

**BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS**

JEFFREY B. JENNINGS  
Chairman  
SAMUEL K. SHAW  
Vice-Chairman  
J.C. ROUNDTREE  
MELVIN JERALDS  
CLAYTON D. RIGGS



RANDELL K. WOODRUFF  
County Manager

AVA MURGIA  
Clerk of the Board/  
Assistant to the Manager

**Camden County Board of Adjustment**  
Record of Proceedings  
January 6, 2003  
7:00 PM  
Senior Center Conference Room  
Courthouse Complex

Chairman Roger Lambertson called to order a meeting of the Camden County Board of Adjustment with the following members present: Roger Lambertson, Morris Kight, William McPherson, Robert Johnson and Emory Upton. Also present were Dave Parks, Permit Technician and Melissa Joines, Clerk to the Board.

Chairman Lambertson called for consideration of the agenda. Chairman Lambertson made a motion to accept the agenda as submitted. McPherson seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0.

Chairman Lambertson called for consideration of the December 2, 2002 minutes. Kight made a motion to approve the minutes as read. Upton seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0.

Chairman Lambertson called for comments from the public. Hearing none Chairman Lambertson continued with the agenda.

**New Business**

**Item #1 Conditional Use Permit Application (UDO 2002-12-15) from Kitty V. Sorey to install a Class B singlewide located at 158 Texas Road, Shiloh Township – attachments**

Eddie Fields was sworn in, representing Ms. Sorey, stated her home is falling down and a new singlewide would be placed on her property. Mr. Fields stated he was going to help Ms. Sorey in having her home torn down.

Chairman Lambertson called upon staff who recommended approval with conditions as stated in the Findings of Facts.

Kight questioned Mr. Fields about the elevation of the singlewide. Mr. Fields stated that the home would be above the flood elevation.

Hearing no comments from the public, Chairman Lambertson continued with the Findings of Facts.

1. Is the requested permit within its jurisdiction, according to the table of uses?
  - Lambertson made a motion that it is within jurisdiction.

- **Kight seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
2. Is the application complete?
- **McPherson made a motion that the application is complete.**
  - **Upton seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
3. Is the application a Nonconforming Use?
- **Lambertson made a motion the application is not a nonconforming use.**
  - **McPherson seconded the motion**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
4. Will the proposed use comply with all of the requirements of this ordinance?
- **McPherson made a motion that the proposal will comply with all requirements.**
  - **Johnson seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
- A. Will the use applied for meet all the requirements of the zoning district where it is proposed to be located?
- **Lambertson made a motion that the use will meet all requirements of the zoning district.**
  - **McPherson seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
- B. Will the proposed use meet all of the special requirements (if any) for that particular type of use?
- **McPherson made a motion that it will.**
  - **Kight seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
5. If the proposed use meets all requirements of the ordinance, is it appropriate for the area where it is intended to be located?
- **Lambertson made a motion that the use is appropriate for the area.**
  - **Johnson seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
- A. Does the evidence show that it will not endanger the public health or safety?
- **McPherson made a motion that the evidence shows that it will not endanger the public health or safety.**
  - **Upton seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
- B. Does the evidence show that it will not substantially injure the value of adjoining or abutting property?
- **Lambertson made a motion that the evidence shows that it will not injure the value of adjoining or abutting property.**
  - **McPherson seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**

- C. Does the evidence show that it will be in harmony with the particular neighborhood or area where it is proposed to go?
- **McPherson made a motion that the evidence shows that it will be in harmony with the area.**
  - **Kight seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
- D. Does the evidence show that it will be in general conformity with the County's adopted land use plan?
- **Lambertson made a motion that the evidence shows that it will be in conformity with the county's land use plan.**
  - **Johnson seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
- E. Does the evidence show that it will not exceed the County's ability to provide adequate public facilities, such as schools, fire protection, law enforcement coverage, water supply, sewage or drainage facilities?
- **McPherson made a motion that the evidence shows that it will not exceed the county's ability to provide adequate fire, water and rescue.**
  - **Lambertson seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
6. Chairman Lambertson called for consideration for approval or disapproval of the findings of facts:
- **McPherson made a motion to approve the Finding of Facts as submitted by staff.**
  - **Kight seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
7. Chairman Lambertson called for consideration for granting or denying the Conditional Use Permit for UDO 2002-12-15.
- **Chairman Lambertson made a motion to approve the Conditional Use Permit with conditions as recommended by staff.**
  - **Kight seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**

Chairman Lambertson stated that the board would vote on Item #2 & #3 together.

