

# MINUTES FOR THE SEMINOLE COUNTY BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT FEBRUARY 26, 2007 MEETING 6:00 P.M.

**Members Present:** Mike Hattaway, Chairman; Dan Bushrui, Tom O' Daniel, Wes Pennington and Alan Rozon

**Staff Present:** Kathy Fall, Principal Planner; Denny Gibbs, Senior Planner; Joy Williams, Planner; Kimberly Laucella, Assistant County Attorney; Patty Johnson, Staff Assistant

Mr. Hattaway, Chairman; called the meeting to order at 6:00 P.M. Mr. Hattaway then explained the method by which the meeting would be conducted, rules for voting and appealing decisions.

## **PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS**

1. **5420 Lake Avenue** – Garry Prickel, applicant; Request for a side yard (north) setback variance from 10 feet to 0 feet for an existing shed in A-1 (Agricultural District); Located on the east side of Lake Avenue approximately 500 feet south of Myrtle Street; (BV2007-04).  
Denny Gibbs, Senior Planner

Denny Gibbs introduced the location of the property and stated that the applicant received a notice of violation for construction of a shed without a building permit. She further stated that the shed was on the north side of the property and encroached approximately 10 feet into the required 10 feet side yard setback. She then stated that she looked at several aerials going back to the 1980's and found that there had been a shed in the current location since that time, although the current shed appeared larger than the previous sheds. She also stated that the applicant submitted pictures showing the construction of the original shed in 1987. She further stated that the applicant submitted letters of support from several neighbors including the neighbor directly to the south of the property and the other letters were from neighbors a block or more south on Lake Avenue. She lastly stated that there was no record of prior variances granted for the property.

Garry Prickel stated that he was asking for a side yard setback variance for a existing shed that had been build a long time ago, but was rebuild after a tornado destroyed it in 1998. He further stated that because of the

location of his well and not knowing about the setback requirements the shed was placed in its current location. He lastly stated that his water pump and water treatment system was located in the shed to protect them.

Dina Munasifi stated that she was an Attorney, representing Mr. Ken Snyder, the property owner located on the north side of the applicant's property. She further stated that the variance that Mr. Prickel was requesting adversely affected her client property, because of the location of the shed and when it rains the water runs off of the shed onto her client's property. She then stated that the reason for their opposition was that the variance request was not consistent with the Land Development Code and that the code states that the granting of the variance should not allow special privilege to the person asking for the variance, and that the applicant was asking for no setback. She then showed the Board pictures of water running off of Mr. Prickel's shed onto Mr. Snyder's property and stated that because the shed did not have a gutter it was causing a drainage problem on Mr. Snyder's property. She further stated that if the shed was moved back the water would not run off on to Mr. Snyder's property and that Mr. Prickel had ample room on his property to move the shed. She also stated that she realized Mr. Prickel provided letters of support from some of his neighbors but Mr. Snyder is the most affected. She lastly stated that she agreed with Staff that Mr. Prickel had not satisfied the criteria for granting a variance.

Mr. Snyder stated that his property was smaller than Mr. Prickel but because he had a mobile home on the property and it was destroyed by a hurricane he was allowed to build his home on the property. He then stated that the drainage on the property runs north to south and that there was a small swell on the property but the property has slow drainage. He further stated that Mr. Prickel's shed has concrete under it that comes over about 2 feet on to his property and the water from the shed comes over on his property.

Mr. Prickel stated that there was a ditch for drainage and Mr. Snyder filled it before he built his house causing a drainage problem. He further stated that about six months ago the County improved the road ditch and buried a pipe for drainage. He lastly stated that if Mr. Snyder put the swell back at a reasonable size it would solve the drainage problem.

**Mr. Pennington made a motion to approve the request with the condition that the applicant put an adequate gutter system on the shed.**

**Mr. Bushrui seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed by (3-2) vote. Mr. Hattaway and Mr. Rozon were in opposition.**

2. **3241 Night Breeze Lane** – Renee Hosein, applicant; Request for a rear yard setback variance from 30 feet to 18 feet for a proposed room addition in R-1AA (Single Family Dwelling District); Located on the west side of Night Breeze Lane approximately 1100 feet east of Old Lake Mary Road; (BV2007-09).  
Denny Gibbs, Senior Planner

Denny Gibbs introduced the location of the property and stated that the applicant requested approval to construct an addition that would encroach approximately 11 feet and 11 inches into the required 30 feet rear yard setback. She further stated that the property is within The Cove subdivision which was platted in 2000 and the existing 3,000 square foot house was built in 2003. She then stated that there were currently no code enforcement or building violations for the property. She lastly stated that there was no record of prior variances granted for the property.

