

**TOWN OF DUCK  
PLANNING BOARD  
REGULAR MEETING  
November 18, 2020**

The Planning Board for the Town of Duck convened at the Paul F. Keller Meeting Hall on Wednesday, November 18, 2020.

Present were: Chair Joe Blakaitis, Vice Chair James Cofield, Tim McKeithan, Marc Murray, and Randy Morton.

Absent: None.

Also present were: Director of Community Development Joe Heard, Council Liaison Sandy Whitman, and Permit Coordinator Sandy Cross.

Absent: None.

Others Present: Jordan Daneker of Evolve Design & Build, John Replogle, Kristin Replogle, and Director of Public Information, Marketing and Events Christian Legner.

Chair Blakaitis called to order the Regular Meeting of the Planning Board for November 18, 2020 at 6:28 p.m. He noted that this was a virtual meeting and that the chat feature was disabled for those watching remotely. He stated that if anyone watching remotely wanted to make a comment, they can indicate by raising their hand and/or submit comments through the chat feature in Zoom.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**Special Exception 20-001: Special Exception Relating to Fill and Grading Activities at 1170 Duck Road to Allow the Use of a Bulkhead to Contain and Stabilize Fill as Part of a Stormwater Management System**

Director Heard stated that the applicant's existing retaining wall at the rear of the site was failing, which places an increased load on the adjoining soundfront bulkhead. He added that the existing deck did not permit vegetative growth under it due to shade, which has led to soil erosion and stormwater runoff directly into the sound. He stated that replacement of the retaining wall was necessary to support the adjoining ground and structures above it, including the existing swimming pool and home. He noted that rather than reconstructing the existing wooden retaining wall and deck, the applicant was proposing to construct a stone retaining wall and replacing the deck with a new pervious raised patio with subsurface infiltration to increase the capacity for stormwater runoff and capture. He added that it would allow it to recharge the subbase and dissipate into the ground naturally.

Director Heard stated that the proposed project involved the addition of fill and grading to accommodate the construction of substantial improvements in the rear yard of the property. He stated that the proposed improvements included the following:

- Removal of approximately 750 square feet of existing wooden decking and replacement with 428 square feet of pervious patio with a subsurface base allowing stormwater infiltration and gradual release into the adjoining ground.
- Removal of 697 square feet of existing impervious stone patio and replacement of 697 square feet of pervious patio with a subsurface base allowing stormwater infiltration and gradual release into the adjoining ground.
- Construction of a stone retaining wall approximately five feet in height along the entire property to support the ground and improvements to the east.
- Filling and leveling the lawn area behind the retaining wall to create a consistent elevation and support the pervious patio.
- Raising and replacing the existing natural lawn with 200 square feet of pervious artificial turf and permeable subbase near the northwest corner of the property.
- Raising the southern portion of the yard and replanting with natural grass.

Director Heard stated that in order for the project to be constructed as proposed, the retaining wall and fill will require approval of the following special exceptions:

Subsection 156.128(A)(6) requires approval of a special exception permit for retaining walls to be used as a method to stabilize or contain fill. The proposed project involves the addition of fill and grading associated with the construction of an elevated lawn and patio behind an approximately five-foot-high retaining wall at the rear of the property.

Subsection 156.128(A)(12)(a) requires approval of a special exception permit for fill in excess of three feet in height. The proposed project adds fill material with a depth of approximately five feet supported by the proposed retaining wall.

Director Heard stated that Subsection 156.128(C) of the Duck Town Code establishes special exception review criteria for applications involving fill and grading activities. He pointed out that the following standards must be considered as part of the Planning Board's review:

1. The site for the proposed fill is otherwise adequate in size, shape, and other characteristics to accommodate the proposed project.
2. The applicant has demonstrated that the requirements of this chapter are unreasonable or impractical due to the necessity for the fill, lot shape, topographical features, location of mature vegetation, or location and characteristics of existing improvements on the lot.
3. The amount of fill proposed is the minimum necessary to accommodate the proposed project, especially for soundfront properties.
4. The proposed fill will not negatively impact adjacent properties or the surrounding areas, especially for soundfront properties.
5. The special exception will be consistent with any applicable goals, policies and objectives specified in the Town's adopted CAMA Land Use Plan and Vision

Statement. This review includes the Town of Duck's evaluation of the proposal's consistency with its adopted CAMA Land Use Plan, which may be more flexible or more stringent than interpretations by others.

