GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF NORTH CAROLINA SESSION 2009

S

SENATE BILL 44 PROPOSED COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE S44-PCS35307-RC-13

	Short Titl	e: A	Appeals of Quasi-Judicial Land-Use Decisions.	(Public)
	Sponsors:			
	Referred	to:		
			February 4, 2009	
1			A BILL TO BE ENTITLED	
2			CLARIFY THE LAW REGARDING APPEALS OF QU	
3	DECI	SIONS	S MADE UNDER ARTICLE 19 OF CHAPTER 160A AND A	RTICLE 18 OF
4			153A OF THE GENERAL STATUTES.	
5	The Gene	ral As	sembly of North Carolina enacts:	
6		SEC	TION 1.(a) Part 3 of Article 19 of Chapter 160A of the Gen	neral Statutes is
7		•	ling a new section to read:	
8	" <u>§ 160A</u>		appeals in the nature of certiorari.	
9	<u>(a)</u>		icability This section applies to appeals of quasi-judici	
10		-	g boards when that appeal is to superior court and in the nature	of certiorari as
11	required b			
12	<u>(b)</u>		ourposes of this section, the following terms mean:	
13		<u>(1)</u>	Decision-making board. – A city council, planning bo	
14			adjustment, or other board making quasi-judicial decisions a	
15			city council under this Article or under comparable provision	ons of any local
16			act or any interlocal agreement authorized by law.	
17		<u>(2)</u>	Person. – Any legal entity authorized to bring suit in the legal	
18		(3)	Quasi-judicial decision. – A decision involving the finding of	
19			a specific application of an ordinance and the exercise of	
20			applying the standards of the ordinance. Quasi-judicial de	
21			decisions involving variances, special and conditional us	
22			appeals of administrative determinations. Decisions on the	approval of site
23			plans are quasi-judicial in nature if the ordinance	authorizes a
24			decision-making board to approve or deny the site plan base	<u>d not only upon</u>
25			whether the application complies with the specific requirem	ents set forth in
26			the ordinance, but also on whether the application compli	
27			more generally stated standards requiring a discretionary	decision on the
28			findings of fact to be made by the decision-making board.	
29	<u>(c)</u>		g the Petition. – An appeal in the nature of certiorari shall be in	itiated by filing
30	with the s	uperio	r court a petition for writ of certiorari. The petition shall:	
31		<u>(1)</u>	State the facts that demonstrate that the petitioner has st	anding to seek
32			review.	
33		<u>(2)</u>	Set forth the grounds upon which the petitioner contends the	at an error was
34			made.	



D

General Assem	ably Of North Carolina	Session 2009
<u>(3)</u>	Set forth with particularity the allegations and facts, if	any, in support of
	allegations that, as the result of impermissible confli	ct as described in
	G.S. 160A-388(e1), or locally adopted conflict rules, the	ne decision-making
	body was not sufficiently impartial to comply with due pr	ocess principles.
<u>(4)</u>	Set forth the relief the petitioner seeks.	
(d) Stan	ding A petition may be filed under this section only by a	petitioner who has
standing to chal	lenge the decision being appealed. The following persons sh	all have standing to
file a petition u	nder this section:	
<u>(1)</u>	Any person meeting any of the following criteria:	
	<u>a.</u> <u>Has an ownership interest, leasehold interest, or or</u>	ther interest created
	by easement, restriction, or covenant in the pr	roperty that is the
	subject of the decision being appealed.	
	b. <u>Has an option or contract to purchase the property</u>	y that is the subject
	of the decision being appealed.	
	c. Was an applicant before the decision-making bo	ard whose decision
	is being appealed.	
<u>(2)</u>	Any other person who will suffer special damages as	s the result of the
	decision being appealed.	
<u>(3)</u>	An incorporated or unincorporated association to which of	
	property in a designated area belong by virtue of their	
	property in that area, or an association otherwise organ	•
	foster the interest of the particular neighborhood or local	
	least one of the members of the association would have	
	individual to challenge the decision being appealed, and	
	not created in response to the particular development of	or issue that is the
	subject of the appeal.	
<u>(4)</u>	A city whose decision-making board has made a decisi	
	believes improperly grants a variance from or is otherwis	
	the proper interpretation of an ordinance adopted by that of	
	bondent. – The respondent named in the petition shall	
	g board made the decision that is being appealed, except tha	_
	iled a petition pursuant to subdivision $(d)(4)$ of this section, the section of	
	decision-making board. If the petitioner is not the ap	
	g board whose decision is being appealed, the petitioner sl	
1 1	respondent. Any petitioner may name as a respondent a asehold interest in the property that is the subject of the decision of	• •
	d in the hearing, or was an applicant, before the decision-mal	
· · ·	t of Certiorari. – Upon filing the petition, the petitioner shall	
	writ of certiorari to the clerk of court of the county in which	± ± ·
	direct the respondent city, or the respondent decision-m	
	city that has filed a petition pursuant to subdivision $(d)(4)$	-
	tify to the court the record of proceedings below within a	
-	direct that the petitioner shall serve the petition and the	-
	the d therein in the manner provided for service of a complain	-
*	ivil Procedure, except that, if the respondent is a decision	
	e writ shall be served upon the chair of that decision-m	-
	Rules of Civil Procedure shall apply in the event the chair of	
	e found. No summons shall be issued. The clerk shall issu	
	spondent or respondents if the petition has been properly file	
	copy of the executed writ shall be filed with the court.	a una mo witt io m
proper torm. A	copy of the executed with shall be filed with the court.	

General	Assem	oly Of North Carolina	Session 2009
<u>(g)</u>	Answ	er to the Petition The respondent may, but need not,	file an answer to the
petition, e	except	hat, if the respondent contends that any petitioner lacks	standing to bring the
appeal, th	nat cont	ention must be set forth in an answer served on all petiti	oners at least 30 days
prior to th	ne heari	ng on the petition.	
<u>(h)</u>	Interv	vention Rule 24 of the Rules of Civil Procedure sha	ll govern motions to
intervene	as a	petitioner or respondent in an action initiated under	this section with the
following	except	ions:	
	(1)	Any person described in subdivision (d)(1) of thi	s section shall have
		standing to intervene and shall be allowed to intervene	as a matter or right.
	<u>(2)</u>	Any person, other than one described in subdivision	(d)(1) of this section,
		who seeks to intervene as a petitioner must demonst	strate that the person
		would have had standing to challenge the decisio	n being appealed in
		accordance with subdivisions $(d)(2)$ through $(d)(4)$ of the	nis section.
	<u>(3)</u>	Any person, other than one described in subdivision	(d)(1) of this section,
		who seeks to intervene as a respondent must demon	
		would have had standing to file a petition in accordance	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
		(d)(2) through $(d)(4)$ of this section if the decision-mak	•
		decision that is consistent with the relief sought by the	
(i)	The I	Record. – The record shall consist of all documents and	
the decisi	-	ting board whose decision is being appealed, together w	
		ngs at which the decision being appealed was considered	
-		shall also contain an audio or videotape of the meeting	· · ·
		g appealed was considered if such a recording was made	-
		cord a transcript of the proceedings, which shall be prep	
		to include it. The parties may agree, or the court ma	
	-	he court's decision be deleted from the record or that ma	
specified	herein	be included. The record shall be bound and paginated o	r otherwise organized
for the co	onvenie	nce of the parties and the court. A copy of the record s	hall be served by the
municipa	l respo	ndent, or the respondent decision-making board, upon	all petitioners within
three days	s after i	t is filed with the court.	
