

d) *Discussion:*

Ben Strickert confirmed for member Brown he will move into the property soon and the proposed garage addition would be used for personal hobby wood-working. He stated the existing garage is currently at two feet from the north and west property lines and in order to match the existing wall, he is proposing an addition that would continue with the two foot setback. Ms. Brown stated she thinks the two foot setback variance requested is already established but is not in support of the size variance request.

Member Charlson stated he thinks the current five yard setback requirement is for fire separation protection and noted there are other garages in this area that are closer than the five foot setback. Mr. Charlson stated the north and west property owners, adjacent to Mr. Strickert's property, are five feet from the property lines with their accessory buildings. Ben Strickert confirmed for Mr. Charlson the addition would not have a garage door and the plans call for opening up the common wall and keeping the existing garage door in the same place. Mr. Strickert confirmed for Mr. Charlson clearing the existing garage and placing a new structure compliant with the zoning regulations would not seem reasonable, as the building is in good shape and that he would rather build an addition onto this structure. Mr. Strickert stated he has taken into consideration the scale of his proposal as it relates to other structures in the neighborhood and thinks his proposal will be in better conformance with the neighborhood accessory structures.

Mr. Strickert confirmed for Chairperson Lampe he would be willing to scale back on the size of the building to bring into code compliance if the variance for a setback is granted to match the existing setback of approximately two feet.

Mr. Strickert confirmed for member Shea he is not willing to do a garage addition onto the home to construct a zoning compliant garage. Mr. Strickert stated his plans for the proposed addition would include flood-proofing methods incorporated into the existing garage and thinks this will be a better alternative than removing that structure. Ms. Shea stated she did not see a substantial hardship demonstrated with this proposal, as with similar variance requests in the past for a setback and size variance. Ms. Shea stated this addition proposal would be on an existing non-conforming building and there may be an inherit fire hazard in allowing the setback variance, but could see the setback being granted and not granting the size variance.

Member Gidley stated he did not see setback as an issue, due to the pre-existing two foot setback from the property line. Mr. Gidley stated he thinks size of the proposed accessory building could not be granted a variance from the zoning regulations. Mr. Gidley stated he looked at possible configurations, but could not see a better solution than the one presented by Mr. Strickert for the setback variance requested.

**Board of Adjustment Minutes
August 9, 2010**

e) Motion by the Board:

Motion By: Shea

Seconded By: Brown

Move that a variance to allow 417 4th St. NW to exceed the setback regulations necessary to bring the proposed accessory building addition in line with the existing accessory building be approved.

Yes: 5

No: 0

Absent: 0

E. Old Business:

None

F. New Business:

1. Secretary Kohout informed the Members the 2010 Comprehensive Land Use Plan Update process has started and the process should occur from September 2010 through September 2011.

G. Adjournment:

Motion By: Gidley

Seconded By: Brown

That the Board of Adjustment meeting be adjourned.

Yes: 5

No: 0

Absent: 0