6. The applicant has submitted a drainage plan consistent with the requirements described in Subsection 156.1218(A)(4)(c).

Director Heard stated that as several of the required findings were not met in staff's opinion, staff was recommending denial of the special exception application. He noted that should the Planning Board decide to recommend approval of the special exception request, staff was asking that the members consider the following conditions:

1. The proposed retaining wall must be certified by a North Carolina licensed engineer.
2. The applicant must obtain a CAMA minor permit from the North Carolina Division of Coastal Management prior to the issuance of a land disturbance permit for the fill/grading or building permit for the retaining wall.
3. The applicant must submit required application materials and obtain land disturbance and building permits prior to commencing work.

Vice Chair Cofield stated that the staff report indicated that staff was recommending denial of the special exception application. He asked why. Director Heard stated that staff did not determine that the applicant had met Findings 3 and 4 as it was up to the Planning Board to consider. He stated that the applicant could present some additional information to the Board, but staff did not find affirmatively on Findings 3 and 4. He explained that the standard that has to be met for special exceptions has to meet all of the findings and if it was found that one was not met, then the decision should be to deny the project. Vice Chair Cofield confirmed that staff was recommending denial of the application. Director Heard stated he was correct, adding that it was based on the information received and the applicant's need to more thoroughly address Findings 3 and 4.

Jordan Daneker of Evolve Design & Build was recognized to speak. Mr. Daneker thought the important thing to remember about the project was that the owners and he wanted to do something that would not negatively impact other lots as well as the sound, while mitigating any erosion that has been happening. He went on to review the project with the Planning Board, explaining the reasoning behind the design and ability to capture stormwater.

Member Murray asked where the fill will be placed that was not already on the property. He noted that the total wall height was five feet, but the existing retaining wall would be torn down that has some height to it. He stated that he needed to know how much material would be in addition to the material that was already on the property. Jordan Daneker stated that they were not necessarily adding a lot of fill but were replacing the current fill by adding two feet. He added that they were not bringing in an excessive amount of fill but replacing some of the fill that was currently there with a permeable stone to capture the stormwater. Member Murray clarified that no sand would be brought in. Mr. Daneker stated he was correct. Member Murray asked how it would work in the grassy area to the south of the property. Mr. Daneker explained that the excavated soil would be used in that area since they would be replacing it to create the reservoir. Member Murray clarified that the south end of the portion of the bulkhead would be backfilled with sand from the site. Mr. Daneker stated he was correct.

Chair Blakaitis noted that Jordan Daneker was anticipating a five-foot high wall. Member Murray noted that two feet of it was sub-grade. Chair Blakaitis agreed, noting that both sides of the grass have quite a slope to them. Jordan Daneker stated that it looked like it, but it was not as much as one would think, adding that there was approximately 21 inches of grade change.

Member Murray clarified that the wall's cross-section showed the total wall height at five feet with one to two feet being below the surface. He asked where Jordan Daneker was raising the grade from the current grade – five feet or three feet. Jordan Daneker stated that the deepest will be five feet, because the toe slope was taken away. He added that there would be five feet in some areas of the wall because there needed to be a slope. He added that the toe slope was being taken away and the land would be flush with the bulkhead. Member Murray noted that the grade was already in existence and the difference in height between the existing grade and the finished grade was in that difference. Director Head explained that the difference was that the applicant was digging out areas of the existing grade and replacing it with a different material, which was part of the fill material. Member Murray wasn't sure it met the Town's definition of fill. He thought the definition had that it had to be like material. He pointed out that the neighboring property had rip rap and it wasn't considered fill. He stated that if it wasn't sand, then it wasn't fill in his opinion.

Chair Blakaitis pointed out that this was a unique situation because the Town has never dealt with a wall on top of a wall. He added that the Town was dealing with walls that go into the sound and this did not. Member Murray understood, but pointed out that the Town has dealt with terraced walls in the past. Chair Blakaitis disagreed, adding that if the Town had, it wasn't like the one in front of them. Member Murray thought the stone wall was different. Chair Blakaitis agreed.

Director Heard explained that the definition of fill in the Town's ordinance was any material placed or graded on a lot where the material has the effect of increasing the elevation of any portion of the lot. He noted that it did not specify sand or any other type of material. Chair Blakaitis stated that it was increasing the fill on both sides. Member Murray understood the sides but when he looked at the diagram of the one area, it made more sense.

