
27 David Cates: Yes, sir.

28
29 Kyle Myers: And it's not a garage, it's a dwelling?

30
31 David Cates: It's a garage with bedrooms.

32
33 Kyle Myers: Okay. Thank you.

34
35 Beth Bronson: It's a garage with a septic.

36
37 David Cates: Correct. A garage with bedrooms with septic, correct. Yes, it could be two bedrooms with a
38 garage.

39
40 Leon Meyers: Have you shown the well on the McHale's parcel? If there were a well on the adjacent parcel to
41 the south, that would have an impact on the septic field, but maybe that's not a problem. Do you
42 happen to know that?

43
44 David Cates: You're talking about this well setback here?

45
46 Leon Meyers: Well, that's the proposed well site, right? And I was just saying, if there were a well on the
47 adjacent property, you would have a similar kind of thing.

48
49 David Cates: That's correct. Yes. I think their well is further away than that.

50

1 Leon Meyers: Got you. Good. Okay.
2
3 Beth Bronson: Does anyone else have issues with the GIS website? No? Okay. That's all right.
4
5 Kyle Myers: Did you want them to show the overhead view? It was included in Jack's presentation.
6
7 David Cates: Yes. There it is. That's exactly what I was going to illustrate. That house that's directly across the
8 street is, again, I don't know how that happened, but it's almost identical.
9
10 Kyle Myers: Make that a little larger?
11
12 David Cates: Yes. That's a much larger building.
13
14 Kyle Myers: No, can you make that larger?
15
16 Beth Bronson: How can you zoom the picture in?
17
18 David Cates: I don't think, can I zoom in? It's a slide.
19
20 Leon Meyers: Might be easier to just go to GIS.
21
22 David Cates: Yes. I measured it at 31 feet.
23
24 Cy Stober: Where would you like to see?
25
26 Kyle Myers: Keep going. That's good. Thank you.
27
28 Leon Meyers: Board members, any other questions?
29
30 Beth Bronson: These parcels were purchased together with the adjacent property to the north, I would assume,
31 since the dock is on this one, as well?
32
33 David Cates: I know they own the adjacent parcel, but I don't know the order in which they were. You could
34 make the assumption that they were all purchased at the same time.
35
36 Beth Bronson: Certainly, and not that it has any bearing. I just wanted to make sure if there was an easement
37 before, or if there didn't need to be.
38
39 Leon Meyers: GIS thinks they were all bought at the same time.
40
41 Beth Bronson: Okay.
42
43 David Cates: Yes. We had discussions with planning staff trying to figure out other ways to provide water and
44 sewer, you know? But there was no good way to get it there. Everywhere we turned, we were
45 wedged out.
46
47 Kyle Myers: I do have another question. I'm sorry. So, is it correct to say that the new garage with bedrooms is
48 going to be, the septic is going to be 5 feet off of Eno Cemetery Road, and the building is going to
49 be approximately how far off the road?
50

1 David Cates: About 30 feet. We'll try to make it a little bit more because I've been involved where the last thing
2 you want to do is have to shave part of your building off, so, we typically try to have a little bit of
3 buffer, and not be right on the 30 foot, but it's similar to this house, actually. It's going to be
4 virtually identical to that except not that big.
5
6 Beth Bronson: And the driveway, it says TBD?
7
8 David Cates: Yes.
9
10 Beth Bronson: But my assumption would be that you wouldn't be able to put a driveway over this septic field, so,
11 you'd have to use the adjacent property driveway.
12
13 David Cates: The septic that we're showing is the potential septic field, but it doesn't have to be. We can use, we
14 have enough room to make a driveway through there.
15
16 Jeff Scott: For the septic field area, is there any concern about, or any kind of requirements for a repair area?
17
18 David Cates: Alan Klapp, who used to work for the county, was the septic designer, and he's taken all of that –
19 into consideration with his design.
20
21 Leon Meyers: You don't yet have a construction authorization, but you have a plan, right?
22
23 David Cates: That's correct, yes.
24
25 Leon Meyers: Got you.
26
27 David Cates: Yes. Alan has tested the soils, and we have a plan.
28
29 Leon Meyers: Right.
30
31 David Cates: We wanted to make sure that this was feasible before we went this far. Because it's so tight that
32 there were concerns at some point. Even with the reduction, would there be enough space of
33 septic? Obviously, the septic takes up the majority of the project area.
34
35 Kyle Myers: Okay. I do have another question, if that's okay. So, would it be that the opening of the garage
36 would be on the parcel, on the back of it, as shown in their diagram, or are we saying you'll pull into
37 it much like the house across the street?
38
39 David Cates: Much like the house across the street, yes.
40
41 Kyle Myers: Got you.
42
43 Tammy McHale: Like the house across the street.
44
45 Leon Meyers: Can I ask you folks to come forward?
46
47 David Cates: Yes. I need you to speak through me, or you have to get sworn in.
48
49 Leon Meyers: Yes. We're interested in your comments, for sure. I just want to be sure they get on the record.
50

