

**TOWN OF ELKTON
BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
AUGUST 20, 2015
MINUTES**

Present: Robert Olewine; Shirley Hicks; Charles E. Cramer, Jr.; Dawn Schwartz; James Cooney; Lisa M. Hamilton Blackson, Esq., Legal Counsel; Charles A. Bromwell, Director, Building & Zoning

Absent: None

Mr. Olewine called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

ACTION: Motion was made by Ms. Hicks to approve the minutes from the July 16, 2015 meeting as amended. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cramer and unanimously approved.

CASE # 1480 – REQUEST OF MCCRONE, INC. REPRESENTING 503 E. PULASKI LLC FOR THE FOLLOWING VARIANCES: 1) TWENTY NINE (29) FOOT FRONT SETBACK VARIANCE FOR A MONUMENT SIGN; 2) EIGHTEEN (18) FOOT FRONT SETBACK VARIANCE FOR A ‘FORD’ GROUND SIGN; 3) FIFTEEN (15) FOOT FRONT SETBACK VARIANCE FOR A ‘FORD TRUCK’ GROUND SIGN; 4) THREE (3) ADDITIONAL WALL SIGNS; 5) EXCEED THE ALLOWABLE SQUARE FOOTAGE FOR A WALL SIGN BY THIRTY TWO (32) SQUARE FEET; 5) SEVEN FOOT, EIGHT AND A HALF INCH (7’8 ½”) HEIGHT VARIANCE FOR “FORD” GROUND SIGN. THIS ACTION CONCERNS PROPERTY LOCATED AT 503 E. PULASKI HIGHWAY, ELKTON, MARYLAND, TAX MAP 315, PARCEL 2043, ZONED C-2

Mr. David Strouss of McCrone, Inc., Mr. Mark Hyman of Ramsey Ford and Mr. Scott Carver of I-Mark Builders were in attendance to address this request. They were sworn in.

Mr. Olewine asked if the signage being requested is typical of all dealership sign requirements. Mr. Strouss confirmed that they are part of the new dealership package required by Ford. He stated it is similar to what you might see at Williams Family Automotive or Hertrich.

Mr. Strouss reviewed the sign package and locations where they wish to place the signage. He noted their request for a setback variance is in line with numerous other businesses along Route 40. It was noted the property is approximately 2.8 acres and has 477 linear feet of street frontage.

Mr. Olewine entertained questions or comment from the audience. There were none.

MOTION: Motion was made by Ms. Schwartz to approve the twenty nine (29) foot front setback variance for a monument sign for Ramsey Ford. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hicks and unanimously approved.

MOTION: Motion was made by Ms. Schwartz to approve the eighteen (18) foot front setback variance for a 'Ford' ground sign for Ramsey Ford. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hicks and unanimously approved.

MOTION: Motion was made by Ms. Schwartz to approve the fifteen (15) foot front setback variance for a 'Ford Truck' ground sign for Ramsey Ford. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cramer and unanimously approved.

MOTION: Motion was made by Ms. Hicks to approve three (3) additional wall signs for Ramsey Ford. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cramer and unanimously approved.

MOTION: Motion was made by Ms. Schwartz to approve the variance request to exceed the allowable square footage for a wall sign by thirty two (32) square feet for Ramsey Ford. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hicks and unanimously approved.

MOTION: Motion was made by Ms. Schwartz to approve the seven foot, eight and a half inch (7'8 ½") height variance for a 'Ford' ground sign for Ramsey Ford. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hicks and unanimously approved.

CASE # 1479 – REQUEST OF THOMAS C. JONES, 105 SOUTH STREET FOR A SIX (6) FOOT PRIVACY FENCE TO EXTEND THIRTY FEET, SIX INCHES (30'6") BEYOND A POINT FIVE (5) FEET FORWARD OF THE REAR BUILDING LINE. THIS ACTION CONCERNS PROPERTY LOCATED AT 105 SOUTH STREET, ELKTON, MARYLAND, TAX MAP 311, PARCEL 2032, ZONED R-2

Mr. Thomas C. Jones was sworn in to address this request. Mr. Jones explained that he had received a permit for the fence and placed it according to what he thought was accurate. It was determined that two of the sections were further forward than they were allowed to be and therefore they needed a variance to remain where they placed.

Mr. Jones explained that the neighboring property does not keep up with their yard and this is the main reason for placing the fence. He stated he has made a great deal of improvements to his property since he purchased it. The fence was placed by a professional landscaper.