Vice Chair Cofield asked how high the stone wall would be on the westernmost portion of the property. Jordan Daneker stated that on the north side the stone will taper to a minimum depth of two feet, all the way up to the fence. He added that on the south side, it will have a two-foot setback from the wall to allow for drainage. Vice Chair Cofield pointed out that there would be essentially two feet between the bulkhead and the retaining wall on the north and south side of the walkway, which would be in stones. He clarified that the stones would capture the water. Mr. Daneker stated that the stone was a three to five-inch cobble and was on the surface, which may help break up the erosion before the bulkhead. He added that it was just a decorative feature of the wall versus the actual system contained in the wall.

Member McKeithan stated that on the stormwater drainage plan, there wasn't a formal engineering design. He asked if, in lieu of it, there were discussions with the adjoining property owners. Jordan Daneker stated that he did not but would be happy to explain the project to the adjacent owners. He added that it was not necessarily a drainage plan since the water was

captured in one place and was a very simple process. He noted that the subbase also acts as a drainage plan.

Member Morton asked how often maintenance has to be completed on the joints as well as the life expectancy. Jordan Daneker stated that the maintenance was approximately five years and was as simple as vacuuming the joints.

Member Murray noted that one of the attachments in the Board's packets showed the grade south of the hot tub as being flush with the patio while another attachment showed the grade south of the hot tub as dropping down from the patio. He asked which one was proposed in this project. Jordan Daneker stated that it was where it showed it flush with the patio.

Vice Chair Cofield stated that some aspects of the project did not seem to go together quite as well as the rest of it. He asked what features were most important. John Replogle was recognized to speak. Mr. Replogle stated that the greatest issue they were facing was the water running off from the house. He stated that they have installed gutters and downspout systems but were still seeing continuing erosion. Vice Chair Cofield pointed out that there was a downspout that was channeling water on the slope Mr. Replogle was complaining about. Mr. Replogle explained that they have a downspout that channels outside the front fence as well as another one that runs out to the middle of the side yard beyond the pool system. Vice Chair Cofield noted that that was where John Replogle was saying that there was runoff, which was the area they were complaining about. John Replogle stated that the area that was eroding most notably was on the south side by the bulkhead. He stated that they added stone that runs along the fence on the south side to create an additional catch basin because of the amount of runoff from the neighboring property. He stated that there was no mitigation from the neighboring property, which was why the stone was added, adding that they have to add stone each year due to the erosion. He noted that his primary concern was continued erosion and he wanted to protect the bulkhead in the long-term as well as protecting their pool. He stated that they were trying to engineer the best design that was aesthetically pleasing as well as a system that works to control the water and the erosion.

Vice Chair Cofield pointed out that the erosion John Replogle was not populous (Joe-I'm not sure if James used the term populous as he was hard to hear/understand). John Replogle stated it was because they took great care of the yard. He stated that the house builder had to come in to lift the support structure of the house and reset it. He pointed out that their neighbor to the north has also had issues with their bulkhead and had dumped stone into the sound front. He stated that he was concerned about his bulkhead in the long-term and didn't want it to fail, so they were trying to take whatever solutions they could to address it over time.

John Replogle explained that the lot runs east to west, sloping west as well as south to north slowing down. He stated that they have had conditions of water pooling on the deck by the pool, coming down in torrents and runs off to the side. He stated that the stone around the pool has been in place for approximately 12 years and was breaking apart. He stated that he wanted to remove the stone in order to obtain better drainage around the pool area as well as shrinking that area. He stated that on the left of the pool was a wooden platform that has been replaced because of the erosion underneath it, which has led to issues on the north side of the pool with cracking

and a broken filter system. He stated that they wanted to remove that in order to create a better system which will help with fixing the north side of the pool.

Vice Chair Cofield stated that it was not obvious that there was an area in either of the bulkhead and retaining wall. He asked if that was the north side of the bulkhead. John Replogle stated he was correct, adding that they want to remove all of the wooden decking which was sitting on top of sand. Vice Chair Cofield reiterated that there was a downspout that was bringing water to the area John Replogle was complaining about. Mr. Replogle agreed, adding that it was by the pool area. Vice Chair Cofield disagreed, noting that it was on the grassy area on the side. Mr. Replogle agreed. Vice Chair Cofield asked if there was a such a problem, why complain about it. John Replogle stated that it was worked on this past summer and he needed it to run in that area, pointing out that the bulkhead was 30-40 feet from the bulkhead. Vice Chair Cofield stated that Mr. Replogle was complaining that the water was running down that slope. Mr. Replogle stated he was correct. Vice Chair Cofield stated that the downspout was creating part of the problem. Mr. Replogle thought it could contribute to it, adding that he thought it needed to be remedied since the job wasn't finished.