1 David Cates: All right. So, it would actually not be similar to the one where they actually do have a garage. It's
2 hard to tell it, but the cars are pointed.
3
4 Kyle Myers: Yes. If you could just point.
5
6 David Cates: Yes. This is where the garage is. The cars pull in this way, and it would be just like that.
7
8 Kyle Myers: But there would be some sort of apron from Eno Cemetery Road, right where your hand is, into the
9 garage.
10
11 David Cates: Correct. Yes. Thank you for that clarity.
12
13 Leon Meyers: Any other questions?
14
15 Beth Bronson: I don't understand the apron being able to be on top of the septic field, I mean if this is the septic
16 area.
17
18 David Cates: The septic area we're showing is not the final septic. It's just showing where we can put septic.
19
20 Beth Bronson: Okay. Thank you.
21
22 Kyle Myers: I do have another question, then. So, what you're trying to show on the potential septic field is
23 directly related to the square footage size of the proposed building, and so, you were simply trying
24 to show that you more than meet that requirement, ultimately.
25
26 David Cates: Correct. We have enough septic to do the project.
27
28 Kyle Myers: Right.
29
30 Leon Meyers: All right. Other questions?
31
32 Beth Bronson: No other questions.
33
34 Leon Meyers: Good. Thank you, David. I think that's what we need.
35
36 David Cates: Okay. Thank you.
37
38 Beth Bronson: I do have one more question. I apologize. I just am not sure if it's relevant.
39
40 Leon Meyers: Well, you're welcome to ask the question, and just say I'm not sure it's relevant.
41
42 Beth Bronson: I am not sure if this is relevant, and I want it to be appropriate, but is there a reason that the
43 parcels were not combined if it's going to be the garage?
44
45 David Cates: Why they were not recombined. Because they chose that that's not the way they wanted to do it. I
46 don't know that there's a motive.
47
48 Beth Bronson: Hundred percent.
49

1 David Cates: Just, it happens, in this case, that they own both ones. I remember discussing it, but I don't
2 remember the exact reason.
3
4 Greg Niemiroski: I think the fact that they're existing as of the date they are, also would be affected.
5
6 David Cates: Yes.
7
8 Greg Niemiroski: If you recombine, it's now a new effective date, subject to all the current standards.
9
10 Beth Bronson: That makes total sense.
11
12 David Cates: That's a better answer.
13
14 Beth Bronson: All right.
15
16 David Cates: Thank you.
17
18 Leon Meyers: Okay, I believe that's it, then. All right. Board members, thoughts, or discussion, or motion?
19
20 Beth Bronson: You want to discuss how Lake Orange is problematic?
21
22 Jack Moran: We do have just one more thing. Well, first, thank you, Greg, for that explanation.
23
24 Greg Niemiroski: I hope it's correct.
25
26 Jack Moran: It is correct, thank you. Forgot to mention at the start the existing development part of the
27 administrative reduction. And then, as we move into the findings of facts, which you will then have
28 a motion to approve or deny, from Section 2.10 of the ordinance, findings of fact, which you can
29 also find in Attachment 5 of your packet, the four criteria for the variance you will review and then
30 make your vote on whether it's appropriate.
31
32 Kyle Myers: Can you just repeat what you just said, the last two sentences.
33
34 Jack Moran: Yes. Section 5 of your packet, you'll find the findings of fact. Within the findings of fact, there are
35 four criteria for the variance, and then you'll make a vote on the motion, whether you find that the
36 application has met them.
37
38 Leon Meyers: So, a first motion would be the findings listed on Page 68, is that right? James, help us here.
39
40 Beth Bronson: Yes.
41
42 James Bryan: Yes. So, this case is a little bit easier because you don't have competing facts, but the first thing
43 you would do is the findings of facts. Yes, but, so, those are just describing them. I don't think
44 those are actually facts.
45
46 Beth Bronson: They would be in the application. Maybe the next page.
47
48 James Bryan: So, where they have it, it just says application package, which is just very broad, the facts are as
49 you heard them today. If you wanted to do something contrary, you could say, call out something
50 that was not substantial evidence, something that was not material, or call out something that was

