



MINUTES

BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS

REGULAR MEETING

Thursday, October 12, 2023 - 4:00 p.m.
Greenville City Hall Council Chambers

NOTICE OF MEETING: Pursuant to Section 30-4-80 of the S.C. Code of Laws, annual notice of this Board's Meetings was provided on January 1, 2023 (and revised on August 10, 2023) via the Greenville City Website. The Agenda for this Meeting was posted outside the meeting place and was emailed to all persons, organizations, and news media requesting notice. In addition, notice for public hearings was published in the Greenville News, posted on the properties subject of public hearing(s), mailed to all surrounding property owners, and emailed to all persons, organizations, and news media requesting notice pursuant to Section 6-29-760 of the S.C. Code of Laws and Section 19-2.2.9 of the Code of the City of Greenville.

A copy of staff reports and recommendations were posted with the meeting agenda.

1. Call to Order

Chairman Chris Price called the meeting to order at 4:04 PM.

2. Welcome and Opening Remarks from the Chair

Chairman Chris Price welcomed attendees to the meeting and invited other board members to introduce themselves. Price continued with standard remarks and explained the procedures for the Board of Zoning Appeals public hearing.

3. Roll Call

The following members of the Board of Zoning Appeals were in attendance: Chris Price (Chair), Seph Wunder (Vice Chair), Mark Herro and Stephanie Gates, Krish V. Patel, and Lauren Rounsville

Absent: Kenneth Betsch

4. Approval of Minutes

A. September 12, 2023 – Workshop

B. September 14, 2023 – Regular Meeting

Seph Wunder motioned to approve as submitted. Stephanie Gates seconded. Motion passed 6-0.

5. Call for Public Notice Affidavit from Applicants

Staff reported that all public notice affidavits were received.

6. Acceptance of Agenda

The agenda was accepted as distributed to the Board.

Seph Wunder motioned to accept. Stephanie Gates seconded the motion. The motion passed 6-0.

7. Conflict of Interest Statement

Lauren Rounsville, in regard to A 23-747, disclosed that her employer conducted the land acquisition closing prior to her employment with the firm. She deferred to members of the Board and Staff to help decide if a conflict of interest was present. After discussion, Rounsville agreed to be fair and impartial.

Seph Wunder, in regard to A 23-747, discloses receipt of complaint from Appellant before the appeal was filed. Agreed to be fair and impartial.

Chris Price, in regard to A 23-747, stated he had a conflict and recused himself due to conflict of interest.

Seph Wunder assumed Chair duties.

8. OLD BUSINESS

None

9. NEW BUSINESS

A. A 23-747

Application by Matt McPheely for an **APPEAL** of the administrator's interpretation to classify a use as a 'General group living' use in a RH-C, Residential House C district at **911/915/917/919 RUTHERFORD RD** (TMS# 018302-01-00901, 018302-01-00903, 018302-01-00904, and 018302-01-00905)

Application was presented by Ross Zelenske, Senior Development Planner, with report summary from previous action and staff findings.

Appellant Presentation

Matt McPheely, 306 Randall Street, Greenville, SC

- Identified himself as the developer of Union House. Discussed history and definition of project as four 3,000 square-foot residences build upon four separate parcels. They were constructed to be adaptable to different living situations, including families and single individuals. Discussed affordability in the neighborhood and offered project as a method of mitigating high rent.
- Identified as a Greenville native and introduced his parents and family. This concept is the first attempt to bring affordability to the city. Discussed challenges during project due to repeated vandalism, the lawsuit by the City, and stop work orders.
- Cited definitions within Greenville Development Code regarding household and group living. Stated that the Code does not regulate number of persons residing together in a dwelling or whether they must be related or have access to all bedrooms. Interpreted the definition of Group Living to only be applicable if the definition of Household Living is not met.
- Provided Webster Definition of Boardinghouse, which is defined as, "a lodging house at which meals are provided." This concept does not provide any such service. Discussed the City's interpretation of use, referencing Section 19.3.3.1(B). This section outlines the rights of the Administrator to determine the use if the proposed use is not listed.
- Presented highlighted emails to provide context of the discussions with Staff beginning in 2021.
- Addressed concerns about parking and that the revised parking plan was denied by Staff. Plans to incentivize alternative forms of transportation to alleviate parking

limitations as well as prohibit parking in front of neighboring homes as a condition of the lease.

