

**Notice of a Meeting of the
Board of Adjustment of the City of Litchfield Park**

Pursuant to A.R.S. Section 38-431.02, notice is hereby given to the members of the Board of Adjustment of the City of Litchfield Park and to the general public that the **Board of Adjustment of the City of Litchfield Park, Arizona, will hold a meeting open to the public on Thursday, October 3, 2019, at 7:00 p.m., in the in the Conference Room at City Hall, 214 West Wigwam Boulevard, Litchfield Park, Arizona.** Please notify City Hall at least 48 hours prior to the meeting if you will require accommodation.

David Ledyard, Chairman

Members of the Litchfield Park Board may attend either in person or by telephone conference call.

I. Call to Order

II. Pledge of Allegiance

III. Business

A. Public Hearing: Variance ZA.19-06: 1087 N. Oro Vista Drive

Information

1. Staff Report
2. Applicant Presentation
3. Public Comment

Citizens may ask questions or speak for or against a variance request for property located at 1087 N. Oro Vista Drive to allow an accessory shade structure to be built within the rear yard setback required for properties with a side yard view fence.

B. Variance ZA.19.06: 1087 N. Oro Vista Drive

**Information
Action**

Discussion and possible approval of a request for a variance for property located at 1087 N. Oro Vista Drive to allow an accessory shade structure to be built within the rear yard setback required for properties with a side yard view fence.

C. Minutes

**Information
Action**

Possible approval of the minutes of the June 6 and August 1, 2019 meetings.

IV. Adjournment

Action



THE CITY OF
Litchfield Park

DATE: October 3, 2019
TO: Chairman Ledyard and Board of Adjustment Members
FROM: Jason Sanks, Planning Consultant
SUBJECT: Variance Request to the Board of Adjustment

Variance Case #: 19-04 Accessory Structure in the Rear Yard / 1087 N. Oro Vista Drive The applicant requests a variance from Zoning Ordinance Section 31.03.d.9, pertaining to the General Provisions for Accessory Structures, specifically related to:

9. Rear setbacks on properties with side yard view fences shall be equal to or greater than the length of the view fence portion of the side yard wall

The property in question is unique in that it has view fences the full length of their side yards, basically precluding them from having any accessory structures in the rear yard. Presumably, the intent of the code section was to prevent adjacent homes from having view corridors (of the golf course) across neighboring properties from being uninterrupted. This would not preclude landscaping or main building setbacks from interrupting these view corridors. The ordinance also did not contemplate that an open structure may have little to no intrusion on the view corridor compared to a solid structure like a guest house or pool cabana.

There are four conditions that must be met in order to obtain a variance from the zoning ordinance, per State of Arizona statutes. These include the following:

- a. That there are special circumstances or conditions applying to the land, building, or use referred to in the application which do not apply to other properties in the district;
- b. That such special circumstances were not created by the owner or applicant;
- c. That the authorizing of the variance is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights; and
- d. That the authorizing of the application will not be materially detrimental to persons residing or working in the vicinity, to adjacent property, to the neighborhood or the public welfare in general.

The special circumstances applying to this property are that it happens to have full length side yard view fences and the code was likely not written to contemplate this. Further, other properties in a similar condition nearby have accessory structures built in the rear yard. It is not

known if those properties obtained permits prior to constructing them. Also, the owner did not create this special condition of having full-length view fences. The fences were built with original development of the property.

Generally, most homes in Litchfield Park, including several homes backing to the golf course, have accessory structures for shade and activities in the back yard. Authorizing a variance to allow an open structure for shade in the rear yard would allow the property to enjoy substantial property rights allowed by other similar properties.

Lastly, Staff does not find that having an open shade structure in the rear yard would be materially detrimental to neighboring properties. The orientation of the main home on this lot and adjacent lots, together with existing mature landscaping, will render any impacts of this open shade structure nearly negligible. It is important to note that the simple columns of this structure will not be as impactful as solid walls on a different building type.

Staff finds that the application has met the four findings necessary to authorize a variance on the property with the understanding that the proposed structure will remain unenclosed. This way, the intent of the code provision to restrict structures is maintained will still allowing the owner to enjoy substantial property rights.

Staff recommends approval of the variance to allow the accessory structure in the rear yard of the home with rear and side yard view fencing, subject to the following condition:

- 1) The shade structure shall remain open as proposed in the exhibits provided by the applicant.