Mr. Olewine entertained questions from the audience. There were none.

MOTION: Motion was made by Ms. Schwartz to approve the variance for placement of the fence for 105 South Street. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cramer and unanimously approved.

CASE # 1482 – REQUEST OF SHERI STONE (RUPP), 314 SUBURBAN DRIVE FOR A TWENTY THREE (23) FOOT REAR SETBACK VARIANCE TO CONSTRUCT A DECK. THIS ACTION CONCERNS PROPERTY LOCATED AT 314 SUBURBAN DRIVE, ELKTON, MARYLAND, TAX MAP 312, PARCEL 2431, ZONED R-3

Ms. Sheri Stone (Rupp) was sworn in to address this request. Ms. Rupp explained that they would like to place an 11' x 18' deck at the rear of their home. She stated the variance is required due to the fact that her house was placed further back on the property than other houses in the subdivision. The steps will be placed toward the back yard rather than the side yard. This was taken into consideration when the size of the variance was determined.

Ms. Stone (Rupp) stated that the work will be done by a neighbor who has also constructed other decks in the neighborhood.

Mr. Olewine entertained questions from the Board. Ms. Hicks asked if there were any concerns from neighbors regarding the placement of the deck. Ms. Stone (Rupp) stated there have been no concerns voiced to her.

Mr. Olewine entertained questions or comment from the audience. There were none.

MOTION: Motion was made by Mr. Cooney to approve the twenty three (23) foot rear setback variance for 314 Suburban Drive. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hicks and unanimously approved.

OLD BUSINESS: Mr. Olewine stated that a number of individuals have requested to speak regarding the next two cases which were tabled and are being heard again at this meeting. He encouraged those who wished to speak to keep their comments under five (5) minutes each and to address the subjects of the traffic study and water & sewer issues. He stated that all comments are appreciated but he asked that comments not be repeated but to simply state you agree or disagree with comments previously voiced.

Ms. Dawn Schwartz stated she did not attend the previous meeting but was provided copies of the three (3) DVD's from the meeting and that she had watched the meeting in its entirety.

DECISION ON CASE # 1478 – SERENITY HEALTH

Mr. Eric McLauchlin, legal counsel for Serenity Health, Ms. Nancy Turner, owner of Serenity Health and Mr. Mark Kealy of Traffic Concepts were sworn in to address this case continuation.

Mr. McLauchlin began by pointing out that at the previous meeting on July 16th when they originally presented their case the Board had requested that vehicular and pedestrian traffic be reviewed at the site. He also addressed the subject of water and sewer at that location. He noted that in the original application it was shown that water & sewer are at that location. The site is currently served by well and septic. It was suggested by the property owner that well and septic would be sufficient for this site. Since that time they have been advised by the Health Department that water and sewer will be required.

Mr. McLauchlin posed questions to Ms. Turner regarding her credentials, time in the health care industry, hours of operation for Serenity, number of current employees and number who will be at the new location, number of employees who drive to work and number of shifts, hours that outpatient services are provided at Serenity, number of patients without transportation to Belle Hill Site, total patient census. It was disclosed that a contract had been made with Key Lime Taxi to provide transportation for patients who require it. A copy of the signed contract was provided. Mr. McLauchlin inquired whether, in light of her previous testimony, there would be any pedestrian traffic to the Belle Hill location. Ms. Turner stated there would not be any pedestrian traffic.

Mr. McLauchlin continued his questioning with reference to activity outside the building and the resulting issue for patient treatment should the special exception be denied. Ms. Turner stated that other services would be unable to handle the number of patients that would be in need of treatment should Serenity's services cease. He asked if at any time the provision of services has been interrupted in the seven years Serenity has been open. She stated the only time was during a natural disaster. She stated that if services are interrupted it would create a public safety and health care crisis.

Mr. Mark Keeley of Traffic Concepts answered questions for Mr. McLauchlin regarding the traffic study provided by his company as well as his credentials and experience in his field. Mr. Keeley went on to provide specifics as to how the traffic study was performed. They provided two intersection counts, Rt. 316 @ Belle Hill and MD 279 @ Belle Hill. Two different methodologies were used in performing this traffic study – Critical lane methodology (which is the acceptable practice by State Highway Administration) and also Traffic counts, trip generation, future level generation, typical traffic peak hours do not coincide with Serenity health peak hours. Mr. McLauchlin summarized that there were four components to the traffic study: 1) identify key intersections; 2) identified existing conditions; 3) reviewed background conditions; and 4) analyzed future conditions taking into consideration the traffic generated by Serenity Health. Mr. Keeley noted that these same components were used recently when determining the traffic study for The Villages at Belle Hill as well as other traffic studies provided to the Town of Elkton in the past.