Renee Hosein stated that she was requesting a variance to have an additional room with a bathroom in the rear of the property. She further stated that it would not extend over to the side of the house and would line up with the end of the house.

Ken Conrad stated that he was the adjacent neighbor to the west of the applicant. He further stated that the proposed addition would be in front of his backyard and that was the reason he was at the meeting. He then stated that he currently had a very nice view of the tree line but with the proposed addition that would go away. He lastly stated that when the time came for him to sell his house, the view from the back may be an issue for the buyer.

Kathleen Jaromin stated that she lived directly behind the applicant. She further stated that she was requesting that the variance not be granted, because it would bring the applicant's home to close to her backyard. She then stated that when they purchased their homes they were aware of the setback restrictions and hoped that others would adhere to them. She also stated that the character between the lot sizes and homes were very well balanced in the neighborhood. She further stated that while the addition would be better for Renee, adding additional square footage, but more house and more roof would be an eyesore.

Renee Hosein stated that Ken's house was to the right of her property and she is planning to completely fence in the property and he would not be able to see in her property and she would not be able to see in his property. She further stated that she was asking for the structure to come

out inline with the existing house. She then stated that there was a lot of space between each property and that other neighbors had applied for variances and received approval.

Mr. Bushrui asked if she had a mandatory Homeowner's Association, and did she ask for approval.

Renee Hosein stated yes they have a mandatory Homeowner's Association and she had not submitted the paperwork, because she wanted to ask for the variance first.

**Mr. Rozon made a motion to deny the request.**

**Mr. O' Daniel seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed by (4-1) vote. Mr. Bushrui was in opposition.**

3. **350 Lake Markham Road** – Joseph Castello, applicant; Request for a front yard setback variance from 50 feet to 22.60 feet for a proposed addition in A-1 (Agricultural District); Located on the east side of Lake Markham Road approximately 1600 feet south of SR 46; (BV2007-011).  
Denny Gibbs, Senior Planner

Denny Gibbs introduced the location of the property and stated that the applicant proposed to construct an addition on the south side of the existing house which would encroach 27.4 feet into the required 50 feet front yard setback. She further stated that the addition would extend along the front line of the existing house which was build in 1960 and at that time the front yard setback was 25 feet. She then stated that in 2004, the applicant was granted a variance for a front yard setback for another addition. She lastly stated that there were currently no code enforcement or building violations for the property.

Joseph Castello stated that the existing room in question was at one time a garage. He further stated that it is now a bedroom that he would like to remodel to improve the house. He then stated that at the time the house was build the setback was 25 feet and is now 50 feet.

**Mr. Rozon made a motion to approve the request.**

**Mr. Bushrui seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed by unanimous consent (5-0).**

4. **752 Cross Bow Lane** – Aluminum & More, applicant; Request for a rear yard setback variance from 30 feet to 17 feet for a proposed screen room

addition in R-1A (Single Family Dwelling District); Located on the north side of Cross Bow Lane approximately 580 feet east of Bedford Road; (BV2007-01).

Joy Williams, Planner

Joy Williams introduced the location of the property and stated that the applicant proposed to construct an approximately 238 square feet screen room over the existing concrete patio. She further stated that the proposed screen room would encroach 13 feet into the required 30 feet rear yard setback. She then stated that the applicant had submitted a letter of approval from the Woodbine Homeowners Association. She also stated that there were currently no code enforcement or building violations for the property. She lastly stated that there was no record of prior variances granted for the property.

Bill Kuhn stated that he was the property owner and that the proposed screen room would be located behind the kitchen. He further stated that there was an existing slab that would be enclosed for the screen room. He then stated that there were other screen rooms in the area. He lastly stated that he received approval from the Homeowners Association.

Rick Rush with Aluminum & More stated that they would not add to the existing slab and that the screen room would not cover the entire slab. He further stated that they would like the Board of Adjustment's approval for the request.

