

The Tuesday, April 17, 2007 meeting of the Delhi Township Board of Zoning Appeals was called to order by Chairman Jerry Kearns at 7:00 p.m. at the Administration Building with the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

Members present:

Robert J. Ashe

Jerome H. Kearns

Joseph Scherer, Jr.

Robert G. Hendon

Charles Brigham III

Also present:

Thomas R. Stahlheber, Director of Development Services

David C. Lane, Law Director

Mr. Stahlheber certified that the requirements of Section 121.22 of the Ohio Revised Code and the rules adopted pursuant thereto had been completely complied with as they concerned the meeting.

The hearing in Case VA2007-4 (778 Stonebridge) was convened.

Mr. Stahlheber (sworn) advised that on February 26, 2007 the Department of Development Services received an application filed by Anne Marie Gibler for a residential addition at 778 Stonebridge. He commented that the application was denied on March 2, 2007 with the applicant notified of the denial by certified letter on that same date. He noted that in the letter were stated the reasons for the denial which included: the premises known as 778 Stonebridge is located in Delhi Township, Hamilton County, Ohio and in the "A2" Residence district as shown on the maps of the Township Zoning Resolution; the subject premises is an irregularly shaped panhandle lot; at the time of the construction of the existing single-family dwelling at the subject premises the yard designations were determined to be as follows - front yard west, rear yard east, side yards north and south; the submitted application and drawings indicated a proposed addition, including a deck, extending from the northwest end of the existing dwelling, such addition having a 14' west front yard setback; the Township Zoning Resolution requires that a zoning certificate be obtained prior to the construction of additions to existing residences and prohibits single-family dwellings and additions thereto having a less than 40' front yard setback in the "A2" Residence District. The denial was also based on the following sections of the Zoning Resolution: Sections 51.1, 69, 70, 61, 62, 62.13, 72, 72.1, 72.1-1, 191, 192, 194, 251, 281, 282 and 291. Pursuant to Article XVIII of the Zoning Resolution the applicant had the right to file an appeal of the denial within twenty days of the action with an appeal being filed in the form of an application received March 5, 2007. Pursuant to the requirements of the Ohio Revised Code the hearing was advertised in a newspaper of general circulation at least ten days before the hearing and those parties of interest were notified by first class mail at least ten days before the hearing.

Exhibit "A" – application
 Exhibit "B" – site plan
 Exhibit "C" – elevation drawings
 Exhibit "D" – floor plan

W. Brian Gibler (sworn) and Anne Marie Gibler (sworn), 778 Stonebridge, advised that the need for the variance was to permit construction of a 40' x 20' addition to their existing single-family residence resulting in a west front yard setback of fourteen feet (14'). Mr. Gibler commented that the addition would make the house more livable as a one-story plan adding a first floor bedroom with a finished basement. He noted that the only place to locate the addition was off the northwest corner of the house because of the severe drop-off of topography to the rear (north) of the house. He advised that the addition would be buffered from the neighboring property west owned by the Stutzmans by way of an existing wooded area in which the majority of the mature trees will be preserved. He commented that Dennis Ott, the builder of the original house, will build the addition assuring high quality workmanship that will result in the addition blending in with the original construction, increasing value to both his and his neighbors' properties. He noted that they had received no objections from the Stutzmans and Radleys, adjacent property owners, or Steve Thiemann and Mark Gates of the subdivisions' homeowners' association.

To Mr. Scherer's question Mr. Gibler clarified the yard designations.

Resolution 2007-5

Mr. Hendon moved and Mr. Ashe seconded to approve the variance as requested in case VA2007-4 noting that the topography and the shape of the lot dictate the location of the addition. Mssrs. Scherer, Ashe, Hendon, and Kearns voted Aye. Motion carried.

Finding of Fact:

1. The case number was VA2007-4.
2. The date of the action by the inspector was March 2, 2007 where a zoning certificate was denied for the construction of a residential addition for the reason that said addition would result in a less than required front yard setback.
3. The appellants' names were Brian and Anne Marie Gibler.
4. The date the appeal was filed was March 5, 2007.
5. The address of the subject premises was 778 Stonebridge.
6. The zone district of the subject premises was "A2" Residence.
7. Sections of the Zoning Resolution on which the denial was based included: 51.1, 69, 70, 61, 62, 62.13, 72, 72.1, 72.1-1, 191, 192, 194, 251, 281, 282 and 291.
8. Sections of the Zoning Resolution authorizing the Board to grant or deny the appeal included: 183, 184, 184.2, 184.6, 185 and 186.
9. There were no sections cited by the appellant as authorizing the Board to grant the appeal.
10. There was no opposition present at the meeting.
11. The Board finds no error on the part of the inspector.