Mr. McLauchlin asked Mr. Keeley if he was able to give his professional opinion regarding the traffic study provided with respect to the impact Serenity might have on both vehicular and pedestrian traffic. Mr. Keeley stated that the existing levels of service, at the two intersections noted in the study, have adequate capacity and they found that under future traffic conditions that the two intersections will continue to work at acceptable and adequate levels of service for vehicular traffic. With regard to pedestrian traffic Mr. Keeley stated they found that under the existing peak hour traffic for conditions at Rt. 316 @ Belle Hill they did not find any pedestrian traffic during the peak one hour and found minimal pedestrian flows at MD 279 @ Belle Hill. Based on their understanding of the operation at Serenity Health they do not believe it will add additional pedestrian traffic to the existing minimum set up. Mr. McLauchlin provided a copy of the traffic study that was previously provided to the Board and asked that it be allowed as an exhibit in their case.

Mr. McLauchlin provided a copy of a letter from Traffic Concepts to KCI addressing KCI's comment specific to ITE Land Use – Clinic: Code 630. It was determined that the number of trips projected for Serenity Health would be less than 50 trips during peak hours and therefore under SHA Guidelines would be considered exempt from conducting traffic impact studies.

Mr. Olewine inquired about 'future traffic patterns' and how that is impacted with regard to school and bus traffic since the study was done in July when schools are not in session. Mr. Keeley stated they did

the study based on current traffic counts because it was needed for the special exception. They included background developments and it did not change the level of service and he does not believe the additional school and bus trips would affect the level of service that the traffic study found.

Mr. Olewine asked if school traffic was included in the study they did for The Villages at Belle Hill. Mr. Keeley stated he believed it was done when school was in session. Mr. Olewine asked, based on the information from the study for Serenity, how it would affect the traffic on Belle Hill and Appleton Roads if school were in session. Mr. Keeley noted that obviously when school is in session it would add trips to the intersection but he stated they used the current counts rather than the counts back in 2012 when The Villages at Belle Hill study was done. Mr. Keeley explained that even with the additional school trips the level of service is within the acceptable traffic levels. Levels of service range from A-F with A-D being acceptable traffic levels. There was discussion regarding peak hours used for this study concerning the peak hours used for the study and peak hours determined for Serenity Health. Mr. Keeley noted that the conclusion of the traffic study was that there would be 15 trips during peak hours and he concluded that number would not add enough traffic to require a more detailed traffic study.

Mr. Olewine entertained questions or comment from the Board. Mr. Cooney inquired about potential growth of patient services which was mentioned at the previous meeting. Mr. Cramer inquired about the rating system for the traffic study with regard to the traffic ratings. Mr. Keeley explained the different ratings and how they are used for traffic analysis. Discussion ensued regarding ratings and peak hours.

Discussion regarding the federal standard of 50 patients to 1 counselor was discussed. Ms. Turner mentioned that not all patients are seen every day and not all patients are receiving medication when they are at the clinic. They may be there for counseling, etc. Ms. Turner stated that there are approximately 12 cars at the clinic per hour. Security for the building was discussed as well as requirements Serenity enforces for loitering at the facility. Ms. Turner noted that DEA tests their security and that Serenity was inspected 11 times last year. A sidewalk feasibility study from August 2013 was discussed and a picture was provided from that study.

Mr. McLaughlin provided letters of support for relocation of Serenity to the new location. He requested that he have the right to make rebuttal upon completion of comment from the audience.

Mr. Olewine entertained questions from the Board for Mr. John Borkowski, one of KCI's traffic engineers. Mr. Olewine asked Mr. Borkowski his opinion regarding the effect of school traffic on the traffic study. Mr. Borkowski was sworn in. Mr. Borkowski stated that typically traffic studies would be done during the school year in order to incorporate that information but in this case they did not feel it would make much difference in the outcome of the traffic study. He stated he felt they demonstrated that this use would not take these intersections to a failing level of service.