**Item #2 & #3 Conditional Use Permit Application (UDO 2002-05-16) & (UDO 2002-05-17) from E. Eugene English to install a Class B singlewide located at 479 Sandy Hook Road and 110 English Court, Shiloh Township – attachments**

Eugene English was sworn in and stated he wanted to put two singlewide trailers on his property.

Chairman Lambertson called upon staff. Staff stated Mr. English came in to apply for two conditional use permits but staff found there was an existing code enforcement action pending on his property. Mr. English has worked to clean up his property in the last 9 months, therefore the conditional use permits are now before the board.

Staff also informed the board of the new subdivision plat which Mr. English was

working on.

Hearing no comments from the public, Chairman Lambertson continued with the Findings of Facts.

1. Is the requested permit within its jurisdiction, according to the table of uses?
  - **Lambertson made a motion that it is within jurisdiction.**
  - **McPherson seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
  
2. Is the application complete?
  - **McPherson made a motion that the application is complete.**
  - **Johnson seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
  
3. Is the application a Nonconforming Use?
  - **Lambertson made a motion the application is not a nonconforming use.**
  - **Kight seconded the motion**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
  
4. Will the proposed use comply with all of the requirements of this ordinance?
  - **McPherson made a motion that the proposal will comply with all requirements.**
  - **Upton seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
  - A. Will the use applied for meet all the requirements of the zoning district where it is proposed to be located?
    - **Lambertson made a motion that the use will meet all requirements of the zoning district.**
    - **McPherson seconded the motion.**
    - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
  
  - B. Will the proposed use meet all of the special requirements (if any) for that particular type of use?
    - **McPherson made a motion that it will.**
    - **Kight seconded the motion.**
    - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
  
5. If the proposed use meets all requirements of the ordinance, is it appropriate for the area where it is intended to be located?
  - **Lambertson made a motion that the use is appropriate for the area.**
  - **Johnson seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
  - A. Does the evidence show that it will not endanger the public health or safety?
    - **McPherson made a motion that the evidence shows that it will not endanger the public health or safety.**
    - **Upton seconded the motion.**
    - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**

- B. Does the evidence show that it will not substantially injure the value of adjoining or abutting property?
- **Lambertson made a motion that the evidence shows that it will not injure the value of adjoining or abutting property.**
  - **Kight seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
- C. Does the evidence show that it will be in harmony with the particular neighborhood or area where it is proposed to go?
- **McPherson made a motion that the evidence shows that it will be in harmony with the area.**
  - **Lambertson seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
- D. Does the evidence show that it will be in general conformity with the County's adopted land use plan?
- **Lambertson made a motion that the evidence shows that it will be in conformity with the county's land use plan.**
  - **McPherson seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
- E. Does the evidence show that it will not exceed the County's ability to provide adequate public facilities, such as schools, fire protection, law enforcement coverage, water supply, sewage or drainage facilities?
- **McPherson made a motion that the evidence shows that it will not exceed the county's ability to provide adequate fire, water and rescue.**
  - **Kight seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
6. Chairman Lambertson called for consideration for approval or disapproval of the findings of facts:
- **Upton made a motion to approve the Finding of Facts as submitted by staff.**
  - **Kight seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
7. Chairman Lambertson called for consideration for granting or denying the Conditional Use Permit for UDO 2002-05-16.
- **Chairman Lambertson made a motion to approve the Conditional Use Permit with conditions as recommended by staff.**
  - **McPherson seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
8. Chairman Lambertson called for consideration for granting or denying the Conditional Use Permit for UDO 2002-05-17.
- **Chairman Lambertson made a motion to approve the Conditional Use Permit with conditions as recommended by staff adding #16 that a recombination plat must be recorded and verified by staff.**
  - **Kight seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**

**Items for Board members and staff**

Chairman Lambertson stated Mr. Robert Johnson was not re-appointed for a new term. Chairman Lambertson thanked Mr. Johnson for all his years of service on the board. Chairman Lambertson welcomed the new members which were present, Mr. Patrick Duckwall and Mr. Calvin Forbes.

**Information**

Board of Commissioners Minutes – Nov. 4, 2002 & Nov. 18, 2002  
Planning Board Minutes – December 18, 2002

**Consideration for date of next meeting – February 3, 2003**

The next meeting of the Camden County Board of Adjustment will be held on Monday, February 3, 2003.

**Adjournment**

Lambertson made a motion that the meeting of the Camden County Board of Adjustment be adjourned. Upton seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0. The meeting adjourned at 7:43 p.m.

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Melissa Joines, Clerk to the Board