City of Litchfield Park
Zoning Amendment

VARIANCE



Address and/or Location: 1087 N. Oro Vista Drive, LP. Az 85340

Beth Jordan and William Braunart OWNER or AGENT
Name (please print)

1087 N. Oro Vista

Address

Suite #

Litchfield Plc

Az

85340

City,

State,

Zip Code #

Area Code & Phone Number

I hereby certify that the information contained herein is correct, and that I am authorized to file an application on said property, being either the owner of record or authorized to file on behalf of the owner.

SIGNATURE

Pre-hearing Consultation: has been held is requested (date: _____) is waived

APPLICANT OR REPRESENTATIVE MUST BE PRESENT AT THE MEETING (date tentative)

IF A REPRESENTATIVE WILL BE ATTENDING THE MEETING IN PLACE OF THE OWNER, A LETTER SIGNED BY THE OWNER(S) GRANTING THE REPRESENTATIVE PERMISSION TO REPRESENT THE OWNER MUST BE INCLUDED WITH THIS APPLICATION.

A READABLE SKETCH, AT LEAST 8 1/2"x11"^{11x17"}, WITH DIMENSIONS AND STREET LOCATIONS, AND PICTURES OF THE AREAS OF SURROUNDING PROPERTIES THAT WILL BE AFFECTED BY THE VARIANCE MUST BE PROVIDED.

VARIANCE APPLICATION

Address and/or Location: 1087N. OroVista Dr. LP. AZ 85340

1. Purpose of Request: To build Pergola in backyard to provide shade in areas by pool. Pool used for hydrotherapy shade provided for wheel chair access side

2. How has this property been deprived of privileges enjoyed by similar properties which DO NOT have variances? Pergola is limited due to "side view" on golf course lot. Otherwise this structure is in accordance of a normal lot requirement/easement

3. How does approval change the terms of the ordinance? Allows us to sink four posts within normal easement tolerances

4. Is the approval of this variance necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights? YES NO Explanation: We currently have NO shade source in back yard rendering it unusable most of the days

5. Will the authorization of this variance be materially detrimental to persons residing or working in the vicinity, to adjacent property, to the neighborhood or the public welfare in general? YES NO Explanation: This has ZERO consequence to neighbors

6. Are there special circumstances or conditions applying to the land, building, or use which do not apply to other properties in the district? YES NO Explanation: Golf course lot w/ side view

7. Are the special circumstances, "hardships", self-imposed? YES NO (Personal hardship is not grounds for a variance. Economic hardship in itself is not grounds for a variance. The hardship must relate to the physical character of the property.) Explanation: Pool area largely unusable in summer months. No shade access for handicapped homeowner who uses pool for hydro therapy.

THERE ARE FOUR QUESTIONS THAT THE BOARD MUST FIND THAT THEY CAN BE ANSWERED AFFIRMATIVELY IN ORDER TO GRANT A VARIANCE.

These questions are being provided for your information. You may provide possible answers and submit this with your application.

1. Are there special circumstances or conditions applying to the land, building, or use referred to in the application which do not apply to other properties in the district?

Yes. Our home currently has no backyard shade due to a conflict between us and our contractor (Build Masters) that is in adjudication (the ROC has ruled in our favor). Our ~~shade~~ "porch" shade cannot be installed until this issue is resolved. We need shade so that our backyard + pool can be safely used as my mother has MS and extreme heat causes her respiratory system to shut down.

2. Were the special circumstances created by someone other than the owner or applicant?

The area surrounding the pool that has the best shade is adjacent to neighbor's fence line and dog run. Neighbor's dogs are always out and constantly barking making this area largely unusable. We raised issues with the city for assistance and we were told to try to find reasonable solutions... this is our reasonable solution.

3. Is the approval of this variance necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights?

Yes, the shade structure will provide a good, safe place for my elderly parents who live with us. Both use wheel chairs and this pad/shade is specific to accommodate their use of our pool. Additionally the city missed a key issue in its inspection of our remodel that has caused systemic damage to our roof. The contractor did not vent our laundry room duct out but rather into crawl space. Roof which was newly installed in 2019 will have to be completely replaced. This means we cannot install shade structures connected to the house until we've resolved the issue w/ our contractor.

