



AGENDA
Greer Board of Zoning Appeals

March 2, 2026
Meeting Location: Greer City Hall - 2nd Floor
301 East Poinsett Street
Greer, SC 29651

5:30 PM
Regular Meeting

Call to Order & Establishment of Quorum

Approval of Minutes

1. February 2026 Board of Zoning Appeals Meeting Minutes

Approval of Findings of Fact / Written Orders

1. BZAA 25-01 Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Staff Updates

Adjournment

Notice under Language Access

Persons requiring language assistance to effectively participate in this event may contact the Planning and Development Department at 864.801.2009, or by email at planning@cityofgreersc.gov, to request interpretation and/or translation services as soon as possible, but no later than three business days before the event or deadline date. Additional information on language access and meaningful access to government services may be found under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act.

Aviso sobre Acceso al Idioma

Las personas que necesiten asistencia con el idioma para participar eficazmente en este evento pueden comunicarse con el Departamento de Planificación y Desarrollo al 864.801.2009 o por correo electrónico a planning@cityofgreersc.gov para solicitar servicios de interpretación o traducción lo antes posible, a más tardar tres días hábiles antes del evento o de la fecha límite. Puede encontrar información adicional sobre acceso al idioma y acceso significativo a los servicios gubernamentales en el Título VI de la Ley de Derechos Civiles.

Notice Under the Americans with Disabilities Act

Anyone who requires an auxiliary aid or service for effective communication or a modification of policies or procedures to participate in a program, service, activity or

public meeting of the City of Greer should contact Keith Choate, ADA Coordinator at (864) 848-5386 as soon as possible, but no later than 48 hours prior to the scheduled event.

Aviso según la Ley de Estadounidenses con Discapacidades

Cualquier persona que requiera ayuda o servicio auxiliar para una comunicación efectiva o una modificación de políticas o procedimientos para participar en un programa, servicio, actividad o reunión pública de la Ciudad de Greer debe comunicarse con Keith Choate, Coordinador de ADA al (864) 848-5386 lo antes posible, pero no más tarde de 48 horas antes del evento programado.



MINUTES
Greer Board of Zoning Appeals

February 9, 2026
Meeting Location: Greer City Hall - 2nd Floor
301 East Poinsett Street
Greer, SC 29651

5:30 PM
Regular Meeting

Members Present: Mike Norris, Chair
Monica Ragin Hughey, Vice-Chair
Steve Griffin
Emily Tsesmeloglou
Nick Uva
Dawn ZaBelle

Members Absent: William Crosby

Staff Present: Alex Cahill, Planning & Development Department Director
Joe Holbrooks, Community Standards & Compliance Manager
Ashley Kaade, Planning Manager
Heather Stahl, Planner II
Andy Boyles, Planner

Call to Order & Establishment of Quorum

Mr. Norris called the meeting to order at 5:30pm and read the opening remarks to begin the meeting.

Approval of Minutes

1. December 2025 Board of Zoning Appeals Meeting Minutes

ACTION – *Mr. Griffin made a motion to approve the minutes from the December 2025 BZA meeting. Mr. Uva seconded the motion. The motion passed with a vote of 6-0.*

Election of Officers

Mr. Norris called for the election of BZA officers for the 2026 calendar year. He first asked for volunteers or nominations for the position of BZA Chair.

ACTION – *Mr. Uva made a motion to re-elect Mr. Norris as BZA Chair. Dr. Hughey seconded the motion. The motion passed with a vote of 6-0.*

Mr. Norris then asked for volunteers or nominations for the position of BZA Vice-Chair.

ACTION – *Dr. Hughey volunteered herself and made a motion to elect herself as BZA Vice-Chair. Mr. Uva seconded the motion. The motion passed with a vote of 6-0.*

Mr. Norris closed the election of officers portion of the meeting.

Swearing-in of Witnesses

Mr. Norris asked all those who intended to speak on a case to please stand up and raise their right hand. He then administered the following oath:

“Do you solemnly swear or affirm that the testimony you are about to give before this Board of Zoning Appeals is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, under penalty of law?”

Those who intended to speak on any case on the evening’s agenda affirmed this oath and took their seats.

Case Hearing

Mr. Norris read a brief statement introducing the night’s cases and the standard procedure for hearing each case.