**Mr. Bushrui made a motion to approve the request.**

**Mr. Pennington seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed by unanimous consent (5-0).**

5. **Catbriar Way (Lot 83 Block A)** – Request for a rear yard setback variance from 30 feet to 10 feet for a proposed single story bedroom addition in R-1A (Single Family Dwelling District); Located on the east side of Catbriar Way approximately 3150 feet northwest of Red Bug Lake Road; (BV2007-03).

Joy Williams, Planner

Joy Williams introduced the location of the property and stated that the applicant proposed to construct an approximately 330 square feet bedroom addition to the rear of the existing home. She further stated that the proposed addition would encroach 20 feet into the required 30 feet rear yard setback. She then stated that the applicant had submitted a letter of approval from the Tuska Ridge Community Association. She also stated that there were currently no code enforcement or building violations

on the property. She lastly stated that there were no record of prior variances granted for the property.

Mike Sprigg stated that he was the homeowner and that he wanted to put an additional room on the house. He further stated that he wanted to take out the pond that he put in because they needed more room in the house.

**Mr. Rozon made a motion to approve the request.**

**Mr. Bushrui seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed by unanimous consent (5-0).**

6. **724 Silver Birch Place** – Xuan Nguyen & Nhan Phan, applicant; Request for a rear yard setback variance from 10 feet to 8 feet for a proposed screen room enclosure in PUD (Planned Unit Development District); Located on the west side of Silver Birch Place approximately 1640 feet north of N Ronald Regan Boulevard; (BV2007-05).  
Joy Williams, Planner

Joy Williams introduced the location of the property and stated that the applicant proposed to construct an approximately 120 square feet screen room over a portion of an existing concrete patio. She further stated that the proposed screen room would encroach 2 feet into the required 10 feet rear yard setback. She then stated that the applicant had submitted a letter of approval from the Crystal Creek Neighborhood Association, as well as signatures of support from surrounding neighbors. She also stated that there were currently no code enforcement or building violations for the property. She lastly stated that there was no record of prior variances granted for the property.

Nhan Phan stated that he was the property owner and he was requesting a rear yard setback from 10 feet to 8 feet for a screen room in his backyard. He further stated that the existing slab was put there when the house was built.

**Mr. Rozon made a motion to approve the request.**

**Mr. Bushrui seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed by unanimous consent (5-0).**

7. **576 Clemson Drive** – Alberto Sosa, applicant; Request for 1) a side yard (west) setback variance from 7.5 feet to 6 feet-3 inches for an existing carport and 2) a rear yard setback variance from 30 feet to 27 feet-7 inches for an addition to an existing sunroom in R-1 (Single Family

Dwelling District); Located on the north side of Clemson Drive approximately 300 feet east of South Weathersfield Avenue; (BV2007-08).  
Joy Williams, Planner

Joy Williams introduced the location of the property and stated that the applicant proposed to enclose an existing carport that currently encroached 1 foot 2 inches into the required 7.5 feet side yard setback. She further stated that the applicant intended to enclose the carport to create additional living space for the 1180 square feet home. She then stated that the applicant also proposed to extend an existing sunroom, located on the rear 3.5 feet west to align with the building line of the home. She also stated the existing sunroom encroached 2 feet 3 inches into the required 30 feet rear yard setback, when the sunroom was built in 1971, the required rear yard setback was 20 feet. She further stated that the zoning regulations had since been amended, changing the setback from 20 feet to 30 feet; therefore, a variance was required for the addition to the sunroom. She then stated that there were currently no code enforcement or building violations for the property. She lastly stated that there was no record of prior variances granted for the property.

Alberto Sosa stated that he was the homeowner and he wanted to bring the existing sunroom out 4 feet and make it square to line up with the existing home. He further stated that he wanted to enclose the existing carport for an addition. He lastly stated that he was told he had to apply for the variances before he could do what he wanted to do.