12. The Board finds that practical difficulties exist as a result of an area zoning requirement after consideration of the following non-exclusive factors:
 - a) The property owner purchased the property with knowledge of the zoning restriction.
 - b) The property owner's predicament feasibly cannot be obviated through some other method other than a variance.
 - c) The variance is not substantial.
 - d) The lot has an irregular shape, topographic and other conditions present.
 - e) The essential character of the neighborhood would not be substantially altered and adjoining properties would not suffer a substantial detriment as a result of the variance.
 - f) The property in question would yield a reasonable return and there can be some beneficial use of the property without a variance.
 - g) The variance would not adversely affect the delivery of governmental services.
13. The Board finds that the spirit and intent behind the zoning requirement would be observed and substantial justice done by granting the variance.
14. The Board finds that the granting of the appeal would not be contrary to the public interest, general welfare and adjoining landowners. Basis of finding:
 - a) The proposed addition, due to the subject property being a panhandle lot, has a unique shape.
 - b) The building will enhance the overall residential character of the neighborhood.
 - c) Owing to the relationship of the subject property to neighboring properties there will still be a substantial distance between the addition and the neighboring residences.
15. The Board wishes to review any alterations regarding the variance.

The hearing in Case VA2007-5 (1289 Fairway View Lane) was convened.

Mr. Stahlheber (sworn) advised that on February 22, 2007 the Department of Development Services received an application filed by Jason Ott on behalf of Fairway View Estates LLC for the continued situation of subdivision entrance monuments and a subdivision identification sign at 1289 & 1300 Fairway View Lane. He commented that the application was denied on February 27, 2007 and the applicant notified of that denial by certified letter on that same date. He noted that in the letter were stated the reasons for the denial which include: the premises known as 1289 & 1300 Fairway View Lane are located in Delhi Township, Hamilton County, Ohio and in the "A2" Residence District as shown on the maps of the Township Zoning Resolution; the subject properties are corner lots; the submitted applications and drawings indicated an existing subdivision entrance monument in the north front yard at the northeast corner of 1289 Fairway View and an existing subdivision entrance monument containing a sign in the north front yard, at the northwest corner of 1300 Fairway View; the Township Zoning Resolution defines subdivision entrance monuments as accessory structures, prohibits accessory structures in any yard other than rear yards and requires zoning certificates be obtained prior to the construction of all accessory structures. The denial was also based on the following sections of the Zoning Resolution: 51.1, 69, 70, 61, 62, 62.13, 62.14, 62.14-7, 312, 312.7, 171, 171.7, 191, 192, 194, 251, 281, 282, and 291. Pursuant to Article XVIII of the Zoning Resolution the applicant had the right to file an appeal of the denial within twenty

days of the action with an appeal being filed in the form of an application received March 6, 2007. Pursuant to the requirements of the Ohio Revised Code the hearing was advertised in a newspaper of general circulation at least ten days before the hearing and those parties of interest were notified by first class mail at least ten days before the hearing.

Exhibit "A" – application

Exhibit "B" – site plan

Exhibit "C" – elevation drawings

Exhibit "D" – photos of the existing walls/sign

To Mr. Kearns' question Mr. Stahlheber advised that no regulations for subdivision entrance monuments are contained within the Zoning Resolution and as such they have been consistently determined to be accessory structures. Mr. Stahlheber commented that inasmuch as accessory structures are not permitted anywhere but in rear yards, all applications for subdivision entrance monuments are denied so to facilitate requests for variances being submitted and considered by the Board.

To Mr. Kearns' question Mr. Stahlheber advised that the proximity of the entrance walls to the right-of-way of Cleves Warsaw has already been approved by the County Engineer.

Sandy Biehn (sworn), Dennis Ott Builders on behalf of Fariway View Estates LLC, advised that the request for a variance was to permit the continued situation of the subdivision entrance monuments/sign at the entrance to the subdivision. She commented that the walls are made from creek stone, are very attractive, and are extensively landscaped. She noted that the monuments are situated well outside the right-of-way, unlike the properties' original monuments which were situated within the right-of-way. She advised that the homes within the subject subdivision are upscale with each including creek stone as part of their building materials. She commented that the sign is necessary to identification the subdivision for those who are looking for it. She noted that the Board has in the past granted variances for subdivision entrance monuments/signs for subdivision elsewhere in the Township.