<u>(j)</u>	Heari	ng on the Record The court shall hear and decide al	l issues raised by the
petition b	y revie	wing the record submitted in accordance with subsection	on (h) of this section.
Except th	at the c	ourt may, in its discretion, allow the record to be supplen	nented with affidavits,
testimony	of wit	nesses, or documentary or other evidence if, and to the ex	tent that, the record is
not adequ	ate to a	llow an appropriate determination of the following issues	<u>:</u>
	(1)	Whether a petitioner or intervenor has standing.	
	(2)	Whether, as a result of impermissible conflic	t as described in
		G.S. 160A-388(e1), or locally adopted conflict rules,	the decision-making
		body was not sufficiently impartial to comply with due	process principles.
	<u>(3)</u>	Whether the decision-making body erred for the	reasons set forth in
		sub-subdivisions a. and b. of subdivision (1) of subsect	
<u>(k)</u>	Scope	e of Review. –	
	(1)	When reviewing the decision of a decision-making	ng board under the
		provisions of this section, the court shall ensure that the	e rights of petitioners
		have not been prejudiced because the decision-mal	<u>king body's findings,</u>
		inferences, conclusions, or decisions were:	
		a. In violation of constitutional provisions, inclu	ding those protecting
		procedural due process rights.	
		b. In excess of the statutory authority conferred	upon the city or the
		authority conferred upon the decision-making b	oard by ordinance.
		-	

decision and remand the case with appropriate instructions, or remand the case for furtherproceedings. If the court does not affirm the decision below in its entirety, then the court shallbe guided by the following in determining what relief should be granted to the petitioners:(1)If the court concludes that the error committed by the decision-making boardis procedural only, the court may remand the case for further proceedings tocorrect the procedural error.(2)If the court concludes that the decision-making board has erred by failing tomake findings of fact such that the court cannot properly perform itsfunction, then the court may remand the case with appropriate instructions solong as the record contains substantial competent evidence that couldsupport the decision below with appropriate findings of fact. However,findings of fact are not necessary when the record sufficiently reveals thebasis for the decision below or when the material facts are undisputed andthe case presents only an issue of law.(3)If the court concludes that the decision by the decision-making board is notsupported by substantial competent evidence in the record or is based uponan error of law, then the court may remand the case with an order that directsthe decision-making board to take whatever action should have been takenthe decision-making board to take whatever action should have been takenthe decision-making board to take such other action as is necessaryto correct the error. Specifically:a.If the court concludes that a permit was wrongfully denied becausethe denial was not based on an error		General Assem	oly Of North Carolina Session 200
2 ordinance. 3 d. Affected by other error of law. 4 e. Unsupported by substantial competent evidence in view of the entire record. 6 f. Arbitrary or capricious. 7 (2) When the issue before the court is whether the decision-making board erred in interpreting an ordinance, the court shall review that issue de novo and freely substitute is judgment for that of the decision-making board. 10 (3) The term "competent evidence." as used in this subsection, shall not preclude reliance by the decision-making board on evidence at a supplied in the trial division of the General Court of Justice if (i) the evidence was admitted without objection, or (ii) the evidence appears to be sufficiently trustworthy and was admitted under such circumstances that it was reasonable for the decision-making board to rely upon it. The term "competent evidence." as used in this subsection, shall not be deemed to include the opinion testimony of lay witnesses as to any of the following: a. The use of property in a particular way would affect the value of other property. b. The increase in vehicular traffic resulting from a proposed development would pose a danger to the public safety. c. Matters about which only expert testimony would generally be admissible under ther rules of evidence. c. Matters about which only expert testimony would generally be admissible under ther rules of evidence. c. Matteres about which only expert testimony would	1		c. Inconsistent with applicable procedures specified by statute
 e. Unsupported by substantial competent evidence in view of the entire record. f. Arbitrary or capricious. 7 (2) When the issue before the court is whether the decision-making board erred in interpreting an ordinance, the court shall review that issue de novo and freely substitute its judgment for that of the decision-making board. (3) The term "competent evidence," as used in this subsection, shall not preclude the decision-making board on evidence that would not be admissible under the rules of evidence as applied in the trial division of the General Court of Justice if (i) the evidence was admitted without objection, or (ii) the evidence aspars to be sufficiently trustworthy and was admitted under such circumstances that it was reasonable for the decision-making board to rely upon it. The term "competent evidence," as used in this subsection, shall not be deemed to include the opinion testimony of lay witnesses as to any of the following:	2		
 e. Unsupported by substantial competent evidence in view of the entire record. (1) When the issue before the court is whether the decision-making board erred in interpreting an ordinance, the court shall review that issue de novo and freely substitute its judgment for that of the decision-making board. (2) When the issue before the court is hall review that issue de novo and interpreting an ordinance, the court shall review that issue de novo and interpreting an ordinance. The suesd in this subsection, shall not preclude the elecision-making board on evidence that would not be admissible under the rules of evidence as applied in the trial division of the General Court of Justice if (i) the evidence was admitted without objection, or (ii) the evidence appars to be sufficiently trustworthy and was admitted under such circumstances that it was reasonable for the decision-making board to rely upon it. The term "competent evidence," as used in this subsection, shall not be deemed to include the opinion testimony of lay witnesses as to any of the following: a. The use of property in a particular way would affect the value of other property. b. The increase in vehicular traffic resulting from a proposed development would pose a danger to the public safety. c. Matters about which only expert testimony would generally be admissible under the rules of evidence. (1) Decision of the Court. – Following its review of the decision-making board in accordance with subsection (k) of this section, the court cannot properly perform its function, then the court concludes that the error committed by the decision-making board in secondance with subsection (k) of this section helow in its entirety, then the court shall be guided by the following in determining what relief should be granted to the petitores: (1) If the court concludes that the error committe	3		d. Affected by other error of law.
 f. Arbitrary or capricious. When the issue before the court is whether the decision-making board erred in interpreting an ordinance, the court shall review that issue de novo and freely substitute its judgment for that of the decision-making board. (1) The term "competent evidence," as used in this subsection, shall not preclude reliance by the decision-making board on evidence that would not be admissible under the rules of evidence as applied in the trial division of the General Court of Justice if (1) the evidence was admitted without objection, or (ii) the evidence appears to be sufficiently trustworthy and was admitted under such circumstances that it was reasonable for the decision-making board to rely upon it. The term "competent evidence," as used in this subsection, shall not be deemed to include the opinion testimony of lay witnesses as to any of the following: a. The use of property in a particular way would affect the value of other property. b. The increase in vehicular traffic resulting from a proposed development would pose adarger to the public safety. c. Matters about which only expert testimony would generally be admissible under the rules of evidence. (1) Decision of the Court. — Following its review of the decision-making board in accordance with subsection (k) of this section, the court may affirm the decision reverse the decision and remand the case with appropriate instructions, or remand the case for further proceedings. If the court concludes that the decision-making board is procedural only, the court may remand the case for further proceedings to correct the procedural entor. (2) If the court concludes that the decision-making board is procedural only, the court may remand the case for further proceedings to correct the procedural substantial competent evidence court shall be asis for the decision below or when the material facts are undisputed and the case prosent subtantial competent evidence and the case presen	4		
7 (2) When the issue before the court is whether the decision-making board erred in interpreting an ordinance, the court shall review that issue de novo and freely substitute its judgment for that of the decision-making board. 0 (3) The term "competent evidence," as used in this subsection, shall not preclude reliance by the decision-making board on evidence that would not be admissible under the rules of evidence as applied in the trial division of the General Court of Justice if (1) the evidence mas admitted without objection, or (ii) the evidence appears to be sufficiently trustworthy and was admitted under such circumstances that it was reasonable for the decision-making board to rely upon it. The term "competent evidence," as used in this subsection, shall not be deemed to include the opinion testimony of lay witnesses as to any of the following: 9 a. The use of property in a particular way would affect the value of other property. 9 a. The use of property in a particular way would affect the value of other property. 01 b. The increase in vehicular traffic resulting from a proposed development would pose a danger to the public safety. 10 c. Matters about which only expert testimony would generally be admissible under the rules of evidence. 11 b. The court does not affirm the decision-making board is proceedings. If the court does not affirm the decision below in its entirety, then the court shall equided by the following in determining what relief should be granted to the petitioners: 12 If the court concludes that the er	5		record.