**Mr. Pennington made a motion to approve the request.**

**Mr. Rozon seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed by unanimous consent (5-0).**

8. **Hickman Drive (Lot 9/I-4 Industrial Park)** – R & R Investments, applicant; Request for a ground sign height variance from 15 feet to 37 ½ feet in the PCD (Planned Commercial Development District); Located on the north side of Hickman Drive approximately ¾ mile north of the intersection of State Road 46 and Hickman Drive; (BV2007-010).  
Kathy Fall, Principal Planner

Kathy Fall introduced the location of the property and stated that the applicant's automotive dealership was currently located on US 17-92, but they were moving to Hickman Drive in the I-4 Industrial Park. She further stated that the site on US 17-92 had three signs, the primary sign that was approved for a variance is 37.50 feet. She then stated that applicant had a 10 year lease on the three signs and were requesting to relocate them to their new facility on Hickman Drive. She also stated that the property on

Hickman Drive had approximately 1200 feet frontage along I-4 and the applicant proposed to place the primary sign along I-4. She further stated that the property was rezoned to Planned Commercial Development on February 13<sup>th</sup> by the Board of County Commissioners but the zoning did not allow the waiver of the sign height. She then stated that the proposed signs did meet the area and separation requirements but not the height for the primary sign, therefore the applicant was requesting a sign height variance for the primary sign to 37.5 feet. She also stated that Automotive Dealerships and other common uses along Interstates depend on adequate signage for business recognition to bring customers from the Interstate to their business. She further stated that the businesses in the immediate area had signage that exceeded the minimum height therefore, without the variance; the applicant would be denied the same rights as other businesses fronting I-4. She lastly stated that staff recommended approval per the submitted site plan and maximum height of 37.5 feet and any conditions deemed appropriate by the Board of Adjustment.

Cas Suvongse stated that he represented the owner and that they were pleased with Staff recommendation. He further stated that the owner was in the audience and if the Board had any questions they would be pleased to answer them.

**Mr. Pennington made a motion to approve the request.**

**Mr. O' Daniel seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed by unanimous consent (5-0)**

## **SPECIAL EXCEPTIONS**

- 9. 1950 County Road 426** – Oviedo Spanish Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses, Richard Duen, applicant; Request for special exception for a 5,139 square foot meeting hall and 200 square foot maintenance shed in A-5 (Agricultural District); Located on the north side of County Road 426 approximately 1100 feet east of Van Arsdale; (BS2007-01).  
Denny Gibbs, Senior Planner

Denny Gibbs introduced the location of the property and stated that on March 25, 2002, a special exception was granted for the Oviedo Spanish Congregation but the special exception had expired and the request before the Board of Adjustment was to reestablish the same use. She further stated that the site plan for review had been modified from the original approval, the building size on the original approval was 4,136 square feet and the meeting hall proposed is 4,512 square feet along with a porte-cochere, for a total of 5,139 square feet. She then stated that there would be 181 fixed seats along with 4 handicap accessible spaces



and they were providing 70 parking spaces and 5 handicap parking spaces. She also stated that a maintenance shed was proposed which would be approximately 200 square feet. She further stated that a site plan had been reviewed by Development Review and was waiting approval pending the granting of the new special exception. She lastly stated that staff recommended approval with the following conditions:

- Total square footage of buildings on site shall not exceed 5,339 square feet
- Final site plan shall comply with provisions of the Scenic Corridor Overlay Zoning District
- Final site plan shall meet the applicable requirements of the Seminole County Comprehensive Plan and Land Development Code or Seminole County
- Any additional condition(s) deemed appropriate by the Board of Adjustment, based on information presented at the public hearing

Louis Celenza stated that he was the Volunteer Construction Coordinator. He further stated that they assist with construction of Jehovah Witnesses Kingdom Hall's in Central Florida. He then stated that he was there to help with any technical questions the Board of Adjustment might have. He also stated that he would like to acknowledge that some of the friends that live close to the proposed Kingdom Hall were at the meeting and were interested in the renewal of the special exception so they could build their place of worship.

**Mr. Rozon made a motion to approve the special exception request.**

**Mr. Pennington seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed by unanimous consent (5-0).**

10. **3016 Alafaya Trail** – Expert Car Care, James Sada, applicant; Request for a special exception to allow a paint booth within an existing mechanical garage in C-2 (Retail Commercial District); Located on the east side of Alafaya Trail approximately 150 feet south of Carrigan Avenue; (BS2007-03).

