



Chairman Bader asked if there was anyone else wishing to speak to the application. Hearing none, he closed the Public Hearing and directed the board to the five-part test.

This is a request for an Area Variance and the board will be weighing the benefit of the variance to the applicant against the detriment of the variance to the neighborhood.

Beginning with question #1: *Show that the granting of the variance will not produce an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or create a detriment to nearby properties.*

Ms. Harris said it is quite large and would be difficult to screen with arborvitae, as the applicant has stated is their intent.

Chairman Bader agreed. It may be possible to screen from road view, but would still be visible by the neighbors.

Mr. Wilmer said it is a massive structure, comparing it to a house.

Chairman Bader noted that the variance would stay with the property. There is no provision for a temporary structure.

Regarding question #2: *Show that the benefit sought by the applicant cannot be achieved by some other feasible method that would not require a variance.*

Mr. Wilmer said there is no other method that would allow a structure of that size.

Chairman Bader said a greenhouse of 100 square feet or less would not require a variance.

Regarding question #3: *Show that the requested variance is not substantial.*

Mr. Wilmer said it is substantial, even on the lot of .7 acres.

Ms. Haller and Chairman Bader agreed.

Regarding question #4: *Show that the proposed variance will not have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood.*

Ms. Haller said the structure has a commercial look to it. It is not appropriate for a residential neighborhood.

Chairman Bader agreed. It would add more impervious surface.

Mr. Wilmer said he is concerned about erosion.

Regarding question #5: *Show that the alleged hardship is not self-created.*

Mr. Wilmer and Chairman Bader agreed the hardship is self-created.

Chairman Bader asked if there were any additional comments or questions. Hearing none, he called for a motion.

Mr. Wilmer moved that the board **Deny** the application for the following reasons:

- #1. The granting of the variance will produce an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood create a detriment to nearby properties.
- #2. The benefit sought by the applicant can be achieved by some other feasible means that would not require a variance.
- #3. The variance is substantial.
- #4. The proposed variance will have an adverse impact on the environmental conditions in the neighborhood.
- #5. The hardship is self-created.

Ms. Harris seconded the motion, which *carried* with a roll call vote of (5-0):

Ryan Wilmer	Voting	YES
John Roberts	Absent	
Roger Brazill	Voting	YES
Julie Harris	Voting	YES
Susan Haller	Voting	YES
Carol Henshaw	Absent	
Joseph Bader	Voting	YES

**MISCELLANEOUS**

Mr. Brown mentioned the City Council’s meeting of the Ordinance Committee to discuss the recommended changes to the short-term rental ordinance in residential zone districts. The committee does not appear to be in favor of an overlay district, but showed support for some changes in terminology and requiring that a rental unit be the owner's primary residence. They also discussed adding a restriction which would limit a short-term rental to no more than 60 days in each calendar year. Issuing renewable, revocable permits was also discussed. These changes would help to clarify the legislative intent of the ordinance.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Ms. Harris moved to adjourn the meeting at 7:28, seconded by Mr. Brazill and carried by unanimous voice vote (5-0).

\_\_\_\_\_  
Richard E. Brown, Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Joseph Bader, Chairman