Sean Sutter, Keeding Meuthing Clekamp, One East Fourth Street, Suite 1400, Cincinnati, OH 45202, representing Mrs. Rosemary Brune, 5845 Cleves Warsaw Pike, advised that his client objects to the requested variance based upon the following: that the subdivision is inconsistent with the adjoining, larger properties (her house being situated on 3+ acres); the property in question was at one time a 4-5 acre residential lot; the walls create a subdivision look which is not in keeping with the character of the area; the improvements would detract from her property value; the improvements are not in keeping with the spirit and intent of the Zoning Resolution and would be a detriment to the public interest.

To Mr. Kearns' question as to how many feet from Mrs. Brune's residence the entrance monuments are Mr. Sutter advised that he did not know.

To Mr. Kearns' question as to what was the depth of the right-of-way in front of the subdivision Mr. Stahlheber advised 50' from the center line of Cleves Warsaw.

To Mr. Kearns' question as to what was the distance from the middle of the private street serving the Fairview View subdivision to the west property line of Ms. Brune's property Mr. Stahlheber advised approximately 165'.

Mr. Kearns commented that there is an empty lot (#1) between the entrance to the subdivision and Ms. Brune's property.

Mr. Sutter reiterated that Ms. Brune's objection regarded the entrance monuments not being in keeping with the character of the established estate sized lots in the vicinity.

Mr. Kearns advised that the subdivision is being developed in accordance with the Township's zoning regulations and as such it was not up to the Board to question the validity of the lots. Mr. Sutter reiterated that Ms. Brune's objection regarded the entrance monuments not being permitted by the zoning code and that such monuments are of such design that one might find in a more suburban setting, not in an area of estate sized lots.

To Mr. Kearns' question as to if there were pictures of the original entrance monuments at the subject property Ms. Biehn responded in the negative.

Mr. Scherer advised that the Board has dealt with numerous cases concerning subdivision entrance monuments. He commented that at the time the Zoning Resolution was written such were not an issue which is why cases such as these are handled in this manner.

To Mr. Brigham's question as to if the subdivision is a recorded subdivision or just a lot cut-up Mr. Lane advised that it is a subdivision served by a private street.

Resolution 2007-6

Mr. Ashe moved and Mr. Scherer seconded to grant the variance as requested in case VA2007-5. Mssrs. Scherer, Ashe, Hendon, Brigham and Kearns voted aye. Motion carried.

Finding of Fact:

1. The case number was VA2007-5.
2. The date of the action by the inspector was February 27, 2007 where a zoning certificate was denied for the continued situation of subdivision entrance monuments and a sign for the reason that said monuments are considered accessory structures and as such would be located in front yards.
3. The appellants name was Jason Ott on behalf of Fairway View Estates LLC.
4. The date the appeal was filed was March 6, 2007.
5. The address of the subject premises were 1289 & 1300 Fairway View.

6. The zone district of the subject premises were "A2" Residence.
7. Sections of the Zoning Resolution on which the denial was based included: 51.1, 69, 70, 61, 62, 62.13, 62.14, 62.14-7, 312, 312.7, 171, 171.7, 191, 192, 194, 251, 281, 282 and 291.
8. Sections of the Zoning Resolution authorizing the Board to grant or deny the appeal included: 183, 184, 184.2, 184.6, 185 and 186.
9. Sections cited by the appellant as authorizing the Board to grant the appeal included: 171.7.
10. There was opposition present at the meeting expressing concern that the entrance monuments/sign would have a negative affect on the area inasmuch as such would be out of character with the vicinity as well as not being in keeping with the spirit of the zoning resolution.
11. The Board finds no error on the part of the inspector.
12. The Board finds that practical difficulties exist as a result of an area zoning requirement after consideration of the following non-exclusive factors:
 - a) The property owner purchased the property with knowledge of the zoning restriction.
 - b) The property owner's predicament feasibly cannot be obviated through some other method other than a variance.
 - c) The variance is not substantial.
 - d) The lots are irregularly shaped with respect to their orientation to neighboring properties.
 - e) The essential character of the neighborhood would not be substantially altered and adjoining properties would not suffer a substantial detriment as a result of the variance.
 - f) The property in question would yield a reasonable return and there can be some beneficial use of the property without a variance.
 - g) The variance would not adversely affect the delivery of governmental services.
13. The Board finds that the spirit and intent behind the zoning requirement would be observed and substantial justice done by granting the variance.
14. The Board finds that the granting of the appeal would not be contrary to the public interest, general welfare and adjoining landowners. Basis of finding:
 - a) The entrance monuments are constructed in character with the subject development;
 - b) The location of the property from which the objections to the variance arose is adjacent the subject subdivision to the east and there is an undeveloped lot between it and the entrance monuments;
 - c) The walls are built in a style that is in character with the neighborhood, in a quality fashion that is not ostentatious;
 - d) The walls provide a marked entrance to the property without having a negative impact for the purpose of providing information and direction;
 - e) The location of the monuments does not present a traffic hazard as they are located outside of sight lines and the right-of-way of Cleves Warsaw
15. The Board wishes to review any alterations regarding the variance.