Mr. Olewine entertained questions from the audience:

Mary Beth Cole voiced her concerns regarding the number of schools in this general area and the traffic generated. As a pharmacist she contacts Key Lime Taxi and it is common for patients to have to cancel their appointments at the pharmacy due to scheduling conflicts with medical transport and Key Lime Taxi has other fares as well and they are not always prompt in picking someone up after being call. She did not feel this would provide prompt enough service to alleviate loitering at Serenity's facility. She also voiced concern about whether the public bus stop would now be located at Serenity or so would a public sidewalk and crosswalk be provided. There is a bus stop currently at the High's on the other side of

Route 279 and patients would have to cross this major highway to get to the clinic which would be unsafe.

Karren Helsel-Spry of Appleton Road voiced her concerns regarding traffic issues, deep ditches, lack of sidewalks and school children and pedestrian safety.

Renee Boyle of Elkton voiced her concerns regarding this particular use because she feels it will bring more problems to the area and Elkton already has its share of problems.

Richard Boyle of Gilpin Avenue voiced his concerns regarding the number of schools in the area and cannot believe this additional traffic will not affect the area. He is concerned for school children walking to and from school along these roads.

Joshua Grollnes, executive director of Serenity Health, spoke in favor of the special exception. He pointed out the quality of treatment, the fact that 96% of their clients live in Cecil County and 53% of those live in Elkton. He also addressed safety at the current location and therefore their desire to move to the new location.

Linda Katz, practice manager of Chesapeake Wellness Center in Cecilton provided a definition of addiction and the fact that 'people' are the most important issue.

Linda Brown and Patty Barton who work at West End Gardens noted the number of vehicles at Serenity's current location is greater than what has been stated.

Jack Foreaker, executive director of Haven House spoke in favor of the move to Belle Hill Road. The drug problem will not be fixed overnight and due to the resistance it is difficult to get programs started. He stated Serenity is the most effective treatment for opiate addiction. He stated without this treatment the crime rate would go up.

Eva Ruggerio, a patient at Serenity, spoke in favor of this application. She stated how much she has gained by the help she has received at Serenity.

Lacey Morris, a client of Serenity Health, stated she has turned her life around and how she has benefited from the therapy and counseling she has received. She is planning to enroll in college hoping to become an addiction counselor.

Jocelyn Ruggerio, a patient at Serenity, stated she has gained a lot through counseling. She currently has a job at the Cherry Hill Vet Hospital and has money in the bank. She is three classes away from getting her GED.

Albert Clark, a client at Serenity, stated he is a better person and father because of his treatment.

Candy Bathon voiced her concerns regarding traffic and pedestrian issues at the current location as well as the proposed new location. She provided pictures and asked that the Board take these issues into consideration in order to protect the public safety. She noted the State Highway issues that still exist at the property. She is also concerned for an increase in crime and decrease in property values.

Stephanie Garrity, health officer at Cecil County Health Department stated the department's mission is to increase the health of those in the community and she is therefore speaking in favor of the relocation contingent upon their connecting to water and sewer.

Donald Turner, a patient at Serenity, stated his agreement with Jack Foreaker and thanked Serenity for all they do for their clients.

Michael Benjamin, a resident at Haven House, questions whether traffic would be a problem if the use was something other than a treatment center. Prior to his treatment he was a criminal and he wishes to change his life and he believes Serenity is helping him do that.

William & Nancy Wells of James Street voiced their concerns about traffic impacts and stated they agreed with Ms. Bathon and the Boyles about the fact that this use would be so close to a number of schools.

John Mackie, a local realtor, voiced his concern regarding a decrease in property values and felt this will not be an asset to the community.

Ralph Nestor of Appleton Road voiced his concerns regarding traffic issues and children's safety. He pointed out that Milburn Orchards has activities in the area, beneficial to the community, which also add to his concerns for traffic.

John Bennett, chair of the Cecil County Drug and Alcohol Council noted the similarities between this meeting and the County meeting regarding Recovery Centers of American and Brace Bridge Hall in Earleville. He stated the same concerns about traffic, no sidewalks, schools and farm equipment in the area were made concerning the other cases. He pointed out that the facility in Earleville draws patients from 50 miles away and yet was approved by the County.