1. BZAA 25-01 - 205 Galena Lane

Mr. Norris introduced the sole case on the meeting’s agenda, BZAA 25-01. He described the nature of the case as an appeal of an administrative decision to issue a zoning violation letter for the appellant’s 2019 Home Occupation permit. He opened the hearing for the case and asked Staff to proceed with their presentation on the matter.

Ms. Kaade came forward to present Staff’s analysis of the case. She listed the violations of the Home Occupation permit for which the appellant was cited before calling forward Joe Holbrooks to present the facts of the case as well as give details about the relevant code enforcement actions.

Mr. Holbrooks walked through the background of the case, describing the circumstances that led to the issuance of the zoning violation letter. He explained that a code enforcement officer was first sent to the property as a result of an anonymous complaint from a neighbor. He walked the Board through the initial inspection, re-inspection, and issuance of the letter.

Ms. Kaade then returned to finalize Staff's presentation, explaining which specific standards were being violated by the appellant's actions, in Staff's opinion. She also reminded the Board of what they were voting on – to affirm, modify, or reverse Staff's decision to issue a zoning violation letter for these violations.

Mr. Norris asked if there were any questions for Staff at this time.

Mr. Uva asked to see the presentation slide which outlined the UDO standards said to be violated. He then asked if the UDO defined "storage". Ms. Kaade said that it did not define storage in this (home occupation) capacity.

Mr. Uva also asked if a sale had been made at this property. Mr. Holbrooks said that they did not have any evidence of a sale beyond the initial anonymous complaint, which centered around the apparent sale of vehicles.

Mr. Uva expressed that he had difficulty understanding how having these vehicles at this home constituted a nuisance. He asked if the UDO defined how many parked vehicles constitutes a nuisance. Ms. Kaade responded by saying that the anonymous neighbor calling to complain was evidence of a nuisance to the neighborhood.

Mr. Uva asked for clarification on where this home occupation's business dealings actually take place. He said that he knew the home address was listed on the business license but wondered where sales actually took place. Ms. Kaade said that that is a question best directed toward the appellant.

Mr. Norris called the appellant forward to present their arguments.

Sandtario Horsey (appellant) & Jessie Carroll (appellant's attorney) came forward.

Ms. Carroll explained that they were appealing Staff's decision to issue a zoning violation letter in connection with her client's car dealership home occupation.

Ms. Carroll started by saying that her client's business license is for automobile wholesale only, meaning that he cannot sell to the general public. She stated that Mr. Horsey has to sell his vehicles at auction, meaning that he could not have been selling cars at his home.

Ms. Carroll claimed that Mr. Horsey has an off-site storage location that he rents to actually store his inventory, stating that he may sometimes bring a car home as he moves it from storage to the auction, where he can sell it. She said that in a previous conversation about this case with the City Attorney, they agreed that this overnight storage does not constitute storage.

Ms. Carroll spoke about enforcement issues with this code. She said that the pictures that were presented earlier to the board as a part of Staff's presentation (showing numerous cars on the property) were taken the day

that Mr. Horsey was hosting a neighborhood barbeque, meaning that it was not reflective of how the property looks like day-to-day. She also said that the cars shown by those pictures did not have dealer plates on them.

Ms. Carroll said that Mr. Horsey has a number of friends in the same line of work, which can explain the multiple dealer tags present in his driveway at times, as friends and associates might be visiting his home.

Ms. Carroll recapped her argument, explaining that the cars in Mr. Horsey's driveway were not violating the UDO's prohibition on the outdoor storage of commercial inventory in connection with a Home Occupation permit because:

- a) Mr. Horsey cannot sell to the general public and has to sell his cars at auction*
- b) Most of the cars shown in Staff's presentation do not belong to him.*
- c) Those cars that do belong to him and are parked in the driveway are only there as he moves them between his storage lot and the auction site.*

Ms. Carroll said that she thought that the enforcement of these standards was very difficult because of the various factors which could make it seem like he is violating the code (i.e., friends visiting and having their cars in Mr. Horsey's driveway) when he is actually in compliance. She said that she did not think that the City had met its burden of proof in issuing this violation letter.

Ms. Carroll also cited Mr. Horsey's years of doing business in good standing with the municipality & community as proof that he had not violated the code in this case.

She referenced various affidavits that they had submitted as a part of this appeal process, written by neighbors saying that Mr. Horsey was a good neighbor and not a nuisance.