Vice Chair Cofield stated that it was not obvious that there was an issue with the bulkhead or retaining wall when one looks at it. John Replogle stated that the bulkhead was not failing yet but was bowed and he looked at having engineers look at building a second bulkhead. He stated that he would like to avoid doing that. Vice Chair Cofield reiterated that it was not obvious that the retaining wall was failing. John Replogle added that it wasn't from a certain angle.

Member McKeithan (Joe, I wasn't sure if it was Tim or Randy that asked this question as it wasn't in the notes, again hard to hear) asked Director Heard if he felt that requiring a retaining wall to run the whole length of the property would work as opposed to turning in and not including the north and south yards. John Replogle stated that the north side the new bulkhead would step down and was not the same height and was lower than the others. He stated that, aesthetically, they were hoping to change it to whatever needed to be done, but there was a water management system effectively that they did not want to undermine. Jordan Daneker thought if the least impact was chosen, it would be the south side as that portion did not control any stormwater runoff. He explained that the wall was made to support the grade, since it was so steep, as well to help remove the fill.

Vice Chair Cofield clarified that the wooden retaining wall was being proposed to be replaced with a stone retaining wall to the height of the pool. Jordan Daneker explained that the wooden retaining wall that currently existed did not do anything. He added that it was just a decorative flower bed. He stated that the pool itself supports its own structure. He stated that all of the sand was coming from under the deck and the reason for raising the wall to the pool height and building a return was to stop the erosion in that area.

Vice Chair Cofield pointed out that the project looked like it was in multiple parts. He asked what the applicant was trying to achieve. John Replogle thought it was a complete project. Vice Chair Cofield noted that some parts of the project were creating issues with respect to the Town's ordinance. Mr. Replogle stated that they were most concerned with the central core because the wooden deck and the concrete decking are a problem and need to be addressed. He stated that the rest, which was fixing the slope on the south side and cleaning up the north side,

they were flexible on that. He noted that they have invested heavily in their home, took great care of it, and wanted to create a complete aesthetic that not only remedied all of the issues, but also improved the conditions. He stated that it was about preserving the core and reducing the stress, erosion, and removing the impermeable conditions.

Chair Blakaitis reminded the Board that the applicant was in front of them because of the sand behind the bulkhead. He added that almost everything else John Replogle wanted to do, could be done with a permit. He noted that the wooden deck and other items could be done with a permit, but he gets into the Town's requirements when dealing with the wall, how high it was as well as what would be behind it. He stated that the Board needed to concern itself with whether they thought it was correct or not and whether they thought it was good enough to satisfy Findings 3 and 4. He pointed out that Finding 3 was whether or not the fill proposed was the minimum necessary. He stated that Finding 4 involved whether the proposed fill will not negatively impact the surrounding properties. He thought that needed to be resolved first.

Member Morton thought that the issue was outside of the core area and the wooden deck being replaced with a new patio. Director Heard stated he was correct as it related to Finding 3. He thought there was good justification for the way the proposal was designed in the central area where the patio was located. He thought the applicant did a good job of explaining how that stormwater management system was going to work and the need for the slight change of elevation in that area. He stated that where staff had a bigger question was that the northern area would still be lower, meaning they would not bring it up to the same height and filling it. He thought it was no longer an issue for staff. He stated that it dealt with the south lot and whether there was justification for carrying the project to the end of the property. He thought what the Board heard was that the applicant was interested in maintaining or creating a more useable, safer lawn area in the area above the retaining wall. He added that there was also an interest in carrying the retaining wall all the way to the property line where there has been erosion issues. He didn't think needing a place to put the fill from elsewhere on the project was a compelling argument as it allows them to use the fill on site.

Chair Blakaitis thought the Board's concern was more with the height of the wall, the sand that would be going behind it, and where it was coming from. He stated that it was already decided that the sand was not going to do any harm since it was coming from the lot. He stated that he walked the property recently and it was shocking to see, but when looking at each piece of the project, it made sense. He stated that some of his concerns about the wall have been minimized somewhat.