 in interpreting an ordinance, the court shall review that issue de novo and freely substitute its judgment for that of the decision-making board. (3) The term "competent evidence," as used in this subsection, shall not preclude reliance by the decision-making board on evidence that would not be admissible under the rules of evidence as applied in the trial division of the General Court of Justice if (i) the evidence was admitted without objection, or (ii) the evidence appears to be sufficiently trustworthy and was admitted under such circumstances that it was reasonable for the decision-making board to rely upon it. The term "competent evidence," as used in this subsection, shall not be deemed to include the opinion testimony of lay witnesses as to any of the following: a. The use of property in a particular way would affect the value of other property. b. The increase in vehicular traffic resulting from a proposed development would pose a danger to the public safety. c. Matters about which only expert testimony would generally be admissible under the rules of evidence. (1) Decision of the Court, — Following its review of the decision-making board in accordance with subsection (k) of this section, the court may affirm the decision, reverse the decision and remand the case with appropriate instructions, or remand the case for further proceedings. If the court concludes that the error committed by the decision-making board is procedural only, the court may remand the case of further proceedings. If the court concludes that the decision below in its entirety, then the court shall be guided by the following in determining what relief should be granted to the petitioners: (2) If the court concludes that the decision below with appropriate instructions so long as the record contains substantial competent evidence that could support be decision below with appropriate instructions so long as the record contains substantial competent evidence tha	6		<u>f.</u> <u>Arbitrary or capricious.</u>
9 freely substitute its judgment for that of the decision-making board. 0 (3) The term "competent evidence," as used in this subsection, shall not preclude reliance by the decision-making board on evidence that would not be admissible under the rules of evidence as applied in the trial division of the General Court of Justice if (i) the evidence was admitted without objection, or (ii) the evidence appears to be sufficiently trustworthy and was admitted under such circumstances that it was reasonable for the decision-making board to rely upon it. The term "competent evidence," as used in this subsection, shall not be deemed to include the opinion testimony of lay witnesses as to any of the following: 9 a. The use of property in a particular way would affect the value of other property. 9 a. The use of property in a particular way would affect the value of other property. 1 b. The increase in vehicular traffic resulting from a proposed development would pose a danger to the public safety. 10 c. Matters about which only expert testimony would generally be admissible under the rules of evidence. 11 b. The court does not affirm the decision below in its entirety, then the court shall be guided by the following in determining what relief should be granted to the petitioners: 11 Decision of the Court any remand the case for further proceedings. If the court does not affirm the decision-making board is proceedings of fact such that the error compitted follow the depropriate instructions, or remaking thoard 12	7	<u>(2)</u>	When the issue before the court is whether the decision-making board erre
0 (3) The term "competent evidence," as used in this subsection, shall not preclude reliance by the decision-making board on evidence that would not be admissible under the rules of evidence as applied in the trial division of the General Court of Justice if (i) the evidence as applied in the trial division of the decision or (ii) the evidence appears to be sufficiently trustworthy and was admitted under such circumstances that it was reasonable for the decision-making board to rely upon it. The term "competent evidence," as used in this subsection, shall not be deemed to include the opinion testimony of lay witnesses as to any of the following: 7 subsection, shall not be deemed to include the opinion testimony of lay witnesses as to any of the following: 8 witnesses as to any of the following: 9 a. The use of property in a particular way would affect the value of other property. 10 b. The increase in vehicular traffic resulting from a proposed development would pose a danger to the public safety. 2 c. Matters about which only expert testimony would generally be admissible under the rules of evidence. 11 Decision of the Court. – Following its review of the decision-making board in accordance with subsection (k) of this section, the court may affirm the decision further proceedings. If the court concludes that the error committed by the decision-making board is sproedural only, the court may remand the case for further proceedings to correct the procedural error. 10 If the court concludes that the decision-making board is sprocedural only, the court may remand the case fo	8		in interpreting an ordinance, the court shall review that issue de novo an
11 reliance by the decision-making board on evidence that would not be admissible under the rules of evidence as applied in the trial division of the General Court of Justice if (i) the evidence was admitted without objection, 13 General Court of Justice if (i) the evidence was admitted without objection, 14 or (ii) the evidence appears to be sufficiently trustworthy and was admitted 15 under such circumstances that it was reasonable for the decision-making 16 board to rely upon it. The term "competent evidence," as used in this 17 subsection, shall not be deemed to include the opinion testimony of lay 18 witnesses as to any of the following: 19 a. The use of property in a particular way would affect the value of 10 other property. 21 b. The increase in vehicular traffic resulting from a proposed 22 c. Matters about which only expert testimony would generally be 23 c. Matters about which only expert testimony would generally be 24 admissible under the rules of evidence. 25 (I) Decision of the Court. – Following its review of the decision-making board in 26 accordance with subsection (k) of this section, the court may affirm the decision reverse the 26 decision and remand the case with appropriate instructions, or remand the case for further	9		freely substitute its judgment for that of the decision-making board.