4. Will the authorization of this application NOT be materially detrimental to persons residing or working in the vicinity, or adjacent property, to the neighborhood or the public welfare in general?

No, we've run our plans by our adjacent neighbors. Neither see any ~~see~~ issue with a pergola at this location.

Cannot install shade structures connected to the house until we've resolved the issue w/ our contractor.



Map





Map





**MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF
THE LITCHFIELD PARK BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
June 6, 2019**

I. Call to Order

The meeting was held in the Conference Room at City Hall and called to order by Chairman Ledyard at 7:00 p.m.

Present: Chairman Ledyard; Vice Chairman Charnetsky; and Boardmember Dudley, and O'Connor.

Absent: Boardmember Romack.

Staff Present: Jason Sanks, Planning Consultant; and Pam Maslowski, Director of Planning Services.

II. Pledge of Allegiance

Chairman Ledyard led the Pledge.

III. Business

Chairman Ledyard explained the meeting order and procedure.

A. Public Hearing: Variance ZA.19-03: 230 E. Bird Lane

Chairman Ledyard opened the Public Hearing.

1. Staff Report:

Mr. Sanks stated that the applicant is requesting a variance to encroach into the required 35' street side and rear setbacks. The home was built in 1970, prior to the City's incorporation and currently meets the City's setback requirements. . The owner is proposing to add a new two car garage that will take access from the street side frontage, Castano Drive. The garage will encroach 13' into the required 35' setback. The side setback is larger on this side because of this being a corner lot. Other homes siding to Castano Drive, extending north to Campina Drive, vary in their setbacks from 25' to 35', and are assumed to be legally non-conforming. Based on the Assessor's website, the lots immediately north of 230 E. Bird Lane are 10' wider since Castano Drive tapers down to a 50' right-of-way width from the 70' right-of-way width immediately west of the subject property. The applicant is also requesting a 4' encroachment into the 35' rear yard setback. The existing garage may be retrofitted as new livable space, which would be subject to Design Review Board approval along with the new garage and driveway access to Castano, if the variance is obtained.

Mr. Sanks read the four conditions that the Board must determine have been met in order to grant a variance.

- a. Are there are special circumstances or conditions applying to the land, building, or use referred to in the application which do not apply to other properties in the district?
- b. Were the special circumstances not created by the owner or applicant?
- c. Is authorization of the variance necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights?

- d. Will authorization of the application not be materially detrimental to persons residing or working in the vicinity, to adjacent properties, to the neighborhood, or to the public welfare in general?

He stated that Staff met previously with the applicant's representative and discussed various ways the applicant's wants might be accomplished. Some revisions were made to the plans, but a variance is still needed. Staff has determined that conditions can be met. The lot is narrower than the nearby lots further north, and those respective homes already enjoy legal non-conforming setbacks similar to what is being requested. The condition was created through the platting of the subdivision and the home was built by a prior owner. The garage addition to the residence will not be materially detrimental to other properties in the neighborhood as they currently share similar setbacks to what is being requested. The property owner states that they have the support of their neighbors. Staff recommends approval of the street side and rear yard setback reductions subject to the exhibits provided by the applicant.

2. Applicant Presentation:

Ryan Gilchrist, the applicant, stated that his property has a drainage issue. Water from the street breaches the driveway curb during significant rain events causing the existing garage and rear yard to flood. This will be addressed with the new garage and landscaping.

Boardmember O'Connor inquired if the current driveway would be removed and if the applicant had explored other ways to build the new garage that would not require the variance. It is hard to picture a building in that location. Karin McMillan, of Rockin' K Designs and the applicant's representative, stated that when she prepared the site plan, she measured and tried different locations. The angles made it difficult. Ms. McMillan provided a drawing with an overlay to help clarify the plan. Mr. Gilchrist noted that home has 3' overhangs.

Vice Chairman Charnetsky stated that the drainage problem could be resolved with landscaping and that she did not consider that a condition for the variance. She believes the justification for the variance is the orientation of the house. A diagonal home on a square lot take up a log of space. She inquired if there was any part of the old garage that could be utilized. Mr. Gilchrist replied that they are planning on using that space for livable space. They might have to take part of the old garage to use for an entry. Ms. Mc Millan stated that if they use the existing garage for livable space they will raise the pad 4", which will help with the drainage issue.