- Presented the signed affidavit and maintains that he has complied with the terms of agreement. Presented emails defending the decision to install a \$70,000 sprinkler system in order to avoid stop-work orders from the City.
- Discussed the precedent of the project by providing examples of homes nearby that are split amongst roommates and the abundance of vehicles parked along neighborhood streets. Presented a screen capture of a website, Furnished Finder, where 67 bedrooms throughout Greenville are listed for rent within a single-family home.
- Stated that this concept is in line with what Greenville has been promoting as affordable alternatives to single-family homes.
- Asked Board what needs to change to make this concept acceptable in the household living use category. Requested the Board vote to find the project consistent with the Household Living category.
 - Board summarized lawsuit filed, corresponding timeline, and request for formal interpretation. Asked why, amidst a pending lawsuit, the interpretation request submitted.
 - Appellant explained that both his attorneys and those of the City discussed the course of action moving forward. The City recommended that a request for formal interpretation be submitted.
 - Board requested clarification regarding the amount of people permitted to reside in a room.
 - Appellant stated that each room is limited to one individual.

Official Appealed Presentation

Rivers Stilwell, 104 South Main Street Suite 900, Greenville SC

- Rivers Stilwell, legal counsel retained by the City of Greenville, spoke on behalf of the official appealed.
- Explained that administrative remedies should be exhausted before a lawsuit proceeds to court. Proposed a rezoning as a more appropriate course of action. Stated that the arguments made by the Appellant were based on policy and should be brought before City Council, not the Board of Zoning Appeals. Informed The Board about various action the board could consider, including calling witnesses and deferment.
- Summarized the timeline that led to this public hearing. The Appellant submitted permits under the Land Management Ordinance and began construction. The neighborhood was upset by the marketing material available online that advertised communal living. The City was made aware and challenged McPheely's concept as Single-Family Living in the R-6 district. The affidavit was signed to address concerns and assure The City and neighbors that the use would not be a Group Living use. The concept as it now exists, is contrary to the affidavit and more so aligns with the Land Management Ordinance's definition of a boardinghouse.
- Single-family living does not account for relation of individuals within the home but assumes that each member has access to each room within the dwelling. All spaces are shared, which is not consistent with the project.

- The lease regulations proposed by McPheely to mitigate disruption to the surrounding neighborhoods are not enforceable. The development may change hands in the future and regulations may not hold under new management, which prompted the lawsuit by the City.
- Discussed the General Group Living category and examples provided within the Greenville Development Code, including single room occupancy. Argued that the use can be both Household Living and Group Living. The use does not readily fit the boardinghouse definition, which is why the City has the authority to assign a use to a category it most resembles.
- Discussed the neighborhood surrounding this project having a rightful concern for parking and the likelihood of cars utilizing illegal street parking along their properties. Household living only requires eight parking spaces for the development, but group living requires twenty-four. A variance would be required to allow for more than the eight currently proposed parking spaces.
- While affordable housing is a valid policy argument, there is zoning designated to accommodate the density and additional requirements that is needed for a development of this size. The business model is highly profitable because it is utilizing land designated for single-family homes, while collecting rent from twenty-four individuals.
 - Board requested the Land Management Ordinance definition of boardinghouse.
 - Board asked which code this project is to be analyzed under.
 - This is to be reviewed under the Greenville Development Code, utilizing previous definitions in the Land Management Ordinance to guide interpretation. Reminded Board of affidavit.
 - Board asked how the City views similar uses such as roommate agreements.
 - The City does not seek out individuals sharing a dwelling unless complaints are made.
 - Board asked what the response would be if a house was rented to an individual and that individual rented it to twelve others.
 - Stilwell stated that the question has no bearing on the analysis. What matters is the intensity and density of the use, which is what makes this project out of character for the neighborhood and zoning designation.
 - Board asked if the Zoning Officer's Action is upheld, what alternatives would be allowed by the City for this development.
 - A use that does not align with group living is allowed. It would have to be a use that is appropriate for the zoning district and complies with the Greenville Development Code.
 - Board asked what administrative remedies are available.
 - Stated he did not want to speak for the Appellant, but escalating to Circuit Court is undesirable to all parties. The preferred course of action is that all can be resolved within the meeting.
 - Board asked about parking pad allowance and the infill ordinance.
 - Staff responded that Section 19-4.6.5 in the Greenville Development Code limits parking pad to 1,000 square feet for any dwelling.