2 admissible under the rules of evidence as applied in the trial division of the 3 General Court of Justice if (i) the evidence was admitted without objection, 4 or (ii) the evidence appears to be sufficiently trustworthy and was admitted 5 under such circumstances that it was reasonable for the decision-making 6 board to rely upon it. The term "competent evidence," as used in this 7 subsection, shall not be deemed to include the opinion testimony of lay 8 witnesses as to any of the following: 9 a. The use of property in a particular way would affect the value of 9 other property. 10 b. The increase in vehicular traffic resulting from a proposed 11 development would pose a danger to the public safety. 12 c. Matters about which only expert testimony would generally be 13 admissible under the rules of evidence. 14 accordance with subsection (k) of this section, the court may affirm the decision-making board in 16 accordance with subsection (k) of this section, the court may affirm the decision-making board 16 decision and remand the case with appropriate instructions, or remand the case for further 17 recedural only, the court may remand the case for further 18	0	<u>(3)</u>	The term "competent evidence," as used in this subsection, shall not preclud
3 General Court of Justice if (i) the evidence was admitted without objection, or (ii) the evidence appears to be sufficiently trustworthy and was admitted under such circumstances that it was reasonable for the decision-making board to rely upon it. The term "competent evidence," as used in this subsection, shall not be deemed to include the opinion testimony of lay witnesses as to any of the following: 6 board to rely upon it. The term "competent evidence," as used in this subsection, shall not be deemed to include the opinion testimony of lay witnesses as to any of the following: 7 subsection, shall not be deemed to include the opinion testimony of lay witnesses as to any of the following: 9 a. The use of property in a particular way would affect the value of other property. 9 b. The increase in vehicular traffic resulting from a proposed development would pose a danger to the public safety. 23 c. Matters about which only expert testimony would generally be admissible under the rules of evidence. 10 Decision of the Court. – Following its review of the decision-making board in accordance with subsection (k) of this section, the court may affirm the decision, reverse the decision and remand the case with appropriate instructions, or remand the case for further proceedings. If the court concludes that the error committed by the decision-making board is procedural only, the court may remand the case for further proceedings to correct the procedural error. 11 If the court concludes that the decision making board has erred by failing to make findings of fact such tha the courd anont properiy set findings of fact. However, findings o	1		reliance by the decision-making board on evidence that would not be
4 or (ii) the evidence appears to be sufficiently trustworthy and was admitted under such circumstances that it was reasonable for the decision-making board to rely upon it. The term "competent evidence," as used in this subsection, shall not be deemed to include the opinion testimony of lay witnesses as to any of the following: a. The use of property in a particular way would affect the value of other property. b. The increase in vehicular traffic resulting from a proposed development would pose a danger to the public safety. c. Matters about which only expert testimony would generally be admissible under the rules of evidence. (1) Decision of the Court. – Following its review of the decision-making board in accordance with subsection (k) of this section, the court may affirm the decision, reverse the decision and remand the case with appropriate instructions, or remand the case for further proceedings. If the court concludes that the error committed by the decision-making board is procedural only, the court may remand the case for further proceedings to correct the procedural error. (2) If the court concludes that the decision-making board has erred by failing to make findings of fact such that the court cannot properly perform its function, then the court may remand the case with appropriate instructions so long as the record contains substantial competent evidence that could support the decision below with appropriate findings of fact. However, findings of fact are not necessary when the material facts are undisputed and the case presents only an issue of law. (3) If the court concludes that the decision should have been taken hasis for the decision below or when the material facts are undisputed and the case presents only an issue of law. (3) If the court concludes that a permit was wrongfully denied because	2		admissible under the rules of evidence as applied in the trial division of the
55 under such circumstances that it was reasonable for the decision-making 66 board to rely upon it. The term "competent evidence," as used in this 77 subsection, shall not be deemed to include the opinion testimony of lay 78 witnesses as to any of the following: 79 a. The use of property in a particular way would affect the value of 70 other property. 71 b. The increase in vehicular traffic resulting from a proposed 72 development would pose a danger to the public safety. 73 c. Matters about which only expert testimony would generally be 74 admissible under the rules of evidence. 75 (1) Decision of the Court. – Following its review of the decision-making board in 76 accordance with subsection (k) of this section, the court may affirm the decision, reverse the 77 decision and remand the case with appropriate instructions, or remand the case for further 77 genedate by the following in determining what relief should be granted to the petitioners: 78 (1) If the court concludes that the error committed by the decision-making board 79 support the decision below with appropriate instructions so 70 (1) If the court concludes that the decision-making board has erred by failing to	3		General Court of Justice if (i) the evidence was admitted without objection
66 board to rely upon it. The term "competent evidence," as used in this subsection, shall not be deemed to include the opinion testimony of lay witnesses as to any of the following: 7 a. The use of property in a particular way would affect the value of other property. 9 a. The use of property in a particular way would affect the value of other property. 9 a. The use of property in a particular way would affect the value of other property. 9 a. The increase in vehicular traffic resulting from a proposed development would pose a danger to the public safety. 2 c. Matters about which only expert testimony would generally be admissible under the rules of evidence. 55 (1) Decision of the Court. – Following its review of the decision-making board in accordance with subsection (k) of this section, the court may affirm the decision reverse the decision and remand the case with appropriate instructions, or remand the case for further proceedings. If the court concludes that the error committed by the following in determining what relief should be granted to the petitioners: 11 be guided by the following in determining what relief should be granted to the petitioners: 12 If the court concludes that the decision-making board is proceedings to correct the procedural error. 13 (2) If the court concludes that the decision by an agreed by failing to make findings of fact such that the court cannot properly perform its function, then the court may remand the case with appropriate instructions so long as the record contains substantial	4		or (ii) the evidence appears to be sufficiently trustworthy and was admitted
7 subsection, shall not be deemed to include the opinion testimony of lay witnesses as to any of the following: 8 witnesses as to any of the following: 9 a. The use of property in a particular way would affect the value of other property. 8 b. The increase in vehicular traffic resulting from a proposed development would pose a danger to the public safety. 23 c. Matters about which only expert testimony would generally be admissible under the rules of evidence. 24 0 Decision of the Court. – Following its review of the decision-making board in accordance with subsection (k) of this section, the court may affirm the decision, reverse the decision and remand the case with appropriate instructions, or remand the case for further proceedings. If the court does not affirm the decision below in its entirety, then the court shall be guided by the following in determining what relief should be granted to the petitioners: 20 (1) If the court concludes that the error committed by the decision-making board is procedural only, the court may remand the case for further proceedings to correct the procedural error. 21 0 (2) If the court concludes that the decision-making board has erred by failing to make findings of fact such that the court cannot properly perform its function, then the court may remand the case with appropriate instructions so long as the record contains substantial competent evidence that could support the decision below with appropriate findings of fact. However, findings of fact are not necessary when the record sufficien	5		under such circumstances that it was reasonable for the decision-making
 witnesses as to any of the following: a. The use of property in a particular way would affect the value of other property. b. The increase in vehicular traffic resulting from a proposed development would pose a danger to the public safety. c. Matters about which only expert testimony would generally be admissible under the rules of evidence. (1) Decision of the Court. – Following its review of the decision-making board in accordance with subsection (k) of this section, the court may affirm the decision, reverse the decision and remand the case with appropriate instructions, or remand the case for further proceedings. If the court does not affirm the decision below in its entirety, then the court shall be guided by the following in determining what relief should be granted to the petitioners; (1) If the court concludes that the error committed by the decision-making board is procedural only, the court may remand the case for further proceedings to correct the procedural error. (2) If the court concludes that the decision-making board has erred by failing to make findings of fact such that the court cannot properly perform its function, then the coird may remand the case with appropriate instructions so long as the record contains substantial competent evidence that could support the decision below or when the material facts are undisputed and the case presents only an issue of law. (3) If the court concludes that the decision by the decision-making board is not supported by substantial competent evidence in the record or is based upon an error of law, then the court may remand the case with an order that directs the decision making board to take whatever action should have been taken had the error not been committed or to take such other action as is necessary to correct the error. Specifically: a. If the court concludes that a permit was wrongfully denied because the decision making board to take whatever action ashould have been t	6		board to rely upon it. The term "competent evidence," as used in th