The hearing in Case VA2007-6 (5125 Foley Road) was convened.

Mr. Stahlheber (sworn) advised that on March 12, 2007 the Department of Development Services received an application filed by Ken Dolch, Delhi Athletic Association, for the construction of storage building at 5125 Foley Road. He commented that the application was denied on March 14, 2007 and the applicant notified of that denial by certified letter on that same date. He noted that in the letter were stated the reasons for the denial which included: the premises known as 5125 Foley Road is located in Delhi Township, Hamilton County Ohio and in the "C" Residence district as shown on the maps of the Township Zoning Resolution; the subject property is an irregularly shaped acreage lot; the subject premises is used as a public park; the submitted application and drawings indicated a proposed 2,400 sq. ft. storage building to be constructed in the northeast corner of the subject premises, such having a 10' north front yard setback; the Township Zoning Resolution requires a zoning certificate be obtained prior to the construction of all such buildings and prohibits buildings having less than a 30' front yard setback in the "C" Residence District. This denial was also based on the following sections of the Zoning Resolution: Sections 51.1, 81, 82, 61, 62, 62.10, 84.1, 84.1-1, 191, 192, 194, 251, 281, 282, 291. Pursuant to Article 18 of the Zoning Resolution the applicant had the right to file an appeal of this denial within 20 days of the action, with an appeal being filed in the form of an application received March 15, 2007. Pursuant to the requirements of the Ohio Revised Code the hearing was advertised in a newspaper of general circulation at least ten days before the hearing and those parties of interest were notified at least ten days before the hearing.

Exhibit "A" – application

Exhibit "B" – site plan

Exhibit "C" – elevation drawings

Ken Dolch (sworn) and Kurt Mechley (sworn), Delhi Athletic Association, advised that they were requesting a variance to the minimum front yard setback requirement as it concerned the proposed building inasmuch as the proposed location of the proposed building is not conducive for use by the park, would be the least disruptive to park operations in comparison to other possible locations within the park, provides the easiest ingress/egress to the proposed building utilizing existing park roadways and parking facilities, is adjacent the library property, will be situated a minimum 150' from the library and nearest residence (exceeding the minimum distance of 60' between such buildings), and provides the minimum setback needed from an adjacent sewer/drainage area. They commented that locating the building any further south would result in the need for the building to be constructed with a foundation and retaining wall, would require additional grading including the need for fill material, and the relocation of existing sewer/drainage improvements. They noted that all expenses associated with the proposed building are being born by DAA and that such has been approved and endorsed by the Township Board of Trustees and Township Parks & Recreation Department.

To Mr. Hendon's question as to if the location of the proposed building is the current location of the dumpsters serving the Lodge Mr. Mechley responded in the affirmative.

To Mr. Hendon's question as to on which side of the proposed building it will be accessed Mr. Mechley advised the west side, noting that the building will be located north and east of the Lodge, at the eastern edge of the current parking lot. He commented that several doors may be utilized, depending on how the interior of the building is to be subdivided for their storage needs.

To Mr. Hendon's question as to if any consideration has been given to where the existing dumpster would be relocated Mr. Mechley advised that moving it over next to the Lodge is being considered.

To Mr. Ashe's question as to what is to be stored in the building Mr. Mechley advised athletic and cheerleading equipment and uniforms as well as equipment to maintain the fields, including a gator and two trailers. Mr. Mechley commented that the plans also include a small meeting room to hold 10-15 people which will also be made available for use by other organizations.