Public Comments

Steve Buckingham, 16 Wellington Avenue, Greenville, SC

- Identified himself as Mr. McPheely's attorney. Reiterated that the reason for this hearing is an appeal of the zoning determination of whether or not the proposed project is consistent with the RH-C district. The law should be applied as written and is written to be classified as either household living or group living. It is possible to qualify a use under more than one classification. The City has only focused on group living and that is an improper use of discretion. The appeal should be granted.

Sharon Clarke, 26 Windsor Drive, Greenville, SC

- Spoke in opposition of project as a retired nurse who has lived in this neighborhood most of her life. Spoke about concerns regarding traffic and parking. This street is a high-volume street with no room for street parking. Expressed concern about setting a precedent for this type of development. The difference between existing single-room occupancy and this concept is it is new construction and is designed to be multiple rental properties and does not believe it aligns with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). It will not better serve the neighborhood. Felt that this was a zoning issue rather than an affordable housing discussion.

Edward Foster, 24 Wedgewood Dr., Greenville, SC

- Spoke in opposition of project with concerns as a neighbor whose shares a property line with the project. States the neighborhood has spoken to Mr. McPheely several times regarding parking concerns on Wedgewood Drive. The plans stated to remedy and mitigate concerns is unrealistic and unenforceable. There are no options for the remaining sixteen tenants seeking a place to park. Street parking affects school buses, fire trucks, and garbage trucks from maneuvering the neighborhood. Requested the Board enforce the law.

Kelsey Mathias, 30 Wedgewood Drive, Greenville, SC

- Spoke in opposition of project as a concerned neighbor with a young family. States her children, and twenty-four others, reside in the neighborhood. Mathias' husband approached the Appellant with concerns, to which McPheely responded "change is hard." Requested the Board protect the neighborhood and not bend to the project.

Joe Henson, 45 Wedgewood Drive, Greenville, SC

- Spoke in opposition of project as a person who has personally dealt with zoning issues in the past with a developer in Pickens County. The developer made promises to the Development Board that were not kept. There was no enforcement action so the only remedy was to contact the police department to no avail. This development will be the same. The

affidavit stated that the dwellings would be single-family and that is not what the project has become. Requested denial.

Diane Smock, 103 Cleveland Street, Greenville, SC

- Spoke in favor of project and presented her qualifications to demonstrate her ability to speak on this project and affordable housing. Acknowledged the affordable housing crisis, citing the deficiency of 7500 units within the city. Private sector must be accommodated to bridge this gap. There will be police officers and teachers renting these units, people who protect and help our community. This use is not group living or a boardinghouse, which require meals be provided. The City staff cannot impose their own interpretations to definitions. McPheely has been forthright from the beginning. The City did not raise any concerns before suing him without warning and using tactics to force him to install a \$70,000 sprinkler system with the threat of a stop work order. This will have a chilling effect on future endeavors for affordable housing development.

Don Oglesby, 3 Dunean Street, Greenville, SC

- Representative of Homes of Hope as an affordable housing developer. Disagreed with the statement that this project is not a conversation about affordable housing. Spoke in favor of project and felt disappointed in the response by the City. There is a project like this in Spartanburg that is now successful. The City's aggression is not reasonable or fair. The City's objections were an overreach. Requested that interpretation be reversed.

Susan McLarty, 204 East Hillcrest Drive, Greenville, SC

- Spoke in favor of project and outlined personal qualification to speak on topic of affordable housing. This project is pro-housing. McLarty teaches a master's course at Clemson and shared example of another teacher whose rent has increased 10 percent each year over three years. Presented an art piece done by Christopher, an individual who was experiencing homelessness and is now thriving. The organization was excited for the project. Requested waiver for Appellant.

Naomi Rustikova, 20 Wedgwood Drive, Greenville, SC

- Lives adjacent to property. Spoke in opposition of project. As a real estate investor, conducted a cash flow analysis with a 2.8-million-dollar debt burden. McPheely is unable to rent rooms for less than \$1,200 a month with an additional \$200 in fees. This project is falsely justified as affordable living. Discussed household living definition and how this project cannot be single-family homes while requiring parking for 24 cars. This has been a less than transparent developer. Expressed concerns that the homes will become nightly rentals. Presents state code language that protects the right to pursue legal remedy against any owner that infringes upon rights of owners on adjacent lands. Requested Board not set a precedent and deny this appeal.