Director Heard thought there was another valid point of discussion in terms of envisioning the impacts. He stated that although the project would involve digging down deeper, the impact would be filling behind the wall where it was needed. He stated that it did not change anything for the pool area as it was already at that height, but in the areas to the north under the patio, would be fill placed there to bring it up behind the wall. He stated that it would be leveled out and brought up to a consistent level with the patio. He added that the same thing would occur in the lawn area to the south.

Member Murray felt that he could see in the staff report that Findings 3 and 4 how the letter of the ordinance has not been met but the application likely met Finding 4 and it could be found that

it met Finding 3. He stated that he wanted to ask the applicant if their preference that the Planning Board try to parse out the parts of the project that may be compliant now and perhaps limit what can be done on the sides. He asked if it would be in the applicant's interest to do the project as a whole and represent it, explain it more clearly as well as bringing in some supporting information. He noted that the most significant piece would be an engineer's stormwater plan. He asked if the Board should parse it out now or if the applicant would be more interested in doing the whole project if it could be explained how it meets the criteria more clearly. Jordan Daneker stated that the south side started to fail. He wondered why the load above it would not be supported in order to give relief to the bulkhead if the long-term solution may fail by supporting that side. He explained that once the left side is built, there would be no way to access the right wing. He noted that if the bulkhead started showing signs of failure, they should try to mitigate it now.

Member Murray agreed with Jordan Daneker, adding that it sounded like what was happening was that Mr. Daneker was trying to convince the Board that this was a good idea. He noted that, unfortunately, that was not what the hearing was about as it was whether the Board could find that the applicant met the requirements of the ordinance. He stated that they were spelled out pretty clearly and he believed there was supporting evidence on the lot to make the case, but thought that the supporting evidence brought to the Board by an engineer or a more detailed survey that showed exactly what the fill depth was could do that. He felt the staff report and the Board's conversation was leaning towards it looking like it could be met but he was asking the applicant if they wanted the Board to meet it by paring the project down in this discussion or by bringing back more information. John Replogle stated that they would like to solve the problem in totality, so he would like for the project to progress with the right information to support the proposal, but he wasn't sure what it would entail. He wasn't sure what evidence would be required, adding that he was looking at the fact that they put hundreds of hours into the project and Jordan Daneker has worked through every detail. He wasn't sure how to solve the issues as this wasn't what he does for a living. He stated that he wanted to do the best he could as well as meet every ordinance, but he wasn't sure because if he came back and the Board didn't approve the project, then he would have spent thousands of dollars and hundreds of hours to get nowhere. He wasn't sure how to answer Member Murray's question, but wanted to do what was right for the Town, for his property and for his neighbors.

John Replogle stated that he wanted to start the project as they have been working on it for a long time. He noted that they started the project in 2020 with Mancuso Development, went through a lot of details with them and changed contractors. He stated that he was now lost and if the Planning Board let him know what could be done to approve the project, he was open to it. He stated that he wanted the approval to proceed with his project.

Chair Blakaitis asked Member Murray if when he discussed parsing things out, he meant it would sever part of the wall. Member Murray stated that he was hearing concern with the south lawn and the filling of that area as well as taking the bulkhead all the way to the property line and returning it there. He stated that from the discussion, it appeared that most of the runoff was roof runoff from rainwater. He wondered if the Board would be more comfortable if the stone retaining wall returned closer to the south side of the house. He added that the Board would then be discussing only one special exception which was the bulkhead retaining fill. He believed in that area that it would be less than three feet of fill, but he wasn't sure because there was



circumstantial evidence in the Board's packets to support it, but it was not presented in a concise way with elevations on the survey. He suspected that there would not be three feet of fill put in under the deck area since the sand presently washes out there. He thought that the fill under the deck was most likely at the level of the top of the existing wooden retaining wall and if that was the case, three feet of fill would not be added in that area. He thought Finding 3 would be met since there would be less fill than the ordinance permits.

Chair Blakaitis asked about Finding 4. Member Murray stated that as staff mentioned in the report, there was a lot of corroborating evidence that the stormwater would be retained in the structure that was being built. Chair Blakaitis stated that it seemed that the Board was moving in the direction of understanding that that would solve some of the problem, all the Board had to do was decide whether or not the bulkhead was too high. Director Heard pointed out that the bulkhead was not an issue at all, adding that it could be 30 feet high as long as it was not supporting new fill. Chair Blakaitis wondered what else there was to discuss.