Ms. Carroll recapped her arguments again:

- a) There was no sale of cars at 205 Galena Lane, since Mr. Horsey's wholesale auto dealer license does not permit him to do so.*
- b) Mr. Horsey has an off-site storage location, so outdoor storage of commercial inventory is not an issue.*
- c) The affidavits in support of Mr. Horsey prove that he is not a nuisance in the neighborhood, contradicting the initial complaint that the City received.*
- d) He is hardly running his home occupation out of his home.*

Ms. Carroll asked that the Board overturn Staff's decision and said that they would be available for questions.

Mr. Norris thanked the appellants and asked for questions.

Mr. Uva asked if there was an HOA in this community. Mr. Horsey said that there was not.

Mr. Norris opened the floor for further public comment. Seeing none, he closed the opportunity for further public comment and asked the Board if they had any additional questions for Staff or the appellant.

Mr. Uva asked for clarification on the general Home Occupation permit standards, confirming that indoor sales & storage was permitted, but outdoor sales & storage was not. He said that there was no indication that outdoor sales were taking place at this location.

When Mr. Uva referred back to the UDO's lack of a definition for storage, Ms. Kaade responded by stating that it does define storage for commercial properties, just not for situations like this (Home Occupations).

Mr. Uva said that he did not feel like the presence of dealer tags on the cars made them commercial vehicles before returning to the commercial inventory storage question. He said that without a definition of Home Occupation outdoor storage of commercial inventory in the UDO, he didn't see it as a problem.

Ms. Kaade explained that, in Staff's interpretation, the presence of these cars on the property constituted outdoor storage because they were merchandise to be sold related to a business, stored outside the home.

Mr. Norris said that the definition of commercial vehicles is difficult. Ms. Kaade responded by stating that Staff is not purporting these to be commercial vehicles – just outdoor storage.

Mr. Griffin asked the appellant to come back up to the podium and confirmed the nature of the wholesale auto business with him. He asked Mr. Horsey if he brings the cars home just before transporting them to another location for storage/sale. Mr. Horsey said that he brings the cars home when he transfers them between locations. Mr. Griffin asked why he doesn't drive it to the storage location to begin with. Mr. Horsey said that it is sometimes late by the time he makes the transfer, so he goes home rather than making another stop by the storage location. He then drives the car to the auction the next morning. Mr. Griffin asked how that works with multiple cars already in his driveway. Mr. Horsey said that he has two dealer plates and other people live with him, so not all of the cars shown in the aforementioned pictures belong to him. Mr. Griffin asked about how the cars were tagged, and Mr. Horsey explained his dealer plates.

Mr. Griffin asked Staff for more details about the initial complaint which led to the investigation and the issuance of the zoning violation letter. Mr. Holbrooks said that the person called in, made the complaint, and requested to be anonymous. Ms. Kaade explained that anonymous complaints are not uncommon. Staff investigates them and issues violations if the complaints are found to be true/valid. Ms. Kaade said that the code enforcement officer did make contact with the property owner on the day of the investigation and that the owner did say that the three vehicles were under one dealer tag.

Mr. Griffin asked if the affidavits in support of the appellant had been made available to the City and asked for Staff's response. Ms. Kaade said that Staff had received the affidavits but did not find them relevant to the case, as Staff's decision was based on whether or not the violated the ordinance.

Ms. Tsesseloglou noted that some people might have a problem with something that others are fine with.

Mr. Uva returned to the question of the definition of storage in this case, referencing the law dictionary, which defined storage as goods and materials that are not in transit but in long-term containment, holding, or placement. Mr. Uva said that he did not see simply parking these cars in the driveway overnight as meeting this definition.

Ms. Tsesseloglou noted that, at least in the pictures provided, it appeared to be daytime, so it is not just an overnight phenomenon. Mr. Horsey said that when those pictures were taken, it was his birthday and the day after Thanksgiving, and that he was having a barbeque/cookout, so most of the cars pictured were not his.

Mr. Norris asked about the average volume of cars in the driveway. Mr. Horsey said maybe two. Ms. Carroll said that Mr. Horsey and his sister own the house together.

Mr. Griffin asked Staff if they would have even known about this situation if they had not received the initial complaint. Mr. Holbrooks said that they would not have made a response without the complaint.

Mr. Uva asked if there was only the one complaint.