19 a. The use of property in a particular way would affect the value of other property. 21 b. The increase in vehicular traffic resulting from a proposed development would pose a danger to the public safety. 22 c. Matters about which only expert testimony would generally be admissible under the rules of evidence. 23 c. Matters about which only expert testimony would generally be admissible under the rules of evidence. 24 c. Matters about which only expert testimony would generally be admissible under the rules of evidence. 26 (1) Decision of the Court. – Following its review of the decision-making board in accordance with subsection (k) of this section, the court may affirm the decision, reverse the decision and remand the case with appropriate instructions, or remand the case for further proceedings. If the court concludes that the error committed by the decision-making board is procedural only, the court may remand the case for further proceedings to correct the procedural error. 26 (1) If the court concludes that the decision-making board has erred by failing to make findings of fact such that the court sunt propriate instructions so long as the record contains substantial competent evidence that could long as the record contains substantial competent evidence that could support the decision below with appropriate findings of fact. However, findings of fact are not necessary when the record sufficiently reveals the basis for the decision below or when the material facts are undisputed and the case presents only an issue of law. 21	17		subsection, shall not be deemed to include the opinion testimony of la
20 other property. 21 b. The increase in vehicular traffic resulting from a proposed development would pose a danger to the public safety. 22 c. Matters about which only expert testimony would generally be admissible under the rules of evidence. 23 c. Matters about which only expert testimony would generally be admissible under the rules of evidence. 24 Decision of the Court. – Following its review of the decision, reverse the decision and remand the case with appropriate instructions, or remand the case for further proceedings. If the court does not affirm the decision below in its entirety, then the court shall be guided by the following in determining what relief should be granted to the petitioners: 26 (1) If the court concludes that the error committed by the decision-making board is procedural only, the court may remand the case for further proceedings to correct the procedural error. 26 (2) If the court concludes that the decision-making board has erred by failing to make findings of fact such that the court cannot properly perform its function, then the court may remand the case with appropriate instructions so long as the record contains substantial competent evidence that could support the decision below or when the record sufficiently reveals the basis for the decision below or when the material facts are undisputed and the case presents only an issue of law. 27 (3) If the court concludes that the decision by the decision-making board is not supported by substantial competent evidence in the record or is based upon an error of law	8		witnesses as to any of the following:
20 other property. 21 b. The increase in vehicular traffic resulting from a proposed development would pose a danger to the public safety. 22 c. Matters about which only expert testimony would generally be admissible under the rules of evidence. 23 c. Matters about which only expert testimony would generally be admissible under the rules of evidence. 24 . Decision of the Court. – Following its review of the decision, reverse the decision and remand the case with appropriate instructions, or remand the case for further proceedings. If the court does not affirm the decision below in its entirety, then the court shall be guided by the following in determining what relief should be granted to the petitioners: 26 (1) If the court concludes that the error committed by the decision-making board is procedural only, the court may remand the case for further proceedings to correct the procedural error. 26 (2) If the court concludes that the decision-making board has erred by failing to make findings of fact such that the court cannot properly perform its function, then the court may remand the case with appropriate instructions so long as the record contains substantial competent evidence that could support the decision below or when the record sufficiently reveals the basis for the decision below or when the material facts are undisputed and the case presents only an issue of law. 27 (3) If the court concludes that the decision by the decision-making board is not supported by substantial competent evidence in the record or is based upo	9		a. The use of property in a particular way would affect the value of
development would pose a danger to the public safety. c. Matters about which only expert testimony would generally be admissible under the rules of evidence. (1) Decision of the Court. – Following its review of the decision, reverse the decision and remand the case with appropriate instructions, or remand the case for further proceedings. If the court does not affirm the decision below in its entirety, then the court shall be guided by the following in determining what relief should be granted to the petitioners: 0 (1) If the court concludes that the error committed by the decision-making board is procedural error. 13 (2) If the court concludes that the decision-making board has erred by failing to make findings of fact such that the court cannot properly perform its function, then the court may remand the case with appropriate instructions so long as the record contains substantial competent evidence that could support the decision below or when the material facts are undisputed and the case presents only an issue of law. 11 (3) If the court concludes that the decision by the decision-making board is not supported by substantial competent evidence in the record sufficiently reveals the basis for the decision below or when the material facts are undisputed and the case presents only an issue of law. 11 (3) If the court concludes that the decision by the decision-making board is not supported by substantial competent evidence in the record or is based upon an error of law, then the court may remand the case with an order that directs the decision-making board to take whatever action should have been taken had the error not been commit	20		other property.
development would pose a danger to the public safety. C. Matters about which only expert testimony would generally be admissible under the rules of evidence. (1) Decision of the Court. – Following its review of the decision-making board in accordance with subsection (k) of this section, the court may affirm the decision, reverse the decision and remand the case with appropriate instructions, or remand the case for further proceedings. If the court does not affirm the decision below in its entirety, then the court shall be guided by the following in determining what relief should be granted to the petitioners: (1) If the court concludes that the error committed by the decision-making board is procedural only, the court may remand the case for further proceedings to correct the procedural error. (2) If the court concludes that the decision-making board has erred by failing to make findings of fact such that the court cannot properly perform its function, then the court may remand the case with appropriate instructions so long as the record contains substantial competent evidence that could support the decision below or when the material facts are undisputed and the case presents only an issue of law. (3) If the court concludes that the decision by the decision-making board is not supported by substantial competent evidence in the record or is based upon support by euclides that the decision below or when the material facts are undisputed and the case presents only an issue of law. (4) (3) If the court concludes that the decision by the decision should have been taken the decision-making board to take whatever action should have been taken had the error not been committed or to ta	21		b. The increase in vehicular traffic resulting from a propose
24 admissible under the rules of evidence. 25 (1) Decision of the Court. – Following its review of the decision-making board in accordance with subsection (k) of this section, the court may affirm the decision, reverse the decision and remand the case with appropriate instructions, or remand the case for further proceedings. If the court does not affirm the decision below in its entirety, then the court shall be guided by the following in determining what relief should be granted to the petitioners: 26 (1) If the court concludes that the error committed by the decision-making board is procedural only, the court may remand the case for further proceedings to correct the procedural error. 27 (2) If the court concludes that the decision-making board has erred by failing to make findings of fact such that the court cannot properly perform its function, then the court may remand the case with appropriate instructions so long as the record contains substantial competent evidence that could support the decision below or when the material facts are undisputed and the case presents only an issue of law. 26 (3) If the court concludes that the decision by the decision-making board is not supported by substantial competent evidence in the record or is based upon an error of law, then the court may remand the case with an order that directs the decision-making board to take whatever action should have been taken had the error not been committed or to take such other action as is necessary to correct the error. Specifically: 27 a. If the court concludes that a permit was wrongfully denied because the denial was not based on substantial competent evidence or was otherwise based on an error of law, the court may remand the case with an order	22		
25(1)Decision of the Court. – Following its review of the decision-making board in26accordance with subsection (k) of this section, the court may affirm the decision, reverse the27decision and remand the case with appropriate instructions, or remand the case for further28proceedings. If the court does not affirm the decision below in its entirety, then the court shall29be guided by the following in determining what relief should be granted to the petitioners:30(1)If the court concludes that the error committed by the decision-making board31is procedural only, the court may remand the case for further proceedings to32correct the procedural error.33(2)If the court concludes that the decision-making board has erred by failing to34make findings of fact such that the court cannot properly perform its35function, then the court may remand the case with appropriate instructions so36long as the record contains substantial competent evidence that could37support the decision below or when the material facts are undisputed and38the case presents only an issue of law.39lf the court concludes that the decision by the decision-making board is not39supported by substantial competent evidence in the record or is based upon31an error of law, then the court may remand the case with an order that directs39the decision-making board to take whatever action should have been taken39had the error. Specifically:39a.If the court concludes that a permit was wrongfully denied	23		c. Matters about which only expert testimony would generally b
accordance with subsection (k) of this section, the court may affirm the decision, reverse the decision and remand the case with appropriate instructions, or remand the case for further proceedings. If the court does not affirm the decision below in its entirety, then the court shall be guided by the following in determining what relief should be granted to the petitioners: (1) If the court concludes that the error committed by the decision-making board is procedural only, the court may remand the case for further proceedings to correct the procedural error. (2) If the court concludes that the decision-making board has erred by failing to make findings of fact such that the court cannot properly perform its function, then the court may remand the case with appropriate instructions so long as the record contains substantial competent evidence that could support the decision below or when the material facts are undisputed and the case presents only an issue of law. [1] (3) If the court concludes that the decision by the decision-making board is not support d by substantial competent evidence in the record or is based upon an error of law, then the court may remand the case with an order that directs the decision-making board to take whatever action should have been taken had the error not been committed or to take such other action as is	24		admissible under the rules of evidence.