Denny Gibbs, Senior Planner

Denny Gibbs introduced the location of the property and stated that the applicant proposed to construct a paint booth within the existing building at the rear of the property. She further stated that the applicant stated that the paint booth would contain a system that filters and traps any fumes and overspray and would have a fire suppression system. She then stated that there had been a mechanical garage on the site since 1987. She also stated the property was adjacent to other commercial uses to the north and south, and the rear of the property is the parking lot for

Riverwind Apartments. She further stated that the applicant would also be providing additional landscaping along Alafaya Trail to meet the current regulations and staff recommended conditions to minimize impacts to adjacent properties. She lastly stated that staff recommended approval of the request with the following conditions:

- The Special Exception granted would apply only to the paint booth as depicted on the attached site plan
- All painting shall be conducted within the paint booth; outdoor painting is prohibited
- No work involving preparing a vehicle for paint shall be performed outside of a building
- The paint booth shall contain a system that filters and traps any fumes and overspray
- The paint booth shall have a fire suppression system
- There shall be a 90 day limit for storage of vehicles on the property

James Sada stated that he was the owner of Expert Car Care and he had been serving the community there since 1987. He further stated that there was currently an enclosed building on the property where the paint booth would be located. He then stated that the proposed paint booth would have a filtering system, which would keep fumes or overspray from getting out. He also stated that the paint booth would be in compliance all Department of Environmental Protection standards. He lastly asked for the Board of Adjustment approval.

**Mr. Pennington made a motion to approve the special exception request with staff conditions.**

**Mr. Bushrui seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed by unanimous consent (5-0).**

11. **305 South Orange Boulevard** – Lakeside Fellowship United Methodist Church, applicant; Request for a special exception for a youth sports complex in the A-1 (Agriculture District); Located on the south east corner of the intersection of Wayside Drive and South Orange Boulevard; (BS2007-02).

Kathy Fall, Principal Planner

Kathy Fall introduced the location of the property and stated that the Lakeside Fellowship Methodist Church currently resides on a parcel that contains approximately 10 acres and they offered the Sanford Little League the use of the south 6 acres. She further stated that the Sanford Little League had agreed to construct the church a basketball court and multipurpose field as part of the lease agreement. She then stated that the proposed Little League fields would consist of three (3) 210 foot fields,

one tee ball field, a 2-story concession stand, restrooms, batting cage, playground, and a maintenance storage building. She further stated that the proposed site is located on the southeast corner of the intersection of Orange Boulevard and Wayside Drive, along both roadways are several non-residential uses and some that have recreation components, these uses include daycares, churches, an elementary school, assisted living facilities, and a veterinary clinic. She then stated that there had been recently approved to the east of the site a bible college and to the west a swimming pool business. She also stated that there was a single family home located on the south east corner of the property in which staff was recommending a 6 foot high masonry wall. She lastly stated that due to the trend of development in the area the location of the Little League fields would not be detrimental staff recommended approval of the request based upon the following conditions:

- The fields will be used for schedule games on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday with starting times from 5:30 to 7:30. On Saturdays there will be games from 8:30 a.m. to 7:30 p.m. These times are based upon the existing church schedule so that the fields and church are not utilized at the same time. Under no circumstances shall the church planned events and fields be in use at the same time, for example weddings and special festivals. Bible study classes, church meetings and other small events would be exempted from the condition
- No parking shall be allowed in undersigned areas and/ or the rights of way
- The fields will not be used for practice
- There will be a 6 foot high masonry wall along the property line of the existing single family home that abuts the south east portion of the site
- There will be no amplification of sound
- There shall be a plan submitted at site plan to show how balls will be secured within the designated property lines to ensure any safety concerns with Orange Boulevard and adjacent property owners
- The fields shall be secured with an 8 foot high black chain link fence
- The lighting for the fields will be turned off by 10:15 p.m. on game nights
- The site plan shall be in compliance with the Seminole County Land Development Code

Cameron Lashbrook stated that he was the Pastor at Lakeside Fellowship United Methodist Church and he wanted to speak about why he felt the proposed project was important. He further stated that Lakeside Fellowship had a passion for providing opportunities for children and their

families to grow and mature. He then stated that the proposed fields would provide recreation and fun for the kids. He also stated it would teach the kids skills regarding teamwork and what it means to practice toward a goal and work hard toward something that is important to them. He further stated that the project would provide the opportunity for coaches to mentor children from a variety of home settings, which would be quite an investment in the lives of the children. He then stated that from an article they read in the newspaper there is a need for recreational facilities and the church wanted to serve the community need. He also stated that he hoped the neighbors in the community would see the need for more recreation facilities. He further stated that any time the church and little league facility were in use at the same time they would not exceed the allowed parking spaces provided.