Vice Chair Cofield stated that overall, he thought it was a good project. He stated that he kept going back to what the main issue that was trying to be solved and thought the applicant could achieve most of their objective without getting the Board's approval for a special exception. He thought the applicant did not present sufficient evidence that would support the request before the Board. He thought the applicant could do most of the project and achieve their objectives, but he saw insufficient support. He suggested that they take the project back and delay it until they could bring forward an engineer's report to support it. Chair Blakaitis clarified that Vice Chair Cofield wanted an engineer's report to support Findings 3 and 4 for the Board to see. Vice Chair Cofield stated he was correct.

Member Murray pointed out that the applicant could not build a bulkhead. Vice Chair Cofield stated that the stone patio presented a problem since there was nowhere for the water to go, adding that some of it would probably go into the swimming pool. He didn't see the runoff on the south side since there was grass. He added that on the north side it wasn't as bad as the applicant had stated. He stated that he did not look under the wooden deck, so he wasn't sure about the runoff there. He pointed out that it wasn't obvious that there was a big problem, but he would allow that there was somewhat of a problem. He stated that the applicant could replace the stone patio and the wooden deck without the Planning Board being involved. Chair Blakaitis pointed out that they seemed to be one of the more important things of the project because they were supposedly stopping the runoff. Vice Chair Cofield stated that he did not see the runoff problem.

Member McKeithan thought getting some more information could help to approve the entire project. He thought the project was well engineered and they were achieving some mitigation for the runoff. He thought if the applicant came back with more information, the Board could approve the project. Chair Blakaitis asked where the information should come from. Member McKeithan thought the stormwater mitigation could come from an engineer to substantiate what the applicant was telling the Board as to what the engineer would certify. He stated that that was his main concern.

Chair Blakaitis thought the Board seemed to be most concerned with satisfying Findings 3 and 4 without an engineer looking at it and the information that would come from an engineer. He thought the rest of it was fine and did not need to be discussed.

Member Murray felt that the engineer's report satisfying Finding 6 would help the Board to get to Findings 3 and 4. He hoped that the engineer would be familiar with the Town ordinance and able to make the case as to why the project meets the standards. Chair Blakaitis clarified that Member Murray felt that more information would help the Board. Member Murray stated he was correct.

Member Murray asked if a motion for denial needed to be made. Vice Chair Cofield suggested asking if the application could be tabled. Director Heard stated that if the applicants were willing to come back to the December Planning Board meeting with that type of information, he would be happy to talk with them as to what was needed. He stated that he would be asking for some sort of certification/insurance that the project was going to work as well as having something that addressed the potential impacts on adjoining properties.

It was *consensus* of the Planning Board to table the application until their December 9, 2020 meeting.

## **OLD BUSINESS**

### **Planning/Scheduling for NCGS Chapter 160D Text Amendments**

Director Heard stated that the Board members had previously watched some videos that the UNC School of Government had put out related to this effort. He stated that there have been some additional changes since then as the state legislature has adopted two amendments to the timeframe by which communities have to adopt this. He stated that the Town was good until August 2021 before something has to be adopted with respect to the changes. He stated that there have been a couple of months since the Planning Board has met, but with him presently serving in two roles in the Town, it has not allowed him the time necessary to get things completed. He stated that due to the deadline being moved back to August 2021, it was not something that he could prioritize or get to the Board in the near future because it was a very complicated subject.

Director Heard stated that the School of Government has provided some good resources but from a staff standpoint, it will take a lot of time to identify all of the changes that needed to be made. He stated that the Town was looking at bringing on a new Town Manager no earlier than mid-January, so it would be late winter/early spring as far as the Board seeing that proposal.

## **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

### **Minutes from the June 10, 2020, Regular Meeting**

Vice Chair Cofield moved to approve the June 10, 2020 minutes as presented. Member McKeithan seconded.

Motion carried 5-0 via roll call.

**Minutes from the July 8, 2020, Regular Meeting**

Member Murray moved to approve the July 8, 2020 minutes as presented. Vice Chair Cofield seconded.

Motion carried 5-0 via roll call.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

**STAFF COMMENTS**

**Project Updates**

Director Heard gave a short overview on various projects going on in Town.

**BOARD COMMENTS**

None.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Vice Chair Cofield moved to adjourn the meeting. Member McKeithan seconded.

There was no vote.

The time was 8:51p.m.

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_  
/s/ Joe Blakaitis, Chairman