To Mr. Kearns' question as to what the height of the structure would be Mr. Mechley advised 12'.

To Mr. Hendon's question as to what the distance between the proposed building and the Lodge would be Mr. Mechley advised that he was not sure. Mr. Stahlheber advised that the building must also be approved by the County Building Department and Township Fire Department and that any setback issues between the two buildings would be addressed as part of those reviews.

To Mr. Brigham's question as to what the exterior of the proposed building would look like Mr. Dolch advised that it would be a hunter green and tan pole building.

To Mr. Kearns' question as to if any opposition to the requested variance had been received Mr. Stahlheber responded in the negative, noting that a representative from the library contacted him but expressed no objection.

To Mr. Hendon's question as to what the minimum east side yard setback of the proposed building is Mr. Stahlheber advised 5'.

Barbara Swegman (sworn) and Ann Bange (sworn), 581 B Covedale, advised that they purchased their property because of the privacy provided from the park property by way of a number of mature trees on the park property. Ms. Bange commented that they now have a reduced level of privacy, reducing the aesthetics and resale value of their home. She noted that trees were removed from the area in July 2006 and of her concern that more will be removed in conjunction with the construction of the proposed building.

Mr. Dolch advised that the appearance of the proposed building would be aesthetically pleasing, and that there will be security lighting and landscape screening to the rear (east) of the building. He commented that the building would help in keeping teenagers from loitering in that area of the park.

To Mr. Kearns' question as to lighting in conjunction with the proposed building Mr. Dolch clarified that the security lights would be located in the front (west) side of the building.

Mr. Meckley advised that the proposed building will be situated having a 15' setback from the east property line, adjacent properties east. He commented that there will be plenty of room to plant landscape materials so to screen the building from the neighboring properties east. He noted that there would be no reason for anyone to be behind the building inasmuch as there will no entrances to it from that side. He advised that it was DAA's desire to work with the community during all stages of construction of the building to assure that it ends up being an improvement to the park. He commented that if necessary they would be willing to construct fencing.

Mr. Kearns advised that the buildings' 15' setback from the east property line provided ample area to install effective screening.

Ms. Bange advised that since excavation for the building has begun that they have experienced a problem with stormwater runoff.

Mr. Dolch advised that clearing of the property was done some time ago, so to confirm the location of property lines, apparently reduced the natural buffer that existed between the park and adjacent properties east. He commented that despite such clearing 5' of the buffer remains.

To Mr. Kearns' question as to if there was a pre-existing stormwater runoff problem onto the neighboring properties east Mr. Dolch advised that he was not aware of one.

To Mr. Hendon's question as to if there was a fence between Ms. Bange's property and the park Ms. Bange advised that the only fence is one around their rear yard pool.

Mr. Scherer advised that the 15' distance between the proposed building and the east property line is code compliant, noting that a setback of only 5' is required. He commented that the purpose of the hearing was to consider a reduced north front yard setback.

Ms. Bange (inaudible).

Mr. Kearns advised that if it was possible to locate the proposed building another 20' south there would be no reason for a variance.

Ms. Bange (inaudible).

Mr. Ashe advised that the stormwater runoff issue needs to be resolved between the property owner and the athletic association.

Mr. Hendon advised that Delhi Township owns the property and that the Delhi Athletic Association leases that portion of the property where the building is to be constructed.

Mr. Stahlheber advised that part of the building permit review process will include the plans being reviewed by the County Soil & Water Conservation District who enforces the County's cut/fill and stormwater run-off regulations.

Mr. Lane advised Mr. Dolch to address and resolve any issues related to stormwater runoff.

Mr. Ashe advised that aesthetic concerns can be dealt with by way of landscaping.

To Mr. Kearns' question as to if a 12' high building is necessary Mr. Mechley responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Bange (inaudible)

Mr. Stahlheber advised that all doors will be located on the west side of the building and that no windows or doors were indicated on the east side of the building which faces Ms. Bange's residence. He commented that the roof will slope to the east and west sides of the building.

Ms. Bange advised of being concerned that the pitch to the roof would result in increased stormwater runoff onto her property.

To Mr. Scherer's question as to if there will be gutters and downspouts on the building Mr. Dolch responded in the affirmative.

To Mr. Hendon's question as to where the downspouts will discharge Mr. Dolch advised that he did not know.

Mr. Stahlheber reiterated that such would be an issue that the County Soil & Water Conservation District will address as part of the building permit review process.