decision and remand the case with appropriate instructions, or remand the case for furtherproceedings. If the court does not affirm the decision below in its entirety, then the court shallbe guided by the following in determining what relief should be granted to the petitioners:(1)If the court concludes that the error committed by the decision-making boardis procedural only, the court may remand the case for further proceedings tocorrect the procedural error.(2)If the court concludes that the decision-making board has erred by failing tomake findings of fact such that the court cannot properly perform itsfunction, then the court may remand the case with appropriate instructions solong as the record contains substantial competent evidence that couldsupport the decision below with appropriate findings of fact. However,findings of fact are not necessary when the record sufficiently reveals thebasis for the decision below or when the material facts are undisputed andthe case presents only an issue of law.(3)If the court concludes that the decision by the decision-making board is notsupported by substantial competent evidence in the record or is based uponan error of law, then the court may remand the case with an order that directsthe decision-making board to take whatever action should have been takenhad the error not been committed or to take such other action as is necessaryto correct the error. Specifically:a.If the court concludes that a permit was wrongfully denied becausethe denial was not based on substantial competent evidence or wasotherwise based on an error of law	25	(1) Decis	ion of the Court Following its review of the decision-making board
Proceedings. If the court does not affirm the decision below in its entirety, then the court shallbe guided by the following in determining what relief should be granted to the petitioners:(1)If the court concludes that the error committed by the decision-making boardis procedural only, the court may remand the case for further proceedings tocorrect the procedural error.(2)If the court concludes that the decision-making board has erred by failing tomake findings of fact such that the court cannot properly perform itsfunction, then the court may remand the case with appropriate instructions solong as the record contains substantial competent evidence that couldsupport the decision below with appropriate findings of fact. However,findings of fact are not necessary when the record sufficiently reveals thebasis for the decision below or when the material facts are undisputed andthe case presents only an issue of law.(1)(3)If the court concludes that the decision by the decision-making board is notsupported by substantial competent evidence in the record or is based uponan error of law, then the court may remand the case with an order that directsthe decision-making board to take whatever action as is necessaryto correct the error. Specifically:a.If the court concludes that a permit was wrongfully denied becausethe denial was not based on substantial competent evidence or wasotherwise based on an error of law, the court may remand withinstructions that the permit be issued, subject to reasonable and	26	accordance with	subsection (k) of this section, the court may affirm the decision, reverse the
be guided by the following in determining what relief should be granted to the petitioners:30(1)If the court concludes that the error committed by the decision-making board is procedural only, the court may remand the case for further proceedings to correct the procedural error.33(2)If the court concludes that the decision-making board has erred by failing to make findings of fact such that the court cannot properly perform its function, then the court may remand the case with appropriate instructions so long as the record contains substantial competent evidence that could support the decision below with appropriate findings of fact. However, findings of fact are not necessary when the record sufficiently reveals the basis for the decision below or when the material facts are undisputed and the case presents only an issue of law.41(3)If the court concludes that the decision by the decision-making board is not supported by substantial competent evidence in the record or is based upon an error of law, then the court may remand the case with an order that directs the decision-making board to take whatever action should have been taken had the error. Specifically: a.47a.If the court concludes that a permit was wrongfully denied because the denial was not based on substantial competent evidence or was otherwise based on an error of law, the court may remand the court may remand with instructions that the permit be issued, subject to reasonable and with	27	decision and ren	nand the case with appropriate instructions, or remand the case for further
30(1)If the court concludes that the error committed by the decision-making board is procedural only, the court may remand the case for further proceedings to correct the procedural error.33(2)If the court concludes that the decision-making board has erred by failing to make findings of fact such that the court cannot properly perform its function, then the court may remand the case with appropriate instructions so long as the record contains substantial competent evidence that could support the decision below with appropriate findings of fact. However, 	28	proceedings. If t	he court does not affirm the decision below in its entirety, then the court sha
31is procedural only, the court may remand the case for further proceedings to32correct the procedural error.33(2)If the court concludes that the decision-making board has erred by failing to34make findings of fact such that the court cannot properly perform its35function, then the court may remand the case with appropriate instructions so36long as the record contains substantial competent evidence that could37support the decision below with appropriate findings of fact. However,38findings of fact are not necessary when the record sufficiently reveals the39basis for the decision below or when the material facts are undisputed and40the case presents only an issue of law.41(3)If the court concludes that the decision by the decision-making board is not42supported by substantial competent evidence in the record or is based upon43an error of law, then the court may remand the case with an order that directs44the decision-making board to take whatever action should have been taken45had the error not been committed or to take such other action as is necessary46to correct the error. Specifically:47a.If the court concludes that a permit was wrongfully denied because48the denial was not based on substantial competent evidence or was49otherwise based on an error of law, the court may remand with50instructions that the permit be issued, subject to reasonable and	29	be guided by the	following in determining what relief should be granted to the petitioners:
32correct the procedural error.33(2)If the court concludes that the decision-making board has erred by failing to make findings of fact such that the court cannot properly perform its function, then the court may remand the case with appropriate instructions so long as the record contains substantial competent evidence that could support the decision below with appropriate findings of fact. However, findings of fact are not necessary when the record sufficiently reveals the basis for the decision below or when the material facts are undisputed and the case presents only an issue of law.41(3)If the court concludes that the decision by the decision-making board is not supported by substantial competent evidence in the record or is based upon an error of law, then the court may remand the case with an order that directs the decision-making board to take whatever action should have been taken had the error not been committed or to take such other action as is necessary to correct the error. Specifically: a.47a.If the court concludes that a permit was wrongfully denied because the denial was not based on substantial competent evidence or was otherwise based on an error of law, the court may remand with instructions that the permit be issued, subject to reasonable and		<u>(1)</u>	
33(2)If the court concludes that the decision-making board has erred by failing to make findings of fact such that the court cannot properly perform its function, then the court may remand the case with appropriate instructions so long as the record contains substantial competent evidence that could support the decision below with appropriate findings of fact. However, findings of fact are not necessary when the record sufficiently reveals the basis for the decision below or when the material facts are undisputed and the case presents only an issue of law.11(3)If the court concludes that the decision by the decision-making board is not supported by substantial competent evidence in the record or is based upon an error of law, then the court may remand the case with an order that directs the decision-making board to take whatever action should have been taken had the error not been committed or to take such other action as is necessary to correct the error. Specifically: a.17a.If the court concludes that a permit was wrongfully denied because the denial was not based on substantial competent evidence or was otherwise based on an error of law, the court may remand with instructions that the permit be issued, subject to reasonable and			is procedural only, the court may remand the case for further proceedings
34make findings of fact such that the court cannot properly perform its35function, then the court may remand the case with appropriate instructions so36long as the record contains substantial competent evidence that could37support the decision below with appropriate findings of fact. However,38findings of fact are not necessary when the record sufficiently reveals the39basis for the decision below or when the material facts are undisputed and40the case presents only an issue of law.41(3)If the court concludes that the decision by the decision-making board is not42supported by substantial competent evidence in the record or is based upon43an error of law, then the court may remand the case with an order that directs44the decision-making board to take whatever action should have been taken45had the error not been committed or to take such other action as is necessary46to correct the error. Specifically:47a.If the court concludes that a permit was wrongfully denied because48the denial was not based on substantial competent evidence or was49otherwise based on an error of law, the court may remand with50instructions that the permit be issued, subject to reasonable and			correct the procedural error.
