ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MINUTES – OCTOBER 24, 2022

The Zoning Board of Appeals met on Monday, October 24, 2022, at Freedom Hall, at 6:00 P.M. Chairman Wharram presiding. Present: Bartholomew, Wharram, Kelso, Butterfield, and Spahr. Absent: Hanback and Jones. Also, in attendance: Zoning Officer Brad Marks, Trustee Craig Hilliard, and Attorney Pat McGrath.

Butterfield made a motion to approve the minutes from the August 22, 2022, ZBA meeting. Spahr seconded the motion to approve. The minutes from the August 22, 2022, meeting was unanimously approved by a voice vote.

PUBLIC HEARING(S):

Case No. 22-06: A variance has been requested for the property located at 2481 North Morton Ave. The petitioner seeks a variance from Ordinance #78-31 relative to front yard fence requirements. Ornamental fences not exceeding three and one-half $(3 \frac{1}{2})$ in height are permitted within the front yard of an interior lot. The petitioner is proposing a six (6') tall fence with stone columns located every eighteen (18') in the front yard. This would result in a variance of two and one-half $(2 \frac{1}{2})$ in height for a front yard fence. The petitioner (Brandon Murphy) addressed the board. Mr. Murphy reiterated the reasons for the variance request that were indicated on the application. After discussion among the board and Mr. Murphy and no one from the public speaking, a motion to approve was made by Butterfield. A second motion to approve was made by Kelso. This was followed by a vote to approve.

Yes-None No-Butterfield, Spahr, Bartholomew, Kelso, and Wharram. Case No. 22-06 Denied

Case No. 22-07: A variance has been requested for the property located at 228 North First Ave. The petitioner seeks a variance from Ordinance #93-30 relative to the location of an accessory structure. Accessory structures are permissible in the rear yard. The petitioner is requesting a variance to permit an accessory structure (patio) to be in the side yard. The petitioner (Stan Galat) addressed the board. Mr. Galat stated that the proposed patio in the side yard provides the most privacy since this is a corner lot. Mr. Galat also reiterated the reasons for the variance request that were indicated on the application. After discussion from the board, a motion to approve was made by Butterfield. A second motion to approve was made by Kelso. This was followed by a vote to approve.

Yes-None No-Butterfield, Wharram, Kelso, Bartholomew, and Spahr. Case No. 22-07 Denied

Other Business: None

Brad Marks: Nothing

With no further business, Butterfield made a motion to adjourn. The motion to adjourn was seconded by Spahr. A voice vote to adjourn was unanimously approved.