

**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**

June 3, 2002, 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: William McPherson, Robert Johnson, Roger Lambertson, and Willie Gallop, Morris Kight, and Emory Upton. Also present were Dave Parks, Permit Technician and Melissa Gray, Clerk to the Board. The following member was absent: Clayton Riggs

Chairman Lambertson called for consideration of the agenda. Chairman Lambertson stated that item #6 would be deleted from the agenda.

Chairman Lambertson called for consideration of the May 6, 2002 minutes. McPherson made a motion to approve the minutes as read. Johnson 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 (UDO2002-05-25) from Rodney Needham to build a family care home located at 918A Sandy Hook Road, Shiloh Township - attachments**

Chairman Lambertson stated that he will excuse himself from the voting and Ms. Upton will be a voting member on this item.

Rodney Needham, of 916 Sandy Hook Road, was sworn in and stated that this was the second time he had been before the board because his first conditional use permit had expired but that he had been working on the permits with the state for the home. Mr. Needham also stated that the name would be changed from family care home to adult care home.

Vice Chairman Kight called upon staff, who reviewed the application, findings of fact, and the staff recommendation.

Hearing no more comments from the applicants, Vice Chairman Kight continued with the findings of facts.

1. Is the requested permit within its jurisdiction, according to the table of uses?
  - **Kight made a motion that it is within jurisdiction.**
  - **Upton seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Gallop, Upton, McPherson, Kight and Johnson voting aye.**
  
2. Is the application complete?
  - **McPherson made a motion that the application is complete.**
  - **Gallop seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Gallop, Upton, McPherson, Kight and Johnson voting aye.**
  
3. Is the application a Nonconforming Use?
  - **Kight made a motion the application is not a nonconforming use.**
  - **McPherson seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Gallop, Upton, McPherson, Kight 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 Gallop, Upton, McPherson, Kight 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?
    - **Kight made a motion that the use will meet all requirements of the zoning district.**
    - **Gallop seconded the motion.**
    - **The motion passed 5-0 with Gallop, Upton, McPherson, Kight 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 Gallop, Upton, McPherson, Kight 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?
  - **Kight made a motion that the use is appropriate for the area.**
  - **McPherson seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Gallop, Upton, McPherson, Kight 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.**

- **Johnson seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Gallop, Upton, McPherson, Kight and Johnson voting aye.**
- B. Does the evidence show that it will not substantially injure the value of adjoining or abutting property?
- **Kight 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 Gallop, Upton, McPherson, Kight 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 Gallop, Upton, McPherson, Kight and Johnson voting aye.**
- D. Does the evidence show that it will be in general conformity with the County's adopted land use plan?
- **Kight 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 Gallop, Upton, McPherson, Kight 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.**
  - **Gallop seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Gallop, Upton, McPherson, Kight and Johnson voting aye.**
6. Vice Chairman Kight 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.**
  - **Gallop seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Gallop, Upton, McPherson, Kight and Johnson voting aye.**
7. Vice Chairman Kight called for consideration for granting or denying the Conditional Use Permit for UDO 2002-05-25:
- **McPherson made a motion to approve the Conditional Use Permit with conditions as recommended by staff.**
  - **Gallop seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Gallop, Upton, McPherson, Kight and**

## Johnson voting aye.

Vice Chairman Kight then turned the meeting back over to Chairman Lambertson.

---

### Item #2 Conditional Use Permit Application (UDO 2002-04-38) from Bettie Ann Smithson to install a new Class A doublewide located at 226 Lilly Road, South Mills Township – attachments

Chairman Lambertson called for a motion to open the public hearing. McPherson made a motion to open the public hearing. Johnson seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0.

Bettie Ann Smithson of 214 Lilly Road was sworn in and stated that her father had given her land to put a new doublewide on for her to live in.

Chairman Lambertson called upon staff, who reviewed the application, findings of fact, and the staff recommendation.

Hearing no more comments from the applicant or the public, Chairman Lambertson called for a motion to close the public hearing. Gallop made a motion to close the public hearing. McPherson seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0.

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

- **Lambertson made a motion that the evidence shows that it will not exceed the county's ability to provide adequate fire, water and rescue.**
- **McPherson seconded the motion.**
- **The motion passed 5-0 with Gallop, Lambertson, McPherson, Kight 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 Gallop, Lambertson, McPherson, Kight and Johnson voting aye.**

7. Chairman Lambertson called for consideration for granting or denying the Conditional Use Permit for UDO 2002-04-38:

- **Gallop 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 Gallop, Lambertson, McPherson, Kight and Johnson voting aye.**

---

**Item #3 Conditional Use Permit Application (UDO 2002-05-19) from Deborah Pettus to install a new Class A doublewide located at 138 Beech Neck Road, Shiloh Township – attachments**

Chairman Lambertson called for a motion to open the public hearing. McPherson made a motion to open the public hearing. Kight seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0.