Mr. Griffin said that it appeared to him that the business is in violation of the UDO, but wondered what difference it made if it was not bothering people. He said that bringing the cars home overnight probably violated various UDO standards but was not convinced that a change was needed if people in the neighborhood don't mind. Mr. Griffin asked Mr. Horsey if he could find out another way to operate his business so that he did not bring his cars home.

Ms. Carroll expressed concerns about the possibility of recurring "violations" if people keep calling to complain even if most of the community is on Mr. Horsey's side. She said that the ambiguity of the UDO's standards make things difficult.

Mr. Uva said that he did not see how the City had met its burden of proof on any of the supposed violations. He said that there were no sales happening on the property (and certainly not outside, where it is prohibited), one complaint does not constitute a nuisance (needs to be multiple complaints to reach that level), these aren't commercial vehicles, and the activity does not meet the legal definition of storage, which he defined as long-term containment. He also said that the only automotive use expressly prohibited in connection with a Home Occupation permit in the UDO is automotive repair, which this is not. In sum, he said it was his intent to vote to reverse the

administrative decision because he did not see proof of how this violated the code.

Dr. Hughey asked the appellant to clarify his business model, asking whether he had a separate storage location in addition to the places where he sells his vehicles at auction. Dr. Hughey asked if it would not be possible to just take the cars to the storage location if Mr. Horsey cannot get them to the auction site on time just to avoid further potential violations. Ms. Carroll said that her argument back was that there is still not a clear definition of what the guidelines are, so Mr. Horsey would be changing his business model based on an ambiguous ordinance. Dr. Hughey said that regardless, the storage facility might be utilized more just to avoid future issues until such a time as the ordinance was made clearer. Mr. Uva said that that would be on the planners, reiterating his view that the UDO needs a clearer definition of storage in connection with a home occupation. Until such a definition is adopted, Mr. Uva said we ought to use the legal definition of long-term containment, which he said this is not.

Ms. Tsesmeloglou asked about the consequences of the zoning violation letter, asking for clarification about what is being affirmed or reversed. Ms. Kaade said that the Board's decision is whether the zoning violation should be upheld or thrown out. In terms of resolution, Ms. Kaade said that that would be removing the vehicles from the property. Mr. Holbrooks said that if the Board affirms the administrative decision to issue the violation, Staff would proceed with enforcement. They would give a window of time to bring the property into compliance, and if the property is not brought into compliance by the end of that time, then Staff would issue a summons to municipal court. Mr. Holbrooks then explained some further aspects of the enforcement process.

Mr. Uva reiterated that he had trouble understanding the City's rationale behind considering these cars prohibited. Mr. Holbrooks said that the City was not considering these cars commercial vehicles, but the storage of commercial inventory, the outdoor storage of which is prohibited in connection with a home occupation. Mr. Uva said again that he didn't see this as storage because it wasn't long-term containment, and Mr. Horsey wasn't selling anything online. Mr. Holbrooks said that the outdoor storage of merchandise on the property, regardless of where that merchandise is sold, is still an issue.

Mr. Griffin said that if the cars are stored on the property overnight, he considers that storage. He said his main issue was that Mr. Horsey has an alternative way of conducting his business and he was wondering why Mr. Horsey would not take that route to avoid the issue altogether, as Dr. Hughey had previously pointed out.

Ms. Carroll said that it was the City's burden to prove that a prohibited action was taking place, which is difficult due to all the various definitions of storage and the ambiguity of the code itself.

Mr. Uva said that that is why he is basing his decision on the law dictionary's definition of storage.

Mr. Cahill came forward to remind the Board that the UDO explicitly empowers the Planning Director or their designee (in this case, Ms. Kaade) to interpret & apply the code. It is not based on case law or something of that sort. That is how the appeal came to be, as Staff interpreted the code as they are empowered to do.

Ms. Carroll said that there was a case about the construction of an ordinance that is relevant to this case (Charleston County Parks & Rec. v. Somners – 319 South Carolina 65), which deals with the matter of the interpretation of ordinances.

Mr. Norris closed the hearing and opened the board discussion of the case.

Mr. Griffin said that having a bunch of cars in a neighbor's driveway might bother him. Mr. Uva reiterated his arguments against the affirmation of the administrative decision.

Dr. Hughey also highlighted some other ways in which this home occupation might be in violation of the UDO, stating that it did not stick to selling things online or by phone. Mr. Uva offered a rebuttal, pointing out that home occupation businesses do not have to limit themselves to exclusively online sales by the UDO standards.