Victoria Galbraith of Belle Hill Road spoke in opposition to the clinic and addressed some 'facts' on Serenity's website. She voiced her concerns about traffic issues, lack of sidewalks, truck and foot traffic, children's safety and possibility for rise in crime should the clinic be relocated to Belle Hill Road. She does not believe this is the best location but should be in a hospital or nonprofit medical facility.

Will Riddle of Gina Marie Lane, stated he felt the Board needed to consider the traffic impact in the C-3 zone as opposed to other commercial zones and he felt the impact would be less in either the C-1 or C-2 zones. He pointed out the fact there are no sidewalks and unique intersections in the area. He believes the clinic use in the C-3 zone will adversely affect the area and questioned the accuracy of the number of vehicles and coming to the current location.

Joe Stanley of Appleton Road voiced his concerns that the traffic impact study did not include school traffic since it was completed when schools were not in session and the School of Technology has not been built. He stated there is no guarantee clients will use Key Lime Taxi even though it has been contracted by Serenity. He does not believe this use is best at this location because there are no sidewalks and the facility was not designed for this type of use. He felt a full traffic study needed to be done.

Allen Spry of Appleton Road agreed that a new traffic study needed to be done for a second opinion. He noted the 52 acres between Belle Hill Road and MD 279 where housing is proposed and which will increase traffic. He also voiced concerns for pedestrian traffic as well.

Ken Lewis, President of Union Hospital, spoke in support of this application on behalf of the hospital management team and chairman of the board of directors. He stated there is little he can say that hasn't been mentioned by Jack Foreaker, Linda Katz and Serenity clients. He noted the complexity of the services they provide would be extremely difficult to replace.

Harry Fink, a pharmacist with a history as an alcohol counselor and retired professor spoke in opposition to the application and stated that methadone was originally developed to get people off drugs. He stated that in his experience people do not need drugs to cure their addiction problem. He stated that rehab clinics are money driven and he believes counseling is the most important aspect in treating addiction. He stated the treatment of addiction is best served within a hospital or medical center facility.

Melissa Smith, a client of the Aberdeen based Serenity program, has used taxis to get to and from the facility and emphasized their policy against loitering at the facility. She stated medical transportation (taxis) are available to those who need them. She felt sidewalks should have been required when the building at Belle Hill Road was originally developed and therefore should not be required now. She stated how well she and her family are doing now that she is getting treatment and counseling.

Samantha Reynolds of Appleton Road noted that there has been no mention of the trucks from Elk Mills Quarry using these roads also. She voiced her concerns for speeding and accidents on these roads and the number of people using the roads to take their children to schools in the area.

Donna Warrington of Appleton Road voiced her concerns regarding traffic, children's safety and speeding. She stated she did not believe this is the best location for this business.

Michael Hitt whose wife is a patient at Serenity spoke in favor of the application. He stated he did not believe the traffic is an issue due to the distance to the nearest house and the fact that there is a fence around the proposed location. He noted how well his wife is doing and felt that if the request is denied it would affect other families' ability to receive the treatment they need.

Latisha Ayers mentioned that Elkton Gas would be moving to Belle Hill Road and this traffic has not been taken into consideration.

Melinda Palmeri stated she works at Milburn Orchards and voiced her concerns for additional traffic being added to these roads. She mentioned that thousands of school children come to the orchard in September and October on school trips

Mr. McLauchlin provided rebuttal with regard to some of the audience comments specific to the traffic study, where the clients reside, number of patients treated, the State Highway work to be completed at their current location as well as other issues. He reiterated the legal standard that the Board must use to determine the basis of their decision with regard to this case.

MOTION: Motion was made by Mr. Cooney to deny the special exception for Serenity Health based upon Article 4, Section 6 (1) that he did not find that Serenity has not provided reliable or thorough information, whether by written word or verbal testimony to adequately address the vehicle/pedestrian issue and therefore does not provide a safe environment in order to provide for the public's health and safety. The motion was seconded by Ms. Schwartz with the remaining members voting as follows: Mr. Cramer – Nay; Ms. Hicks – Aye. With a majority of the members voting for the motion the motion is carried.

MOTION: A motion was made by Mr. Cooney for a closed meeting in order to confer with the BZA attorney. The motion was seconded by Ms. Schwartz and unanimously approved.

Mr. Olewine stated that they would reconvene the meeting at the end of the closed session in approximately 15 minutes.