3. Public Comments:

Ron Clair stated that his mother-in-law lives directly to the north. He is concerned about her losing her view. He wants to make sure that the addition will not impede on her view. Chairman Ledyard stated that this Board is only reviewing the setbacks. The Design Review Board will review what the addition will look like.

Vice Chairman Charnetsky **moved** to close the Public Hearing; Boardmember O'Connor **seconded**; **unanimous approval**.

B. Variance ZA.19-03: 230 E. Bird Lane

Boardmember O'Connor **moved** to approve the application as recommended by Staff based upon being able to find affirmative answers to the four questions the Board must address, and with understanding that the driveway access to Castano will be addressed with the design review application and review; Vice Chairman Charnetsky **seconded**; **unanimous approval**.

C. Minutes

Vice Chairman Charnetsky **moved** to approve the minutes of the April 4, 2019 meeting; Boardmember Dudley **seconded unanimous approval.**

IV. Adjournment

Boardmember O'Connor **moved** to adjourn the meeting; Vice Chairman Charnetsky **seconded; unanimous approval.** The meeting was adjourned at 7:23 p.m.

APPROVED:

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

David Ledyard, Chairman

/pm

**MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF
THE LITCHFIELD PARK BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
August 1, 2019**

I. Call to Order

The meeting was held in the Conference Room at City Hall and called to order by Chairman Ledyard at 7:01 p.m.

Present: Chairman Ledyard; Vice Chairman Charnetsky (by phone); and Boardmembers Dudley and O'Connor (by phone).

Absent: Boardmember Romack.

Staff Present: Jason Sanks, Planning Consultant; and Pam Maslowski, Director of Planning Services.

II. Pledge of Allegiance

Chairman Ledyard led the Pledge.

III. Business

Chairman Ledyard explained the meeting order and procedure.

A. Public Hearing: Variance ZA.19-04: 205 W. Alegre Drive

Chairman Ledyard opened the Public Hearing.

1. Staff Report:

Mr. Sanks stated that the applicant is requesting a variance to allow a building addition to encroach into the required 30' front yard setback to provide more livable area. The home is situated on a corner lot and is also required to maintain 30' street side yard setback. The home already encroaches 10' into the front yard setback on Alegre Drive, as do many of the other homes in the neighborhood. Those homes were built prior to the City's incorporation under different development standards. He read the four questions that the Board must determine can be answered affirmatively in order to grant a variance and provided possible answers based on his findings.

- a. Are there are special circumstances or conditions applying to the land, building, or use referred to in the application which do not apply to other properties in the district? Yes, the home already has a 20' front yard setback on the other side of the home. The applicant is proposing to build the new addition on the opposite side of the home to that same setback. Also, the lot is nearly the same size or smaller than other homes in the area, but has to contend with having two 30' setbacks, in the front and on the side. The interior lots only have to meet a 15' side yard setback. The applicant has noted that their home is significantly smaller than other homes nearby and their opportunity to enlarge their home is more limited than those other properties.
- b. Were the special circumstances not created by the owner or applicant? Yes, the special circumstances occurred prior to the City's incorporation when the home was built to a prior development standard under Maricopa County.

- c. Is authorization of the variance necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights? Yes, the variance will allow the applicants to enjoy a larger home similar in size to other homes in the neighborhood.
- d. Will authorization of the application not be materially detrimental to persons residing or working in the vicinity, to adjacent properties, to the neighborhood, or to the public welfare in general? Yes, this property, as well as other homes in the neighborhood, already have encroachments into the currently required 30' front yard setbacks, so the neighbors are already accustomed to the setback.

He stated that, based on Staff's determination that all four conditions for a variance have been met, approval is recommended.

In response to a question, Mr. Sanks confirmed that the request is for encroachment into only one of the setback yards, not both.

2. Applicant Presentation:

Christoph Gerz, the applicant, stated that Mr. Sanks had covered most of his points. When he submitted his first application, he submitted letters of support from the current residents on Alegre. The addition will mirror what already exists on the other side of the home. The addition will not encroach into any setback any more than the current home already does. Because this home was built prior to the City's incorporation, as were the other homes in the neighborhood, he now needs a variance to build the same way that the other homes were built.

3. Public Comments:

There were no other comments.