Jerry Blassingame, 741 Rutherford Road, Greenville, SC

- Spoke in support of project as an individual who operates a non-profit. Understands what a boardinghouse is and disagrees that the project falls into this category. Participated in creative housing for people post-incarceration with a 96% success rate in rehabilitation. This project needs to continue further.

Bernie McPheely, (address not provided)

- Spoke in favor of project as the Appellant's father and an investor. Cited need for affordable housing and the proximity of location for essential workers as reasoning for this project's success. The City stated that projects like this would be duplicated in other areas in the City. The Appellant was always transparent from the first meeting. Questioned why any investor would trust a City that supported a project until right before it was complete.

Eliza Foster, 24 Wedgewood Drive, Greenville, SC

- Spoke in opposition and clarified the daycare that existed before the development. It was a single-family home that operated for a long time. The owner watched four children. Discussed deterrents when initially purchasing her home. Now, as a residential real estate professional, Foster informs clients to research the areas around the homes they are interested in to identify features that could deteriorate home values or detract from enjoyment of the property. The rules in place to protect neighborhoods are zoning and building codes. Foster would inform clients that a group home would detract from the values of the neighboring homes. The neighborhood could not find a compromise that allowed McPheely's project to coexist with the neighborhood.

Joy Grayson, Greenville, SC (street address unable to be transcribed)

- Agreed that the group living definition is a red herring. Asked Board to consider the purpose and intent of revising the old code in the first place. It was to provide flexibility and meet the needs of the ever-changing community. The code aims to promote quality new housing. These are high quality homes and are meant to meet affordable housing. Section 19-7.1.1 states all provisions should be considered in light of the intents and purposes of the code. The roadblocks that the city relied on cannot outweigh the intents of the code. No one can foresee the problems that may come of the development. To say that essential workers splitting rent could be compared to a fraternity or boardinghouse is preposterous.

Sandy Thompson, 1814 North Main Street, Greenville, SC

- Owns property next door as well as another nearby. Spoke in favor of project. Thompson and her husband own several rental homes. Urged Board to consider the code a work in progress. Asked that this appeal be granted as Greenville is growing and we need to grow with it. Zoning is the issue with the project. Mr. McPheely has addressed the parking and other concerns. It is not about what type of people who will live in the house, it is about Greenville's economy.

Nick Gilley, 8 David Street, Greenville, SC

- Identified himself as the contractor for Union House and spoke in favor of the project. Stated that building permits were issued in 2022 to begin construction on four single-family homes. 14 months later, the project is at a standstill and cannot proceed to inspections. In 19 years as a general contractor, a project has not taken this long or experienced such vandalism on site. The contracting company has been disrupted by the delays. Gilley is a resident of Rutherford Road and agreed that affordable housing is needed at this location.

Marc Mendes, 39 Richland Creek Drive, Greenville, SC

- Lives nearby subject property and spoke in opposition of the project. Defined apartment and stated that the definition aligned with the project, rather than the definition of single-family dwellings. These are rental properties requiring 24 cars. It is not enforceable to limit each room to a single occupant, creating the potential for 48 cars or more. Teachers, police, and firefighters need affordable housing, but property managers cannot choose who occupies the units. Discussed ability to tow cars and plans to address that issue within the community.

Scott Kingston 4 Majestic Oak Court, Greenville, SC

- Undecided about feelings regarding the project but leaning towards opposed. Stated that if the intent of this project is to be affordable housing, it should have been discussed from the beginning. This approach appears to be disingenuous. Proposed rent caps.

Osborne Brown, 23 Bridwell Avenue, Greenville, SC

- Spoke in favor of project as an individual also operating a rental and an investor in Union House. Was able to find tenants to rent the home and considers rental property an important asset. The opportunity for these to be affordable was brought up early in the project to investors. Disagrees that a home is determined by use of all space within the dwelling.

Paige McPheely, 306 Randall Street, Greenville, SC

- Spoke in favor of project as Appellant's wife. Spoke about the Union House Concept. Mr. and Mrs. McPheely disagreed about the process to establish concept as she recommended the project proceed quietly. Matt followed his instinct to be completely transparent and met with Shannon Lavrin. City Staff saw the plans and agreed to keep in contact through the rewrite of the Development Code to ensure the project would continue to be acceptable. Permits were granted. Has not heard a single code-based reason as to why this project should not be considered household living units. Cited AARP, which states 80% of households are not traditional nuclear families. 1 in every 5 households is made up of adults living with roommates. 1 of 3 is singles living alone. Demands for housing have changed, which the City acknowledged with

the development code rewrite. Greenville must adapt to this shift in housing demand.

