CALL TO ORDER  
At 7:05 p.m., Senior Planner Angela Zubko called the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting to order.

ROLL CALL  
Members present: Scott Cherry, Karen Clementi, Tom LeCuyer, Dick Thompson and Dick Whitfield  
Also present was: Senior Planner Angela Zubko  
Absent: Donna McKay and Randy Mohr (Chairman)  
In the audience: Mark and Karen Craig, Jeff Rugg and Brad Cass.

A quorum was present to conduct business.

MINUTES  
Dick Whitfield motioned to approve the July 1, 2013 ZBA meeting minutes as amended. Karen Clementi seconded the motion. All were in favor and minutes were approved.

PETITIONS  
#13-20 Bradley Cass/ Michael Tracy  
Planner Zubko went through the report stating the location of the petition and that the petitioner is requesting 2 variances for a new detached garage. The petition would like to exceed the 15’ maximum height requirement to 17’ and also allow the detached accessory structure building to have a footprint larger than 70% of the principle structure. The detached accessory structure will be 960 square feet and the current house is a total of 992.25 square feet and the current house is a total of 992.25 square feet, 97% of the size of the principle structure. Section 4.05.F states: FOOTPRINT OF ACCESSORY BUILDINGS. Any detached accessory building must have a footprint no larger than 70% of the principal structure if located in the R5, R6 or R7 zoning districts. If you take a look at the plat of survey it shows what’s currently on the property. The owner has applied for a demolition permit for the existing frame garage, patio and screened in porch as depicted below. Once the screened porch will be demolished the home will be 992.25 square feet. The petitioner meets all other requirements including hard surface coverage. Therefore staff recommends approval of the two variances with the one condition that that current patio, screened porch and detached garage must be demolished before the building permit for the new detached garage can be released.

Ms. Clementi asked if the current structures are in disrepair. Mr. Brad Cass stated yes the back room/screened porch has taken on water before and was not a permitted structure so not to code. The same thing for the garage, there’s mold and would like to fix any previous issues. Ms. Clementi asked why the garage needed to be this big. Mr. Brad Cass stated they currently have 2 cars and 1 truck so wanted to make sure all the cars fit in the garage.

Mr. Brad Cass just wanted to add that most likely he will not need a 17’ height variances but was advised to ask for it as he thought the roof would be at about 15’8” but wanted to be sure he met the building code requirements for the pitch of the roof and depending on the foundation.
No audience members wanted to testify, with no further testimony, Planner Zubko closed the testimony and reviewed the Findings of Fact as follows:

That the particular physical surroundings, shape, or topographical condition of the specific property involved would result in a particular hardship or practical difficulty upon the owner if the strict letter of the regulations were carried out. The principle structure is small which makes it impossible to build a two car garage. In order to have the roof at a 2:12 pitch to meet building codes it needs a height variance.

That the conditions upon which the requested variation is based would not be applicable, generally, to other property within the same zoning classification. The petitioner is demolishing 3 items to construct a two car detached garage, most people would probably not wish to do that.

That the alleged difficulty or hardship has not been created by any person presently having an interest in the property. The house was built before the petitioner bought making this a 992 square foot home.

That the granting of the variation will not materially be detrimental to the public welfare or substantially injurious to other property or improvements in the neighborhood in which the property is located. The requested variances should not affect any of the neighbors nor be detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to other property or improvements in the neighborhood.

That the proposed variation will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property, or substantially increase the congestion in the public streets or increase the danger of fire, or endanger the public safety or substantially diminish or impair property values within the neighborhood. These variations will not impair an adequate supply of light and air or substantially increase the congestion in the public streets or increase the danger of fire, or endanger the public safety or substantially diminish or impair property values.

Ms. Clementi is in favor of any Boulder Hill resident that’s trying to improve their property. Karen Clementi approved staff’s findings of fact as written, Dick Whitfield seconded the motion. All were in favor of approving the findings of fact.

With no further questions Karen Clementi made a motion, seconded by Dick Whitfield to approve the two variances with staff’s recommendations. With a roll call vote all were in favor of the two variances with staff’s recommendation.

**REVIEW PBZ APPROVALS BY COUNTY BOARD & CHANGES**
- 13-11 Any text related to guns or target practice- approved with changes shown in the packet in blue
- 13-15 Subdivision Control Ordinance- approved as is
- 12-03 Land Cash Ordinance- approved with very minor changes

**NEW BUSINESS**- None

**OLD BUSINESS**-
Planner Zubko stated the fence variance will be discussed at the next meeting along with the text for poultry and small animal processing plants.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None

**ADJOURNMENT**
Scott Cherry made a motion to adjourn the ZBA meeting, Tom LeCuyer seconded the motion. Planner Zubko adjourned the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting at 7:19 p.m. The next meeting will be on September 3, 2013.

Respectfully Submitted,
Angela L. Zubko
Senior Planner & Recording Secretary