35function, then the court may remand the case with appropriate instructions so36long as the record contains substantial competent evidence that could37support the decision below with appropriate findings of fact. However,38findings of fact are not necessary when the record sufficiently reveals the39basis for the decision below or when the material facts are undisputed and40the case presents only an issue of law.41(3)If the court concludes that the decision by the decision-making board is not42supported by substantial competent evidence in the record or is based upon43an error of law, then the court may remand the case with an order that directs44the decision-making board to take whatever action should have been taken45had the error not been committed or to take such other action as is necessary46to correct the error. Specifically:47a.If the court concludes that a permit was wrongfully denied because48the denial was not based on substantial competent evidence or was49otherwise based on an error of law, the court may remand with50instructions that the permit be issued, subject to reasonable and		<u>(2)</u>	If the court concludes that the decision-making board has erred by failing
36long as the record contains substantial competent evidence that could support the decision below with appropriate findings of fact. However, findings of fact are not necessary when the record sufficiently reveals the basis for the decision below or when the material facts are undisputed and the case presents only an issue of law.40(3)If the court concludes that the decision by the decision-making board is not supported by substantial competent evidence in the record or is based upon an error of law, then the court may remand the case with an order that directs the decision-making board to take whatever action should have been taken had the error not been committed or to take such other action as is necessary to correct the error. Specifically: a.47a.If the court concludes that a permit was wrongfully denied because the denial was not based on substantial competent evidence or was otherwise based on an error of law, the court may remand with instructions that the permit be issued, subject to reasonable and			make findings of fact such that the court cannot properly perform i
37support the decision below with appropriate findings of fact. However,38findings of fact are not necessary when the record sufficiently reveals the39basis for the decision below or when the material facts are undisputed and40the case presents only an issue of law.41(3)If the court concludes that the decision by the decision-making board is not42supported by substantial competent evidence in the record or is based upon43an error of law, then the court may remand the case with an order that directs44the decision-making board to take whatever action should have been taken45had the error not been committed or to take such other action as is necessary46to correct the error. Specifically:47a.If the court concludes that a permit was wrongfully denied because48the denial was not based on substantial competent evidence or was49otherwise based on an error of law, the court may remand with50instructions that the permit be issued, subject to reasonable and			function, then the court may remand the case with appropriate instructions s
38findings of fact are not necessary when the record sufficiently reveals the basis for the decision below or when the material facts are undisputed and the case presents only an issue of law.40(3)If the court concludes that the decision by the decision-making board is not supported by substantial competent evidence in the record or is based upon an error of law, then the court may remand the case with an order that directs the decision-making board to take whatever action should have been taken had the error not been committed or to take such other action as is necessary to correct the error. Specifically: a.47a.If the court concludes that a permit was wrongfully denied because the denial was not based on substantial competent evidence or was otherwise based on an error of law, the permit be issued, subject to reasonable and			
39basis for the decision below or when the material facts are undisputed and the case presents only an issue of law.40(3)If the court concludes that the decision by the decision-making board is not supported by substantial competent evidence in the record or is based upon an error of law, then the court may remand the case with an order that directs the decision-making board to take whatever action should have been taken had the error not been committed or to take such other action as is necessary to correct the error. Specifically: a.47a.If the court concludes that a permit was wrongfully denied because the denial was not based on substantial competent evidence or was otherwise based on an error of law, the court may remand with instructions that the permit be issued, subject to reasonable and			support the decision below with appropriate findings of fact. However
40the case presents only an issue of law.41(3)If the court concludes that the decision by the decision-making board is not supported by substantial competent evidence in the record or is based upon an error of law, then the court may remand the case with an order that directs the decision-making board to take whatever action should have been taken had the error not been committed or to take such other action as is necessary to correct the error. Specifically:47a.If the court concludes that a permit was wrongfully denied because the denial was not based on substantial competent evidence or was otherwise based on an error of law, the court may remand with instructions that the permit be issued, subject to reasonable and			
11(3)If the court concludes that the decision by the decision-making board is not supported by substantial competent evidence in the record or is based upon an error of law, then the court may remand the case with an order that directs the decision-making board to take whatever action should have been taken had the error not been committed or to take such other action as is necessary to correct the error. Specifically: a.14a.If the court concludes that a permit was wrongfully denied because the denial was not based on substantial competent evidence or was otherwise based on an error of law, the court may remand with instructions that the permit be issued, subject to reasonable and			basis for the decision below or when the material facts are undisputed an
42supported by substantial competent evidence in the record or is based upon43an error of law, then the court may remand the case with an order that directs44the decision-making board to take whatever action should have been taken45had the error not been committed or to take such other action as is necessary46to correct the error. Specifically:47a.48If the court concludes that a permit was wrongfully denied because49otherwise based on an error of law, the court may remand with50instructions that the permit be issued, subject to reasonable and	10		the case presents only an issue of law.
43an error of law, then the court may remand the case with an order that directs44the decision-making board to take whatever action should have been taken45had the error not been committed or to take such other action as is necessary46to correct the error. Specifically:47a.48If the court concludes that a permit was wrongfully denied because48the denial was not based on substantial competent evidence or was49otherwise based on an error of law, the court may remand with50instructions that the permit be issued, subject to reasonable and	11	<u>(3)</u>	If the court concludes that the decision by the decision-making board is not
14the decision-making board to take whatever action should have been taken15had the error not been committed or to take such other action as is necessary16to correct the error. Specifically:17a.If the court concludes that a permit was wrongfully denied because18the denial was not based on substantial competent evidence or was19otherwise based on an error of law, the court may remand with50instructions that the permit be issued, subject to reasonable and	12		supported by substantial competent evidence in the record or is based upo
45had the error not been committed or to take such other action as is necessary46to correct the error. Specifically:47a. If the court concludes that a permit was wrongfully denied because48the denial was not based on substantial competent evidence or was49otherwise based on an error of law, the court may remand with50instructions that the permit be issued, subject to reasonable and			an error of law, then the court may remand the case with an order that direc
16to correct the error. Specifically:17a.If the court concludes that a permit was wrongfully denied because18the denial was not based on substantial competent evidence or was19otherwise based on an error of law, the court may remand with50instructions that the permit be issued, subject to reasonable and	14		the decision-making board to take whatever action should have been take
47a.If the court concludes that a permit was wrongfully denied because48the denial was not based on substantial competent evidence or was49otherwise based on an error of law, the court may remand with50instructions that the permit be issued, subject to reasonable and	45		
18the denial was not based on substantial competent evidence or was19otherwise based on an error of law, the court may remand with50instructions that the permit be issued, subject to reasonable and			
19otherwise based on an error of law, the court may remand with50instructions that the permit be issued, subject to reasonable and			
50 instructions that the permit be issued, subject to reasonable and			• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
			· · · · ·
appropriate conditions.			
	51		appropriate conditions.

	General Assembly Of North Carolina Session 2009
1	b. If the court concludes that a permit was wrongfully issued because
2	the issuance was not based on substantial competent evidence or was
3	otherwise based on an error of law, the court may remand with
4	instructions that the permit be revoked.
5	(m) Ancillary Injunctive Relief. – Upon motion of a party to a proceeding under this
6	section, and under appropriate circumstances, the court may issue an injunctive order requiring
7	any other party to that proceeding to take certain action or refrain from taking action that is
8	consistent with the court's decision on the merits of the appeal."
9	SECTION 1.(b) Article 18 of Chapter 153A of the General Statutes is amended by
10	adding a new section to read:
11	" <u>§ 153A-349. Appeals in the nature of certiorari.</u>
12	(a) Whenever appeals of quasi-judicial decisions of decision-making boards are to
13	superior court and in the nature of certiorari as required by this Article, the provisions of
14	G.S. 160A-393 shall be applicable to those appeals.
15	(b) For purposes of this section, as used in G.S. 160A-393, the term "city council" shall
16	be deemed to refer to the "board of commissioners," and the term "city" or "municipal" shall be
17	deemed to refer to the "county."