MOTION: A motion was made by Ms. Schwartz to reconvene the meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hicks and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON CASE # 1477 – GLOBAL HEALTH

Ms. Mary Cannistraro of Global Health and Mr. Dwight Thomey, legal counsel were sworn in to address this request. Ms. Cannistraro provided pictures which gave specifics of the location on the parcel where they are proposing to place the detox center. She stated the stockade fence existing at the location is being renovated as necessary.

Ms. Cannistraro confirmed her desire to help people get off of drugs. She confirmed that two security guards would be at the facility 24/7 with keyed access to the building. She stated she has spoken with Dr. Keith Sokoloff and Jessica Wood and they have shown interest in being involved with this project. Dr. Sokoloff is a national speaker on bipolar anxiety and depression and Jessica Wood is a social worker with the CACD and is a certified drug and alcohol counselor.

The maximum number of patients would be twelve. A health care professional will be available most of the day. Ms. Cannistraro stated that the patients would go from this facility to an outpatient facility for follow-up counseling. She has consulted with Cecil County Health Department and Upper Bay Counseling Services for these services.

Mr. Thomey inquired how the length of stay at the facility would be determined. Ms. Cannistraro stated that it would be determined by the individual patient's evaluation which would include their current physical health, drug and alcohol use history, family social background and medical history which would be performed by a doctor, a licensed social worker or registered nurse. They would make a comprehensive assessment of their medical needs. The patients will have daily group therapy and private therapy five days a week. Their intention is to provide a holistic approach to patient treatment. They plan to provide family counseling at least one day a week.

Mr. Thomey stated the Board had requested some specific information that they are unable to provide such as a letter of recommendation from the State which could only be provided once the building and program are in place. Ms. Cannistraro stated that specific COMAR requirements in order to be licensed would be that they must provide a registered nurse for 8 hours a day/5 days a week, two (2) employees must be on duty from 11 p.m. to 7 a.m. seven days a week who are trained in crisis management, and there must be a doctor on call 24 hours a day.

Mr. Thomey shared an article from the New York Times with regard to a similar facility and its effect on the community. Mr. Thomey noted that this is just the first step in a long process with the Town as well as the State.

Mr. Olewine asked for confirmation that the only drugs being used at the facility would be for medications for anti-nausea and hydration. Ms. Cannistraro provided the Board with a list of medications

which will be used and stated that they are all non-narcotic drugs. Mr. Thomey added that they would have to be prescribed by a health care professional.

Mr. Cooney inquired of Stephanie Garrity whether Ms. Cannistraro had been in touch with the Health Department. Ms. Garrity stated they had not spoken with her but have been in touch with other staff in the addictions division at the Health Department. She added that the Health Department would be supportive of any licensed facility that continues to provide services to the community that complete the continuum of prevention, treatment and recovery. She stated she was unable to speak to this particular request because she does not have enough information at this time.

Discussion ensued regarding green space for patients, security, how they are referred to the program and parking requirements.

Mr. Olewine entertained comment from the audience.

Mary Beth Cole questioned how the prescribed medication would be provided and when patient intake would occur. It was determined that all medications would be purchased from an outside pharmacy and that intake of patients would be during normal business hours.

Patricia Jones, director of Dexter House, which is a residential facility. She stated she believes a detox facility will increase drug use. She stated that facilities with a 21 day stay where patients are going home afterward have approximately a 5% success rate. She questioned whether Upper Bay Counseling had addiction counselors since they did not have any when she worked there. She voiced her concern that this is an attempt to expand the current drug treatment system which resides in Alpha Health Center which she understood currently has approximately 500 patients who are receiving suboxone treatment. She questioned whether anyone at the facility is certified in addiction treatment and suggested they might be working together.

Karren Helsel-Spry voiced her concerns with the location of the proposed treatment facility to Holly Hall School on Whitehall Road.

Mr. Thomey made a rebuttal of the suggestion that Dr. Aslam is involved with this business. He stated that one of Dr. Aslam's entities owns the property but that is the extent of his involvement with the facility. He stated this property is a good location because it is close to other medical facilities.

MOTION: Motion was made by Mr. Cramer to approve the special exception for Global Health for a detox facility at 308 E. Pulaski Highway. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hicks and unanimously approved.

NEW BUSINESS: Mr. Bromwell informed the Board that at this time there would be one case submitted for the September 17th meeting.

There being no further business to discuss Mr. Olewine adjourned the meeting at 11:13 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Brenda Humphreys