Chairman Ledyard closed the Public Hearing.

B. Variance ZA.19-04: 205 W. Alegre Drive

Boardmember Dudley **moved** to approve the variance based upon being able to find affirmative responses to the four questions required and subject to the exhibits provided; Vice Chairman Charnetsky **seconded**; **unanimous approval**.

C. Public Hearing: Variance ZA.19-05: 231 S. Old Litchfield Road

1. Staff Report

Mr. Sanks stated this is a variance request from Zoning Code Section 15.03.e., Residential Cluster Zoning District, which requires a home to maintain a 10' side yard setback in those districts. The Design Review Board previously reviewed an application for this home where the applicant requested several design considerations for the property. Most of the plans were approved, except for the side yard encroachment of the patio cover because it is not within the purview of the Design Review Board to approve setback encroachments. The applicant has now submitted a variance application for the side yard encroachment for the patio cover. This small subdivision and its zoning district are unique. When the City incorporated, it overlaid zoning districts on areas that did not always match setbacks that the homes were developed under. However, the City later approved an ordinance allowing homes to utilize the side yard setbacks that were in

place when the area was developed. There were two types of developments/subdivisions put in this area. One had narrower lots that allowed 0' setbacks on both sides. However, that does not apply to this lot; it applies to the narrower lots located to the east. This home, and the homes adjacent to it, are located on larger lots in a different subdivision, and they have all provided a 10' side yard setback on the non-carport side of the home as was required when the homes were built. The carports are all located on the front of the home off of Old Litchfield Road. The City has been enforcing the 10' side setback on that non-carport side, and it is into that side that the applicant is seeking to encroach.

Mr. Sanks read the four conditions the four questions for which the Board must find that they can supply affirmative answers in order to grant a variance.

- a. Are there are special circumstances or conditions applying to the land, building, or use referred to in the application which do not apply to other properties in the district?
- b. Were the special circumstances not created by the owner or applicant?
- c. Is authorization of the variance necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights?
- d. Will authorization of the application not be materially detrimental to persons residing or working in the vicinity, to adjacent properties, to the neighborhood, or to the public welfare in general?

He stated that the applicant has provided a narrative with their application. Unfortunately, the narrative did not demonstrate that they meet the four conditions necessary for a variance. Instead, they wrote their narrative in a context where they felt that Staff was not interpreting the Zoning Code correctly. Staff did not rely upon their narrative for any of the findings; but, instead, relied on what is required for a variance. Staff found that the applicants were not able to meet Conditions a and b because this is a regularly shaped lot, it was developed prior to the City's incorporation as were the other properties to the north and south, and it was developed in accordance with its original zoning approval. There are no special circumstances applying to the property. Staff also found that the variance request did not meet Condition c because the applicants have the same property rights as their neighbors and are already enjoying comparable development rights as the adjacent neighbors. Condition d might be met. Until a few days ago, there was no involvement of the neighbors. However, the other day, Ms. Maslowski was approached by a couple of neighbors that felt the variance was not appropriate because the rest of the neighborhood complies with the 10' setback. They were concerned this would set a precedent. He is not certain if any of the neighbors would even see the side yard patio cover, so he is not certain if it would be considered materially detrimental. However, in order for a variance to be granted affirmative answers must be found for all four questions. Therefore, Staff is recommending denial.

2. Applicant Presentation

George Goldman, representing the applicant, stated that the home already has a side patio and a roof that already extends 3'10" out and they want to extend that to 7'. His point in rejecting Staff's interpretation was based on what is deemed a residence. Taxes are based upon the air conditioned/heated portion of the house and the square footage. A patio is more appropriately considered a yard. Vice Chairman Charnetsky commented that anything that is structural is considered part of the structure of the home. Any kind of structure is not allowed to be built into a setback. Mr. Goldman noted that it is already there. Vice Chairman Charnetsky pointed out that the roof overhangs. Putting new posts in the ground would be the encroachment. She would suggest, if the variance is not granted, putting in retractable awnings on the existing home. They might go out a little further.

Mr. Sanks stated that, tonight, questions as to what is considered to be a structure or not, is not on the agenda. It is in the City Zoning Code and widely accepted throughout the Valley that this would be considered structural and, therefore, the setbacks apply. Some communities have allowances for open covered patios, but Litchfield Park does not. The question is whether this request meets the conditions for a variance.