18	(c) For purposes of this section, the "impermissible conflict as described in
19	G.S. 160A-388(e1)" shall mean "impermissible conflict as described in G.S. 153A-345(e1)."
20	SECTION 2.(a) Part 2 of Article 19 of Chapter 160A of the General Statutes is
21	amended by adding a new section to read:
22	" <u>§ 160A-377. Appeals of decisions on subdivision plats.</u>
23	(a) When a subdivision ordinance adopted under this Part provides that the decision
24	whether to approve or deny a preliminary or final subdivision plat is to be made by a city
25	council or a planning board, other than a planning board comprised solely of members of a city
26	planning staff, and the ordinance authorizes the council or planning board to make a
27	quasi-judicial decision in deciding whether to approve the subdivision plat, then that
28	quasi-judicial decision of the council or planning board shall be subject to review by the
29	superior court by proceedings in the nature of certiorari. The provisions of G.S. 160A-381(c),
30	160A-388(e2), and 160A-393 shall apply to those appeals.
31	(b) When a subdivision ordinance adopted under this Part provides that a city council,
32	planning board, or staff member is authorized to make only an administrative or ministerial
33	decision in deciding whether to approve a preliminary or final subdivision plat, then any party
34	aggrieved by that administrative or ministerial decision may seek to have the decision reviewed
35	by filing an action in superior court seeking appropriate declaratory or equitable relief. Such an
36	action must be filed within the time frame specified in G.S. 160A-381(c) for petitions in the
37	nature of certiorari.
38	(c) For purposes of this section, an ordinance shall be deemed to authorize a
39	quasi-judicial decision if the city council or planning board is authorized to decide whether to
40	approve or deny the plat based not only upon whether the application complies with the
41	specific requirements set forth in the ordinance, but also on whether the application complies
42	with one or more generally stated standards requiring a discretionary decision to be made by
43	the city council or planning board."
44	SECTION 2.(b) Part 2 of Article 18 of Chapter 153A of the General Statutes is
45	amended by adding a new section to read:
46	" <u>§ 153A-336. Appeals of decisions on subdivision plats.</u>
47 48	(a) When a subdivision ordinance adopted under this Part provides that the decision
48 40	whether to approve or deny a preliminary or final subdivision plat is to be made by a board of commissioners or a planning board, other than a planning board commission of a planning board of members.
49 50	commissioners or a planning board, other than a planning board comprised solely of members of a county planning staff, and the ordinance authorizes the board of commissioners or
50 51	planning board to make a quasi-judicial decision in deciding whether to approve the
J I	promising obtained to make a quasi judicial decision in deciding whether to approve the

General Assembly Of North Carolina

subdivision plat, then that quasi-judicial decision of the board of commissioners or planning 1 2 board shall be subject to review by the superior court by proceedings in the nature of certiorari. 3 The provisions of G.S. 153A-340(f), 153A-345(e2), and 153A-349 shall apply to those appeals. 4 When a subdivision ordinance adopted under this Part provides that a board of (b) 5 commissioners, planning board, or staff member is authorized to make only an administrative or ministerial decision in deciding whether to approve a preliminary or final subdivision plat, 6 7 then any party aggrieved by that administrative or ministerial decision may seek to have the 8 decision reviewed by filing an action in superior court seeking appropriate declaratory or 9 equitable relief. Such an action must be filed within the time frame specified in G.S. 153A-340(f) for petitions in the nature of certiorari. 10 For purposes of this section, an ordinance shall be deemed to authorize a 11 (c) quasi-judicial decision if the board of commissioners or planning board is authorized to decide 12 13 whether to approve or deny the plat based not only upon whether the application complies with 14 the specific requirements set forth in the ordinance, but also on whether the application complies with one or more generally stated standards requiring a discretionary decision to be 15 made by the board of commissioners or planning board." 16 17 **SECTION 3.** G.S. 63-34 reads as rewritten: 18 "§ 63-34. Judicial review. Any person aggrieved by any decision of the board of appeals, or any taxpayer, or 19 (a) 20 any officer, department, board, or bureau of the political subdivision, may present to the 21 superior court a verified petition setting forth that the decision is illegal, in whole or in part, and 22 specifying the grounds of the illegality. Such petition shall be presented to the court within 30 23 days after the decision is filed in the office of the board. Such petition shall comply with the 24 provisions of G.S. 160A-393. 25 (b) Upon presentation of such petition the court may allow a writ of certiorari directed 26 to the board of appeals to review such decision of the board. The allowance of the writ shall not stay proceedings upon the decision appealed from, but the court may, on application, on notice 27 28 to the board and on due cause shown, grant a restraining order. 29 The board of appeals shall not be required to return the original papers acted upon (c)30 by it, but it shall be sufficient to return certified or sworn copies thereof or of such portions 31 thereof as may be called for by the writ. The return shall concisely set forth such other facts as 32 may be pertinent and material to show the grounds of the decision appealed from and shall be 33 verified. 34 The court shall have exclusive jurisdiction to affirm, modify, or set aside the (d) 35 decision brought up for review, in whole or in part, and if need be, to order further proceedings 36 by the board of appeals. The findings of fact by the board, if supported by substantial evidence, 37 shall be accepted by the court as conclusive, and no objection to a decision of the board shall be 38 considered by the court unless such objection shall have been urged before the board, or if it 39 was not so urged, unless there were reasonable grounds for failure to do so. 40 Costs shall not be allowed against the board of appeals unless it appears to the court (e) 41 that it acted with gross negligence, in bad faith, or with malice, in making the decision appealed 42 from." 43 SECTION 4. G.S. 162A-93(b) reads as rewritten: 44 The provisions of subsection (a) shall not apply if the city council adopts an "(b) 45 annexation ordinance including an area served by a district and finds, after a public hearing, 46 that adequate fire protection cannot be provided in the area because of the level of available 47 water service. Notice of the public hearing shall be provided by first class mail to each affected 48 customer and by publication in a newspaper having general circulation in the area, each not less 49 than 10 days before the hearing. The clerk's certification of the mailing shall be deemed conclusive in the absence of fraud. Any resident of the annexed area aggrieved by such a 50

51 finding of the council may file a petition for review in the superior court in the nature of

General Assembly Of North Carolina Session 2009
certioraricertiorari, within 30 days after the finding. The petition for review in the nature of
certiorari shall comply with G.S. 160A-393."
SECTION 5. G.S. 160A-388(e1) reads as rewritten:
"(e1) A member of the board or any other body exercising the functions of a board of
adjustmentquasi-judicial functions pursuant to this Article shall not participate in or vote on
any quasi-judicial matter in a manner that would violate affected persons' constitutional rights
to an impartial decision maker. Impermissible conflicts include, but are not limited to, a
member having a fixed opinion prior to hearing the matter that is not susceptible to change,
undisclosed ex parte communications, a close familial, business, or other associational
relationship with an affected person, or a financial interest in the outcome of the matter. If an
objection is raised to a member's participation and that member does not recuse himself or
herself, the remaining members shall by majority vote rule on the objection."
SECTION 6. G.S. 153A-345(e1) reads as rewritten:
"(e1) A member of the board or any other body exercising the functions of a board of
adjustmentquasi-judicial functions pursuant to this Article shall not participate in or vote on
any quasi-judicial matter in a manner that would violate affected persons' constitutional rights
to an impartial decision maker. Impermissible conflicts include, but are not limited to, a
member having a fixed opinion prior to hearing the matter that is not susceptible to change,
undisclosed ex parte communications, a close familial, business, or other associational
relationship with an affected person, or a financial interest in the outcome of the matter. If an
objection is raised to a member's participation and that member does not recuse himself or
herself, the remaining members shall by majority vote rule on the objection."
SECTION 7. This act becomes effective January 1, 2010, and applies to
quasi-judicial decisions rendered on or after that date.