Cliff Miller stated that he was a member of Lakeside Fellowship and that when they purchased the 10 acres they received approval for the church with a four step plan. He further stated that the first plan was the existing building and 3 additional building to be built, and they were not in position to go ahead with the additional buildings. He then stated that 6 acres of the property was not being used and they wanted to put them to the best possible use, and after seeing the article they decided to do the Sport's Complex. He lastly stated that the project would be good for the church and the community.

Jeff Reedy stated that he was on staff at Lakeside Fellowship and they wanted to provide the impact that organized sports have on student lives. He further stated that he had some discussion with some of his neighbors and they were disappointed because they had not been able to find fields in the area for their current baseball teams. He lastly stated that there is a need in the community for the Little League Fields.

Bill Sutton stated that he was a Board member of the Lake Mary Little League and he wanted to express his support for the project. He further stated that there was a tremendous need for a facility because they were at full capacity in Lake Mary. He then stated that he wanted to address some of the concerns from one of the letters that was submitted to the Board about the proposed project; the noise, lights and balls flying into their property. He stated that the lights really don't come into play at the early part of the season, after daylight saving time there isn't much need for the lights. He then stated that there are time limits on the games. He further stated that in his career of about 220 games he had only seen 2 balls go out of the yard and with the proposed 210 feet fence it should not be a problem. He also stated that the noise level with baseball crowds are usually quiet, but of course there is some noise but it should not be a problem. He lastly stated that if the project was approved the Sanford Little League would develop a tremendous league community.

Alex Hamrick stated that the proposed project would be near his Sylvan Lake Reserve community and on February 15 they had a Homeowner's Association meeting and he mentioned the project and the community was in favor of it. He further stated that his grandmother currently lives next to the Lake Mary Sport's Complex and he wanted her to speak.

Thea Wickom stated that she lived across the street from the Lake Mary Sport's Complex and she had not had any problems with flying balls in her windows. She further stated that you have to think of the kids and how they are in need of a place to play ball.

Leigh Anne Morrison stated that they moved to Florida three years ago and when they bought their house in Sanford they did not have a Little League in Sanford and Lake Mary allowed her son to play in that district. She further stated that Sanford had no fields and the proposed project would be great for the area and the County. She lastly stated that she was in support of the request.

Michelle Kovach stated that she was on the Sanford Little League Board. She further stated that there were some very talented boys in Sanford, and sometimes sports is the only opportunity for the kids to attend college. She then asked for the Board of Adjustment support in the proposed Little League Fields.

Barbara Tucker stated that she was the resident that lived on the south east corner of the proposed site. She then stated that two people that lived across the street from her asked her to submit their letters of opposition. She further stated that they had lived there for 22 years and had seen tremendous growth. She also stated that she and her husband both worked and the only time they enjoyed their home was in the evenings and weekends. She stated that her back patio would face the ball fields. She further stated that there was a possibility of a proposed Highway coming through in the next 5 years and she thought the Board of Adjustment should take that into consideration in making a decision on the request.

George Pihakis stated that he was the President of the Sanford Little League. He further referred to an article that the Tucker's sent in with their concerns about the proposed fields; cars and lights were an issue in the article. He then stated that all the cars would be parked at the other end of the property away from the Tucker's home. He also stated that the entire project would be fenced in with a locked fence and people will not be able to come in as they pleased. He further stated that there were no fields for the kids to play on in the area. He then stated that they would put a 6 foot buffer wall 170 feet long to match the other wall from the

Academy of Learning. He lastly stated that the project would be an upscale park serving the greater good of the community.

**Mr. Pennington made a motion to approve the special exception request with staff conditions.**

**Mr. Rozon seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed by unanimous consent (5-0).**

## **APPROVAL OF JANUARY 22, 2007 MEETING MINUTES**

**Mr. Pennington made a motion to approve the January 22, 2007 Amended minutes.**

**Mr. O' Daniel seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed by unanimous consent (5-0).**

## **ADJOURNMENT**

**Time of Adjournment was 9:00 P.M.**