Mr. Norris called for a vote on the matter at hand.

ACTION – *Mr. Griffin made a motion to affirm the administrative decision to issue a zoning violation letter for home occupation violations at 205 Galena Lane. Ms. Tsesmeloglou seconded the motion. The motion passed with a vote of 5-1, with Mr. Uva voting against the motion.*

****Mr. Uva tried to make a motion to reverse the administrative action; however, at that time, Mr. Griffin's motion to affirm it was already on the floor.*

New Business

Mr. Norris opened the New Business section of the meeting.

1. Board of Zoning Appeals Rules of Procedure

Mr. Cahill came forward to give the Board its training on the new Board of Zoning Appeals Rules of Procedure.

After Mr. Cahill's presentation, Ms. Kaade asked if the Board would like more time to consider the new Rules of Procedure before officially adopting them. The Board said no.

ACTION – *Mr. Uva made a motion to approve the Board of Zoning Appeals Rules of Procedure. Dr. Hughey seconded the motion. The motion passed with a vote of 5-0.*

Staff Updates

Mr. Norris asked for staff updates.

Ms. Kaade welcomed Ms. ZaBelle to the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Adjournment

Mr. Griffin made a motion to adjourn. Dr. Hughey seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 6:49pm.

Notice under Language Access

Persons requiring language assistance to effectively participate in this event may contact the Planning and Development Department at 864.801.2009, or by email at planning@cityofgreersc.gov, to request interpretation and/or translation services as soon as possible, but no later than three business days before the event or deadline date. Additional information on language access and meaningful access to government services may be found under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act.

Aviso sobre Acceso al Idioma

Las personas que necesiten asistencia con el idioma para participar eficazmente en este evento pueden comunicarse con el Departamento de Planificación y Desarrollo al 864.801.2009 o por correo electrónico a planning@cityofgreersc.gov para solicitar servicios de interpretación o traducción lo antes posible, a más tardar tres días hábiles antes del evento o de la fecha límite. Puede encontrar información adicional sobre acceso al idioma y acceso significativo a los servicios gubernamentales en el Título VI de la Ley de Derechos Civiles.

Notice Under the Americans with Disabilities Act

Anyone who requires an auxiliary aid or service for effective communication or a modification of policies or procedures to participate in a program, service, activity or public meeting of the City of Greer should contact Keith Choate, ADA Coordinator at (864) 848-5386 as soon as possible, but no later than 48 hours prior to the scheduled event.

Aviso según la Ley de Estadounidenses con Discapacidades

Cualquier persona que requiera ayuda o servicio auxiliar para una comunicación efectiva o una modificación de políticas o procedimientos para participar en un programa, servicio, actividad o reunión pública de la Ciudad de Greer debe comunicarse con Keith Choate, Coordinador de ADA al (864) 848-5386 lo antes posible, pero no más tarde de 48 horas antes del evento programado.



Board of Zoning Appeals Written Decision Order

Docket Number:	BZAA 25-01
Case Type:	Appeal of an Administrative Decision
Property Address:	205 Galena Lane
Tax Map Numbers:	5-18-00-080.00
County:	Spartanburg
Applicant Name:	Sandtario Horsey
Applicant Address:	205 Galena Lane
Request:	A request to appeal an administrative decision to issue a violation letter (CE25-00779) for the applicant’s 2019 Home Occupation (P19-038230).
Date of Board Action:	February 9, 2026
Action:	The Board voted 5-1 to affirm the Administrative Decision.

This matter came before the Board of Zoning Appeals (“Board”) on February 9, 2026 upon Sandtario Horey’s appeal from the administrative zoning enforcement decision (CE25-00779) finding him in violation of his 2019 Home Application Permit (P19-038230). Present before the Board was Ashley Kaade, Planning Manager with the City of Greer; Joseph Holbrooks, Codes Enforcement Officer with the City of Greer; the applicant/appellant, Sandtario Horsey; and Jessie Carroll, attorney for the Applicant. After careful consideration of the evidence before the Board, including the materials prepared by the City and the Applicant and arguments of counsel, the Board makes the following findings of facts and conclusions of law:

Findings of Fact

1. In 2019, Sandtario Horsey applied for an received a home occupation permit for his property located at 205 Galena Lane, Greer, SC 29651 (the “Property”).
2. On August 7, 2025, Greer Planning Staff issued a zoning violation letter for Home Occupation violations after receiving complaints about a number of cars parked in the driveway of the home located at 205 Galena Lane, Greer, SC 29651 (the “Property”). These vehicles were found to be licensed to a car dealer associated with the Home Occupation permit.
3. Greer Planning Staff determined that the vehicles located on the Property constituted outdoor storage and/or the storage of commercial vehicles, neither of which is permitted with Home Occupations. The zoning violation letter was issued for noncompliance with UDO Sections 4.7.A.3, 5, & 9 (pages 155-156), which provides as follows: “3. No outdoor sales or storage nor commercial vehicles shall be permitted in connection with the home occupation; 5. The home occupation shall not be a nuisance or cause any undue disturbance in the neighborhood; and 9. Permitted home occupations include businesses conducted exclusively by phone or computer, internet-based sales, personal services such as instruction,



Board of Zoning Appeals Written Decision Order

home-based food productions that does not require commercial equipment.”

4. Mr. Horsey timely appealed the zoning violation letter.

5. On December 1, 2025, upon review of Mr. Horsey’s appeal, Greer Planning Staff issued a report and recommended affirming the administrative decision.

6. At the hearing, Ashley Kaade, the City Planning Manager, presented Planning Staff’s analysis of the case and explained the violations of the Home Occupation Permit. Mrs. Kaade’s presentation is made a part of the record herein. In addition, Joe Holbrooks, the City Codes Enforcement Officer, presented the facts of the case, the relevant code enforcement violations, and introduced pictures showing cars at the property with dealer tags.

7. Ms. Carroll presented the appellant’s case. The summary of Mr. Horsey’s position is as follows: That his business is for automobile wholesale only, and the sale of vehicles can occur only at auction and not from his home; that he has an off-site storage location, but that he sometimes brings a car home as he moves it from storage to auction; and, that most of the cars shown on his property as part of the City’s presentation do not belong to him. Ms. Carroll presented affidavits to demonstrate that Mr. Horsey’s property is not a nuisance.

Standard of Review

Pursuant to S.C. Code Ann. §6-29-800(A)(1), the Board is granted the authority “to hear and decide appeals where it is alleged there is error in an order, requirement, decision, or determination made by an administrative official in the enforcement of the zoning ordinance.”

Conclusions of Law

1. The Board of Zoning Appeals and Adjustments has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to Section 6-29-800(A)(1), South Carolina Code of Laws, and the City of Greer Unified Development Ordinance (“UDO”).

2. The administrative decision being appealed arose from staff’s determination that multiple vehicles located on the subject property were licensed to a car dealership associated with the Appellant’s approved Home Occupation permit and therefore constituted commercial vehicles and/or outdoor storage in connection with a home occupation, which is expressly prohibited by UDO Section 4.7(A)(3).

3. The zoning violation letter (CE25-00779) was issued in accordance with the authority granted to the UDO Administrator under the Unified Development Ordinance.

4. The Appellant holds an active Home Occupation approval and maintains a dealership license associated with that approval, and that multiple vehicles bearing dealership tags were repeatedly observed and documented on the subject property by Code Enforcement staff.



Board of Zoning Appeals Written Decision Order

5. According to UDO Section 4.7(A)(3) outdoor storage and commercial vehicles “in connection with the home occupation” is prohibited. Furthermore, the UDO regulates land use impacts and observable conditions, not solely the Appellant’s stated intent. The presence, quantity, and licensing status of the vehicles support staff’s determination that the use exceeded what is permitted for a residential home occupation regardless of the Appellant’s assertion that the vehicles are for personal use.

6. The Board finds that the zoning administrator correctly interpreted and applied UDO Sections 4.7(A)(3), (5), and (9) in issuing the violation letter, and that the administrative decision was neither arbitrary nor capricious, but supported by the entire record herein, including documented inspections, complaints, and ordinance standards.

7. Planning staff followed all applicable procedures, applied the ordinance consistently, and acted within the scope of their administrative duties. The Appellant did not provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the administrative decision was made in error, was arbitrary, or was contrary to the UDO.

Conclusion

Based upon the foregoing, pursuant to a majority vote (5-1) by the Board, the Board finds and concludes that the Appellant has not met the burden of proof required to overturn the administrative decision. Accordingly, the Board finds that the administrative decision is supported by the preponderance of the evidence and must be affirmed.

Signatures

Chair Signature: _____

Date: _____

Staff Signature: _____

Date: _____