Mr. Goldman stated that the Zoning Code district requirements apply to Litchfield Park. He has another home at 258 Bahia that he applied for and received a permit to build a side patio with a roof. It is in Litchfield Park and comes under the same ordinance. You cannot pick and choose where an ordinance applies. An ordinance has to be clear and applied uniformly or it should not be enforceable in a court of law. Mr. Sanks stated the Bahia property is located in another subdivision. The Zoning Code allows properties developed prior to the City's incorporation to utilize the side yard setbacks in place prior to the incorporation. In the case of the Bahia home, the setbacks in place were 0' and 0' with a carport. In the subject home's subdivision, the setbacks the area was developed with were 10' on one side and 0' on the carport side. The applicant wants to encroach into the side yard on the opposite side of where the car port is located. These setbacks are being applied to all the homes in this subdivision. If the applicants disagree with Staff's interpretation of the Zoning Code requirements, they should file a request for a zoning ordinance interpretation, which would be researched in a different manner and run through the City's legal counsel. If they did not agree with that interpretation, it would be reviewed by this Board, and if they do not agree with the Board's decision, they can appeal it to the Superior Court. The applicants have applied for a variance not, for an interpretation of the Code's requirement.

Mr. Goldman noted that the home has an atrium that was put in to meet the current Code because access to the outside was required. They hired an architect and worked to redesign the home. They need openings on the side of the home. They need to have a patio roof over the glass doors.

Chairman Ledyard noted that the Board can only go by what is in front of them based on open meeting laws and the application.

Mr. Goldman stated that he wrote the application. He did say on the application that there were no special circumstances other than the similarity between this house and his other house on Bahia, and that they are in the same city. He feels the variance is necessary for preservation and enjoyment of property rights because they cannot do what they need to do to upgrade the house, due to the atrium. They cannot meet the Building Code requirement for windows. The reason is they are changing the design the house. Chairman Ledyard asked the applicant if they did not change the design of the home, would they still need the patio. Mr. Goldman replied that the atrium no longer meets Code. He was told that it did comply with the Code at the time it was put in. Chairman Ledyard noted that codes do change periodically. Every time the Code changes, homeowners do not have to upgrade their homes. It is when homes are being remodeled or additions put on, that the new Code must be met. This Board is required under State law to determine that a variance application meets all four of the conditions. One of the issues that the Board has run into is when someone buys a property and wants to make changes, but cannot do it without a variance. It is not a hardship if this community will not allow them to do that. There are a lot of homes that were built in the 1960's and 1970's in the City that met the requirement in place at that time. In some neighborhoods, most every home was built to the old Code. Every so often, someone will come in and want to build to the old Code. It makes sense to allow that because most of the other homes on the block are at that standard. However, in this case, the applicant wants to go beyond what was previously allowed. The applicant must convince the

Board that the variance request meets all four of the conditions. The Board must use what is in front of them in making a decision.

Mr. Goldman asked if he could redraft the application and reapply. Chairman Ledyard suggested continuing the item to allow the applicant time to work with Staff, and then go through an interpretation process or redraft the variance application. Mr. Goldman stated he would be open to that.

3. Public Comments

Pam Brender stated that she lives next door to the applicant. She supports the application and has no problem with the plans. She wishes that everyone within their subdivision, community, and neighborhood would make improvements to their properties.

Richard Goldman stated that he is the applicant's brother. In that subdivision, there are other properties with structures built within the setback. He does not know if they built those without permits. All the applicant is trying to do is improve that which needs improvement. He asked the Board to reconsider, but noted that he understands the four conditions.

Chairman Ledyard **moved** to continue the Public Hearing to September 5, 2019 at 7 p.m. to provide the applicant time to work with Staff and perhaps file a different application; Boardmember Dudley **seconded; unanimous approval.**

D. Variance ZA.19-05: 231 S. Old Litchfield Road

Chairman Ledyard **moved** to continue this item to September 5, 2019 at 7 p.m.; Boardmember Dudley **seconded; unanimous approval.**

IV. Adjournment

Boardmember Dudley **moved** to adjourn the meeting; Vice Chairman Charnetsky **seconded; unanimous approval.** The meeting was adjourned at 7:35 p.m.

APPROVED:

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

David Ledyard, Chairman

/pm