

**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**

September 9, 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: Roger Lambertson, Morris Kight, Clayton Riggs, William McPherson, Robert Johnson and Emory Upton. Also present were Dave Parks, Permit Technician. The following member was absent: Willie Gallop

Chairman Lambertson called for consideration of the agenda. Chairman Lambertson stated that items #1, 2, and 3 will be handled separately, items 4, 5, and 6 Conditional Use Permits for Trotman Road will be handled as one but voted on separately, and items 7 and 8 (Conditional Use Permits) for Wickham Road would be handled as one but voted on separately.

Chairman Lambertson called for consideration of the August 5, 2002 minutes. Johnson made a motion to approve the minutes as read. Kight 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 Code Enforcement Appeal (CEA 2002-07-04) from Clayton Homes on Building Code Enforcement Officer decision to require a porch be built on a modular (required in R-3 zone) – attachments**

Eddie Fields, representative for Clayton Homes was sworn in and stated that they usually take care of the permits for their customers and when he received the permit and called Ernie Swanner for an inspection that he was told he needed to put 3X3 landings at each openings. The landing were put in and when we called for the inspection he was told he was given a wrong permit because the zoning was wrong and that he was required to put a 6X9 covered porch in the corrected zone of R-3 and not GUD. Mr. Fields stated that he had no choice but to pursue with the appeal as the only way he would be able to the certificate of occupancy and to turn on the power so his customers could move in.

Chairman called upon staff for comments. David Parks, Permits Technician replied that the building permit was inadvertently zoned wrong as Mr. Ralph Sawyer rezoned

the property and it did not reflect the change on the zoning map. He also stated it was an honest mistake and that the porch should still be required.

After more discussion, Kight made a motion to table the appeal and requested that Mr. Ernie Swanner be present at the next meeting. McPherson seconded the motion. Motioned passed on a 5-0 vote to table the appeal with Lambertson, Upton, Johnson, Kight and McPherson voting aye.

---

**Item #2 Variance application (UDO 2002-08-04) from Kitty V. Sorey for a Variance on lot density requirements in the UDO Section 202.1.A located at 156 and 158 Texas Road**

Kitty Sorey applicant was sworn in and stated she need the variance to separate the two houses that existed on her lot so she could tear down the one she is living in and replace it with a single wide mobile home.

Chairman Lambertson called upon staff who recommended approval of the variance though you are correcting one nonconforming situation and creating another and approval of the variance would be the better of the two..

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

1. If the applicant complies strictly with provisions of the UDO, can the applicant make no reasonable use of their property.

**Without the variance the applicant will not be able to make reasonable use of the property. As it stands, there exists a violations of UDO Section 1204.4 for having two dwellings on one lot (tax card indicates houses have been there forever and probably nonconforming).**

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

**The applicant suffers the hardship as to comply with one violation of the ordinance (Section 1204.4), the applicant creates another (Section 202.1.a).**

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

**The hardship relates to the land and the inability to split the property as you are correcting one nonconforming situation with the two dwellings on one lot and creating another in not being able to meet the 40,000 square feet density requirements.**

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

**The hardship is unique and one not shared by surrounding**

**properties.**

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

**The hardship is not a result of the applicants 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.

**The variance will result in eliminating one nonconforming situation in two dwellings on one lot and creating another in not meeting density and dimensional requirements.**

Chairman Lambertson called for consideration of the variance. Johnson made a motion to approve the variance. Lambertson seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0. Vice-Chairman McPherson made a motion to approve the conditions recommended by staff and to approve the variance based on items 1-6 and item 7 conditions. Johnson seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0.

---

**Item #3 Conditional Use Permit Application (UDO 2002-07-55) from Heath M. Williams to install a Class B singlewide mobile home located at 297 Pudding Ridge Road, South Mills Township.**

Mr. Frank Williams was sworn in and spoke for his son who was present and requested a permit to put a singlewide mobile home on a lot for his son.

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

Staff was called upon to read the conditions as applicant did not receive a copy. After reading conditions, it was noted that condition #9 was incorrect and should read "The underpinning must be of all weather material."