Deborah Pettus of 200 Pond Road was sworn in and stated that she had purchased a mobile home from Oakwood Homes to install at 138 Beech Neck Road.

Chairman Lambertson stated that the septic tank permit, which the board had received at the meeting, would be added into the packet for this item.

Chairman Lambertson called upon staff, who reviewed the application, findings of fact, and the staff recommendation.

Hearing no more comments from the applicant or the public, Chairman Lambertson continued with the findings of fact.

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 Gallop, Lambertson, McPherson, Kight**

**and Johnson voting aye.**

2. Is the application complete?
  - **Lambertson made a motion that the application is complete.**
  - **Gallop seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Gallop, Lambertson, McPherson, Kight 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 Gallop, Lambertson, McPherson, Kight and Johnson voting aye.**
  
4. Will the proposed use comply with all of the requirements of this ordinance?
  - **Lambertson made a motion that the proposal will comply with all requirements.**
  - **Kight seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Gallop, Lambertson, McPherson, Kight 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.**
    - **Gallop seconded the motion.**
    - **The motion passed 5-0 with Gallop, Lambertson, McPherson, Kight and Johnson voting aye.**
  
  - B. Will the proposed use meet all of the special requirements (if any) for that particular type of use?
    - **Lambertson made a motion that it will.**
    - **Kight seconded the motion.**
    - **The motion passed 5-0 with Gallop, Lambertson, McPherson, Kight 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.**
  - **McPherson seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Gallop, Lambertson, McPherson, Kight and Johnson voting aye.**
  - A. Does the evidence show that it will not endanger the public health or safety?
    - **Lambertson made a motion that the evidence shows that it will not endanger the public health or safety.**
    - **Kight seconded the motion.**
    - **The motion passed 5-0 with Gallop, Lambertson, McPherson, Kight 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 Gallop, Lambertson, McPherson, Kight 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?
- **Lambertson 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 Gallop, Lambertson, McPherson, Kight 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.**
  - **Gallop seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Gallop, Lambertson, McPherson, Kight 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?
- **Lambertson 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 Gallop, Lambertson, McPherson, Kight 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 Gallop, Lambertson, McPherson, Kight and Johnson voting aye.**
7. Chairman Lambertson called for consideration for granting or denying the Conditional Use Permit for UDO 2002-05-19:
- **McPherson made a motion to approve the Conditional Use Permit with conditions as recommended by staff.**
  - **Johnson seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Gallop, Lambertson, McPherson, Kight and Johnson voting aye.**
-



**Item #4 Variance Application (UDO 2002-04-21) from George & Gail Byberg, to submit Conditional Use Permit application without all required approval from adjacent property owners located at 295 North 343, Courthouse Township – attachments**

Chairman Lambertson called for a motion to open the public hearing. Gallop made a motion to open the public hearing. Kight seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0.

George & Gail Byberg of 295 North 343 were sworn in and stated they were applying for a variance

Melvin Jerals of 293 North 343 was sworn in and stated that he owned the property all around the Byberg property and was opposed to the temporary medical trailer.

Penny Leary of 289 North 343 was sworn in and stated she was opposed to the variance.

Gail Byberg stated that the reason for the variance was to be able to put a temporary trailer on her property for her mother. Ms. Byberg said that her mother could not stay in her home due to the fact that she smoked and Ms. Byberg's son could not be around the smoke.

Mr. Bartlett, of 291 North 343, stated he was opposed to the temporary trailer.

Hearing no more comments from the applicant's or the public, Chairman Lambertson made a motion to close the public hearing. McPherson seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0.

**1. If the applicant's comply strictly with provisions of the UDO, can the applicant's make no reasonable use of their property.**

Applicant Response: No. The use of the property will be temporary until the medical care is no longer required. My mother can't stay in the house with my family due to her smoking, as I have a handicapped child that I do not want to be around anything that could endanger his health. The cost of converting my garage will far exceed the cost of a trailer. With the trailer I could sell it once the medical care is no longer required.

Staff Response: Without the variance the applicant may still make reasonable use of the property as a single family residence.

**Board Response: McPherson made a motion that without the variance the applicant may still make reasonable use of the property as a single family residence. Johnson seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0.**

**2. The hardship of which the applicant complains is one suffered by the applicant rather than by neighbors or the general public.**

Applicant Response: The applicant suffers the hardship.

Staff Response: The alleged hardship under Section 1303(10.4.f) applies to all applicants for this form of Conditional Use Permit.

**Board Response: Lambertson made a motion that the hardship under Section 1303(10.4.f) is suffered by all applicants but not suffered by neighbors or the public. Gallop seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0.**

**3. The hardship relates to the applicant's land, rather than personal circumstances.**

Applicant Response: It relates to the land and personal circumstances as in order to provide the health care for my mother and try to keep a smoke free environment for my handicapped child, the temporary trailer is the only solution as my mother can not afford any other health care options.

Staff Response: The hardship relates to the inability to obtain the necessary approvals from adjacent property owners and not the land.