1 incompetent evidence, just to have a pristine record, but you don't have to do that. So, you could
2 just have a motion to, the findings of facts are as presented in the application and in the testimony
3 of staff and Mr. David Cates.
4

5 Leon Meyers: And there are some findings listed on Page 69. Are you saying those are not relevant?

6
7 James Bryan: So, the first part is the findings of facts, what you guys are considering. Consider the application
8 and everybody that spoke today. And then, the second one is the conclusions you have to make,
9 and those are the four, and you have to say yes or no to each of the four. And then, the final one
10 is to approve or deny based on whether they have met all four of them. I'm sorry if I got too far
11 from the mic on that.
12

13 Beth Bronson: So, the reference they attach, that is referencing Agreement 1, which indicates the interpretation,
14 Exhibit B. So, that would be Page 54. Yes, 54 and 55. So, they didn't do anything to create this
15 hardship, it is the geometry of the parcel, and this lot was created in 1976.
16

17 Leon Meyers: All of that stuff is referenced on Page 69. Right.

18
19 Beth Bronson: Yes.
20

21 Kyle Myers: Yes. So, the motion is to accept the findings, which are unnecessary hardship, which is Section
22 2.10.4.A, and that's shown in the package, and then, No. 2, or B is hardship results from conditions
23 that are peculiar to the property. The third one is hardships did not result from actions taken by the
24 applicant or property owner, and the fourth one is the requested variance is consistent with the
25 spirit, purpose, and intent of the ordinance.
26

27 Leon Meyers: But, James, what you're saying is that a motion to approve the findings would reference Page 69
28 and the application package and tonight's testimony. Did I understand that correctly?
29

30 James Bryan: You could do it that way. I'm sorry, there's a lot of ways to attack it, but I would suggest just, the
31 first motion should be about the findings of fact, and so, it would be what are you basing your
32 decision on, and that would be the application and the speakers. And you could just say that. You
33 could just say the application and the speakers. You don't have to identify them as staff and David
34 Cates, but you can if you want. And then vote on that. So, everybody agrees that's what we
35 heard, and that's what we're basing our decision on. And then, we'll have a discussion of, all right,
36 now, based on that, let's go through these four. Did they create this hardship on their own? Is it
37 necessary? You know.
38

39 Leon Meyers: And the second motion would confirm the Board's findings that the facts, which we've already
40 approved, satisfy the four conditions.
41

42 James Bryan: Yes.
43

44 Leon Meyers: Okay. So first, motion to approve the findings, as James has described them.
45

46 Beth Bronson: I mean, before I make a motion, I would just have that discussion of these four items. The
47 hardship did not result from actions taken by the applicant or the property owner. I think that is
48 correct. However, the one comment from the DAC committee that referenced the parent tract, and
49 because I can't pull the GIS up, I don't understand if that's actually relevant to this or if it is a
50 complete, like they're referencing if this tract were to be divided up.