Hearing no comments from 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.**
  - **Upton 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.**
  - **Kight 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.**
  - **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.**
  - **Johnson 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.**
  - **McPherson 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.**
  - **Kight 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.**
  - **Upton 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.**
  - **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.**
  - **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:
- **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 2002-07-55.
- **Lambertson made a motion to approve the Conditional Use Permit with conditions as recommended by staff.**
  - **Upton seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**

---

**Item #4 Conditional Use Permit Application (UDO 2002-08-12) from Walter and Vickie Christoffer to install a new Class A doublewide mobile home located at 488 Trotman Road, Shiloh Township.**

Vickie Christoffer was sworn in and requested permit to put a doublewide mobile on her property.

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

Chairman Lambertson opened the floor for public comment. Mr. James Innes representing Three of a Kind Inc. was sworn in and stated that the applicants for doublewides on Trotman Road should be honored as the contract was prior to August 5, 2002.

Hearing no more comment 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.**
  - **Johnson 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.**
  - **Kight 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.**
    - **Kight 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.**
    - **Upton 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.**

- **Kight 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.**
  - **Johnson 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.**
  - **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.**
  - **Upton 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.**
  - **Johnson 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 2002-08-12.
  - **Johnson 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.**

---

**Item #5 Conditional Use Permit Application (UDO 2002-08-10) from Robert Hope Chandler to install Class A doublewide mobile home located at 544 Trotman Road, Shiloh Township.**

Mr. Chandler was sworn in and requested a permit to install doublewide mobile home on his lot.

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

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.**
  - **Johnson 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.**
  - **Johnson 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.**
  - **Lambertson 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.**
- **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.**
- **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 2002-08-10.

- **Upton 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.**

---

Item #6 Conditional Use Permit Application (UDO 2002-08-11) from Robert Hope Chandler to install Class A doublewide mobile home located at 538 Trotman Road, Shiloh Township.

Mr. Chandler was sworn in and requested permit to install doublewide mobile home on his lots.

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

Hearing no comments from the public, Chairman Lambertson continued with both 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.**
  - **Johnson 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.**
  - **Johnson 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.**
  - **Lambertson 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.**
  - **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.**
  - **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 2002-08-11.
- **Kight 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.**

---

Chairman Lambertson called for a 5 minute recess.

Chairman Lambertson called the meeting back to order.

---

Item #7 Conditional Use Permit Application (UDO 2002-08-23) from Erica L. Walker to install a Class A doublewide mobile home located at 459 Wickham Road, Shiloh Township.

Erica Walker was sworn in and requested a permit to put a doublewide mobile home on her lot on Wickham Road.

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

Chairman Lambertson opened the floor for public comment. Mr. James Innes representing Three of a Kind Inc. stated that the lots in the subdivision were intended for doublewides and that they had contracts on all 5 lots. He also stated that the applicants wanted to live in Camden County.

Hearing no more comments from the public, Chairman 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.**
  - **Johnson 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.**
  - **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.**
  - **Kight 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.**
  - **Upton 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.**
  - **Lambertson 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.**
  - **Kight 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.**
  - **Upton 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.**
  - **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.**

- **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:
- **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 2002-08-23.
- **Upton 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 Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**

---

Item #8 Conditional Use Permit Application (UDO 2002-08-22) from Pamela L. Morgan to install Class A doublewide located at 443 Wickham Road, Shiloh Township.

Chairman Lambertson stated that the item would be tabled due to the fact that the applicant was not present.

---

### Information

Board of Commissioners Minutes – June 3, 2002  
Planning Board Minutes – August 21, 2002  
Letter to Innes & Innes from Dave Parks

---

### Consideration for date of next meeting – October 7, 2002

The next meeting of the Camden County Board of Adjustment will be held on Monday, October 7, 2002.

---

### Adjournment

Upton made a motion that the meeting of the Camden County Board of Adjustment be adjourned. Lambertson seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0. The meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

---

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
David Parks, Permit Technician