Mr. Hendon advised that he didn't feel that the height of the building is an issue, commenting that the east neighbors' view of it could be reduced by way of landscaping.

To Mr. Scherer's question as to if the Board could approve the requested variance conditioned upon submission of a landscape plan Mr. Stahlheber responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Lane advised that before the Township will accept the transfer of ownership of the building a number of conditions would have to be met. He commented that in lieu of testimony given the Formal Resolution approving the variance will include an acknowledgment that DAA intends to correct stormwater runoff problems created in conjunction with construction of the building and install effective screening to the east of

the building, in addition to maintaining the mature landscaping along the east property line.

Resolution 2007-7

Mr. Scherer moved and Mr. Brigham seconded to approve the requested variance conditioned upon the installation and maintenance of landscape screening materials east of the building and resolution of stormwater runoff issues. Msrs. Ashe, Hendon, Brigham, Kearns, and Scherer voted aye. Motion carried.

Finding of Fact:

1. The case number was VA2007-6.
2. The date of the action by the inspector was March 14, 2007 where a zoning certificate was denied for the construction of a storage building for the reason that said building would not comply with the required front yard setback.
3. The appellants name was Ken Dolch for the Delhi Athletic Association on behalf of the Delhi Township Board of Trustees.
4. The date the appeal was filed was March 15, 2007.
5. The address of the subject premise was 5125 Foley.
6. The zone district of the subject premises was "C" Residence.
7. Sections of the Zoning Resolution on which the denial was based included: 51.1, 81, 82, 61, 62, 62.10, 84.1, 84.1-1, 191, 192, 194, 251, 281, 282 and 291.
8. Sections of the Zoning Resolution authorizing the Board to grant or deny the appeal included: 183, 184, 184.2, 184.6, 185 and 186.
9. Sections cited by the appellant as authorizing the Board to grant the appeal included: 84.1-1.
10. There was opposition present at the meeting expressing concern for the size and aesthetics of the building, the amount of clearing done to facilitate it, the loss of privacy to the neighboring properties east and stormwater runoff issues.
11. The Board finds no error on the part of the inspector.
12. The Board finds that practical difficulties exist as a result of an area zoning requirement after consideration of the following non-exclusive factors:
 - a) The property owner purchased the property with knowledge of the zoning restriction.
 - b) The property owner's predicament feasibly cannot be obviated through some other method other than a variance.
 - c) The variance is not substantial.
 - d) The lot has an irregular shape, topographic, and other conditions present.
 - e) The essential character of the neighborhood would not be substantially altered and adjoining properties would not suffer a substantial detriment as a result of the variance.
 - f) The property in question would yield a reasonable return and there can be some beneficial use of the property without a variance.
 - g) The variance would not adversely affect the delivery of governmental services.
13. The Board finds that the spirit and intent behind the zoning requirement would be observed and substantial justice done by granting the variance.

- 14. The Board finds that the granting of the appeal would not be contrary to the public interest, general welfare or the adjoining landowners. Basis of finding:
 - a) The site is an isolated area of the park;
 - b) The site is constrained by existing drainage facilities,
 - c) The installation and maintenance of landscape screening materials east of the building will minimize its impact on neighboring properties east,
 - d) Any stormwater run-off issues are to be resolved.
- 15. The Board wishes to review any alterations regarding the variance.
- 16. Further finding of fact: the 15' setback of the building from the east property line is greater than the minimum required setback of 5'.

To Mr. Kearns question as to if there was a better way to address requests for subdivision entrance monuments Mr. Stahlheber advised that such is amongst a number of issues to be addressed by amendments to the text of the Zoning Resolution.

To Mr. Kearns reiterating his concerns for the size and height of detached residential garages Mr. Stahlheber advised that such also is amongst the number of issues to be addressed by amendments to the text of the Zoning Resolution.

Old Business:

- Mr. Stahlheber advise that the minutes from the Boards' March 2007 meeting aren't yet complete and of his intent to have them finalized by the Boards' next meeting.

New Business:

- Mr. Stahlheber advised there is nothing currently pending.
- The Board tentatively scheduled Tuesdays May 15, June 5 & 12 as meeting dates.

There being no further business on motion of Mr. Scherer and seconded by Mr. Ashe the meeting was adjourned at 8:35 pm. Messrs. Ashe, Hendon, Scherer, Kearns and Brigham voted aye.

Board of Zoning Appeals:

Thomas R. Stahlheber, Secretary