Bryan De Bruin 2 Kinderwood Court

- Spoke as an attorney in favor for this project. Does not have an investment interest and lives nearby the property. Support derives from the fact that McPheely is a small business owner, not a developer. A problem was identified, and Union House was his proposed solution. McPheely invested his own money to address the affordability crisis and promote density. Now the City has increased his cost and timeline, which should be alarming to everyone. The neighborhood is fortunate to live in a fantastic community, but this issue of density and affordability is a city-wide issue. To address option for rezoning the property, De Bruin stated that he has personally undergone the rezoning process and would not recommend it. The City can change the new code to accommodate this use.

Appellant Rebuttal

- Acknowledged the concerns of neighbors and stated this was the reason the code was rewritten. It was written to accommodate new solutions to identified problems in the City that had been prioritized. If projects like this are not supported, others will not attempt to provide a product that addresses the need for housing. Stated that he was not attempting to persuade anyone to like the concept or design, rather that investments can be made and trust that they will be fulfilled.

Board Discussion

- Stephanie Gates stated that the board could not apply conditions to the affirmation of action. Vice Chairman, Seph Wunder, referenced slideshow which indicates that the Board may modify the Zoning Official's action and requested staff explain the option further.
 - Ross Zelenske informed the Board that the option to modify the action is a standard comment. In this case, the Board's options are to affirm or reverse the Zoning Official's action. Staff stated that conditions would not be applicable, as discussion revolves around the use itself and whether it meets the definition of general group living. Clarified what the option to modify action is.
- Mark Herro summarized the difficulty of the decision as the Appellant began construction under the Land Management Ordinance, and continued into the Greenville Development Code, effective July 15, 2023. The affidavit was discussed as the Appellant agreed to operate under single-family residential standards.
- The Board reiterated that the dwellings have six bedrooms and six bathrooms to house unrelated individuals. While the Appellant did state that each dwelling would operate under a singular master lease, a member of the public expressed concern about the difficulty of enforcement. Mark Herro agreed that lack of ability to enforce is problematic. Code is somewhat ambiguous, and affordable housing and density are not applicable.
- Seph Wunder began the discussion regarding the intent of the Land Management Ordinance, specifically Section 19-1.1.3, which encourages quality

and diversity of housing. The Greenville Development Code has ambiguous language that creates difficulty in interpretation and left the Board in need of guidance. The Vice Chairman expressed that the lawyers of the Board should utilize their training to interpret the ordinance. Lauren Rounsville agreed that the language is somewhat ambiguous. The arguments for affordable housing were appreciated, but unapplicable in this situation.

- The Board reiterates the intent section of the document, which promotes affordable, diverse, and dense housing. The Board discussed legal theory and how it applies to situations that are not directly addressed in the ordinance.
- The Board discussed the nine criteria used by the Administrator to determine if a use is appropriate and if a use should reach that review if it does not clearly fit into one category or the other. Stephanie Gates asked if the discussion was to identify the use as either group living or household living. The Board agreed but reiterated that the question was if the use met the definition and standards of household living.
- Gates stated that the dwelling has one kitchen, one living room, and multiple bedrooms: the same as any house. The Board agreed. Gates asked if the distinction lies in whether the rooms are individually rented out. The dwelling structures themselves are not outside of compliance. The Board directed their attention to the marketing material, as it would define the use.
- The Board asked staff to clarify the option to modify the Zoning Official's action. Staff stated that it is standard language but is not applicable to this case. The Board then reiterated that, in this case, the only way to modify the action is to reverse the action. Rounsville referenced the marketing material, and it stated the dwelling consisted of four bedrooms with bathrooms and two offices with bathrooms. The offices could be used as bedrooms since they also have bathrooms.
- A member of The Board stated that group living appeared to be the appropriate classification due to the revolving tenancy of multiple individuals within the dwelling. Wunder expressed concern with drawing a line regarding rentals and the precedent it would set.
- The Board discussed the Appellant testimony that cited 67 dwellings in the City that rented by the room. Gates stated that many dwellings are occupied by roommates and the Board agreed. Staff's argument is that this use is a boarding house, therefore classified as group living. If it is not household living, it must be group living. Gates referenced the definition of group living, which states that facilities have a common eating area, and the residents may receive care, training, or treatment. Several members of the Board agree.
- Herro pointed out the use of the word "may," to which Wunder attributed to poorly written language. Instead of "may," the desired wording should be "shall." The Board reiterated the previously introduced definitions of "boardinghouse" under various entities including Webster's Dictionary and Wikipedia.
- Mark Herro made a motion to affirm the Zoning Official's action based upon the fact that the development should fall under the group living use. Particularly in points 1,2,3,7, and 9 of the Administrator's Zoning Verification Letter. These points outlined the projected characteristics of the use, the amount and nature of nuisances generated on the premises, the type, size, nature, and arrangement of buildings and structures, the number of vehicle trips generated, and the likely impact on adjacent properties being negative.