**Board Response: McPherson made a motion that the hardship relates to the applicant rather than the land. Gallop seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0.**

**4. The hardship is unique, or nearly so, rather than one shared by many surrounding properties.**

Applicant Response: The hardship is unique as I love my mother very much and want to provide for her and without approval of this variance my family will suffer the hardship.

Staff Response: The hardship is unique since there is only one adjacent property owner (actually two, son handles his mother's affairs) within 150 feet and so just one person can effectively stop the proposed development. However, since the law requires 100% approval of adjacent property owners within 150 feet, so any single property within 150 feet of any applicant would be affected in the same manner.

**Board Response: Lambertson made a motion that the hardship is unique as there is only one property owner within 150 feet. Johnson seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0.**

**5. The hardship is not the result of the applicant's own actions.**

Applicant Response: No.

Staff Response: The hardship is not a result of the applicants own actions.

**Board Response: Lambertson made a motion that the hardship is not a result of the applicant's own actions.**

**6. The Variance will neither result in the extension of a nonconforming situation in violation of Article 14 nor authorize the initiation of a nonconforming use of land.**

Applicant Response: None

Staff Response: The variance will not result in the extension of a nonconforming situation in violation of Article 14 or authorized the initiation of a nonconforming use of land.

**Board Response: McPherson made a motion that the variance will not result in the extension of a nonconforming situation in violation of Article 14 or authorize the initiation of a nonconforming use of land.**

Chairman Lambertson called for a motion to grant or deny the variance application. McPherson made a motion to accept the recommendation of staff as the application does not comply with the UDO. Kight seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-1 with McPherson, Lambertson, Kight and Johnson voting yes and Gallop voting no.

install a new Class A doublewide located at 506 Trotman Road, Shiloh Township – attachments

Chairman Lambertson called for a motion to open the public hearing. McPherson made a motion to open the public hearing. Gallop seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0.

Danny Brothers of Luv Homes was sworn in as agent for the applicant. Mr. Brothers stated that he had sold the Gibbs' a mobile home from Luv Homes and they wished to installed it on Lot 7 Timberland Estates on Trotman Road.

Chairman Lambertson called upon staff, who reviewed the application, findings of fact, and the staff recommendation.

Hearing no more comments from the applicant or the public, Chairman Lambertson continued with the findings of fact.

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 Gallop, Lambertson, McPherson, Kight and Johnson voting aye.**
  
2. Is the application complete?
  - **Lambertson made a motion that the application is not complete that the application needed an agency agreement letter.**
  - **McPherson seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Gallop, Lambertson, McPherson, Kight and Johnson voting aye.**
  
3. Is the application a Nonconforming Use?
  - **Lambertson made a motion the application is not a nonconforming use.**
  - **Gallop seconded the motion**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Gallop, Lambertson, McPherson, Kight and Johnson voting aye.**
  
4. Will the proposed use comply with all of the requirements of this ordinance?
  - **Lambertson made a motion that the proposal will comply with all requirements.**
  - **Kight seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Gallop, Lambertson, McPherson, Kight 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.**
  - **Gallop seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Gallop, Lambertson, McPherson, Kight and Johnson voting aye.**

- B. Will the proposed use meet all of the special requirements (if any) for that particular type of use?
- **Lambertson made a motion that it will.**
  - **McPherson seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Gallop, Lambertson, McPherson, Kight 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.**
  - **Kight seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Gallop, Lambertson, McPherson, Kight and Johnson voting aye.**

- A. Does the evidence show that it will not endanger the public health or safety?
- **Lambertson made a motion that the evidence shows that it will not endanger the public health or safety.**
  - **Gallop seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Gallop, Lambertson, McPherson, Kight 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 Gallop, Lambertson, McPherson, Kight 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?
- **Lambertson 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 Gallop, Lambertson, McPherson, Kight 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 Gallop, Lambertson, McPherson, Kight 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?
- **Lambertson made a motion that the evidence shows that it will not exceed the county's ability to provide adequate fire, water and rescue.**

- **McPherson seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Gallop, Lambertson, McPherson, Kight 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 with the addition of an agency agreement.**
  - **Kight seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Gallop, Lambertson, McPherson, Kight and Johnson voting aye.**
7. Chairman Lambertson called for consideration for granting or denying the Conditional Use Permit for UDO 2002-05-24:
- **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 Gallop, Lambertson, McPherson, Kight and Johnson voting aye.**

---

**Information**

Board of Commissioners Minutes – March 18, 2002  
Planning Board Minutes – May 15, 2002

---

**Consideration for date of next meeting – July 1, 2002**

The next meeting of the Camden County Board of Adjustment will be held on Monday, July 1, 2002.

---

**Adjournment**

Chairman Lambertson made a motion that the meeting of the Camden County Board of Adjustment be adjourned. Gallop seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0. The meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

---

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman

ATTEST:

Melissa Gray, Clerk to the Board