1
2 Leon Meyers: Land disturbance thresholds are cumulative to the parent tract and will carry over to any and all
3 subdivided lots.
4
5 Beth Bronson: And does that mean should this lot be subdivided further, or was this lot subdivided, and there is a
6 parent tract? That would be my only question.
7
8 Cy Stober: Permission to address the Board.
9
10 Leon Meyers: Sorry. Go ahead.
11
12 Cy Stober: It's the latter, Mrs. Bronson. It's a standard note from our county engineer that is more of a, it's
13 less relevant because this property could not be subdivided because it would result in non-
14 conforming lots, but it is a standard note that the engineer places in his comments so that there is
15 awareness because there has not been awareness on other regulated subdivisions that
16 stormwater regulation is cumulative as a common plan of development to resulting lots and that it
17 must be regulated as such. And so, it's a best practice he's put into place as a precaution, and the
18 awareness for applicants. It is not relevant to this case.
19
20 Beth Bronson: And that's fine. I just wanted to make sure that it wasn't insinuating that this was a subdivided
21 tract.
22
23 Cy Stober: No. Your statement before is correct, that this parcel was created in 1976, and prior to this
24 ordinance having been adopted, as well the prior ordinance, for that matter, and as such, any
25 parent predates our ordinance regulation.
26
27 Beth Bronson: Okay. Thank you very much for that explanation. With that said, then, I would make a motion to
28 approve the findings of fact as laid out in Attachment 5 and the applicant testimony today and staff
29 testimony today, as well. Motion to approve.
30
31 Greg Niemiroski: Second.
32
33 Leon Meyers: Any discussion on the motion to approve the findings of fact? All in favor, please say aye.
34
35 **MOTION** was made by Beth Bronson. Seconded by Greg Niemiroski.
36
37 **VOTE:** Unanimous. All in favor.
38
39 Leon Meyers: None opposed? Then, a second motion would affirm that the Board has found that the application
40 meets the four criteria to issue a variance listed on Page 68. And that's unnecessary hardship
41 would result. The hardship results from conditions that are peculiar to the property. Hardship did
42 not result from actions taken by the applicant, and the variance is consistent with the spirit,
43 purpose, and intent of the ordinance.
44
45 Beth Bronson: I will make a motion that this application meets the findings of facts, is, this application meets the
46 requirements for the variance under the UDO Section 2.10.4 based on the findings of fact.
47
48 Kyle Myers: Second.
49
50 Leon Meyers: Any discussion on the compliance motion? All in favor, please say aye.

1 **MOTION** was made by Beth Bronson. Seconded by Kyle Myers.

2
3 **VOTE:** Unanimous. All in favor.

4
5 Leon Meyers: None opposed? Then, a final motion would approve the variance.

6
7 Beth Bronson: I'll make a motion to approve the variance.

8
9 Kyle Myers: Second.

10
11 Leon Meyers: Okay. Any discussion on the motion to approve the variance? All in favor, please say aye.

12
13 **MOTION** was made by Beth Bronson. Seconded by Kyle Myers.

14
15 **VOTE:** Unanimous. All in favor.

16
17 Leon Meyers: None opposed? Thank you, folks. Good luck with your project.

18
19 Beth Bronson: Thank you, guys.

20
21 Leon Meyers: Jack saw anything else that we need to take care of tonight? Any – Next meeting is next month,
22 right?

23
24 Cy Stober: We have no scheduled items for the September Board meeting. We will have the appeal of my
25 determination for the Union Grove Farm agri-tourism on October 8th at 7 p.m. in this room.

26
27 Leon Meyers: And no other items on that agenda that you know of?

28
29 Cy Stober: No. We have a special use permit major modification that has now requested to be scheduled for
30 our November meeting, which should be November 12th.

31
32 **AGENDA ITEM 7: ADJOURNMENT**

33
34 Leon Meyers: Okay. Good. Then, motion to adjourn would be in order.

35
36 Beth Bronson: Motion to adjourn.

37
38 Jeff Scott: Second.

39
40 **MOTION** was made by Beth Bronson. Seconded by Jeff Scott.

41
42 **VOTE:** Unanimous. All in favor.

43
44 Leon Meyers: Adjourned. Thank you, folks.

45
46 The meeting was adjourned at 7:36 p.m.

47
48
49  12 Nov 2025
50 **LEON MEYERS, CHAIR**