***Motion: Mark Herro moved to affirm A 23-747.**

***Motion Fails**

- Stephanie Gates motioned to reverse the Zoning Official's action based upon the fact that the use meets the household living classification within the residential use category, therefore does not meet the group living classification.

***Stephanie Gates moved to reverse A 23-747.**

- Rounsville expressed that more discussion was needed.

***Motion Fails**

- The Board discussed the ambiguity of the language and the option to subpoena a witness to provide clarity. Gates clarified reason behind previous motion. Rounsville expressed the multifamily classification was more appropriate since 24 people are to be living on a subdivided lot that was once a single dwelling.
- Gates stated that multi-unit living would be appropriate if living spaces were not shared. Rounsville acknowledged using the wrong term, as she meant to state that group living was the appropriate classification.
- Gates read aloud the conditions of group living and household living, referencing Section 19-3.3.2 *Residential Uses* of the Greenville Development Code. Provided the subcategories of Household Living, the Board agreed the use aligned with Single-Unit Living. Group Living is defined as a group of people living together that do not meet the definition of household living. Wunder explained that the examples of group living do not pertain to this situation, as the use already meets household living standards. The intent of the ordinance is to promote diverse housing.

***Stephanie Gates moved to reverse A 23-747.**

***Krish Patel Seconded**

***Motion to reverse passed 3-2. Herro and Rounsville voted against the motion.**

Chris Price returns to the meeting.

10. Other Business

A. Staff updates

i. November 2023 meeting

1. Staff explained that the most senior member would run the meeting as the current chair and vice chair would no longer be on the Board and that elections would need to be held.

ii. Reminder of board and commission training

iii. Update on Board bylaws

iv. Update on Current Planning projects

1. Update on the Airport Plan
2. Thanked Board Members for their experience and service.

11. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:28 p.m.

Staff Present: Mike Spinelli, Assistant City Attorney; Mary Douglas Hirsch, Planning Administrator (attended virtually); Kristopher Kurjiaka, Principal Development Planner; Ross Zelenske, Senior Development Planner; Sharon Key, Planning Coordinator.

Minutes prepared by Sharon Key, Amanda Oler, and Ross Zelenske.

STATEMENT OF POTENTIAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST

TO: Chairperson or Presiding Officer of the Board of Zoning Appeals

FROM: Christopher L. Price

Pursuant to South Carolina Code Section 8-13-700(b), I make this statement concerning the matter described below, action or decision upon which will directly affect an economic interest as contemplated by the Ethics, Government Accountability Campaign Reform Act of 1991:

A. The matter requiring action or decision is as follows:

Meeting Date: 10-12-2023

Agenda Item No.: A 23-747 Subject: Union House

Agenda Item No.: _____ Subject: _____

Agenda Item No.: _____ Subject: _____

B. The nature of my potential conflict is as follows:

I have an economic interest which will be affected by the action.

A member of my immediate family has an economic interest which will be directly affected.

An individual with whom I am associated has an economic interest which will be affected.

A business with which I am associated has an economic interest which will be affected.

I hereby withdraw from any votes, deliberation or other actions on this matter and request that my disqualification and the grounds therefore be noted in the minutes.

Date: 10-09-2023 Signature: 

STAFF LIAISON SHALL NOTE THIS ABSTENTION AND THE ABOVE GROUNDS IN THE MINUTES. THIS STATEMENT SHALL BE ATTACHED TO THE MINUTES.


Chairperson or Presiding Officer