

MINUTES OF MEETING

HOOVER BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

Date: July 5, 2018
Time: 7:30 P.M.
Place: Hoover Municipal Center
Present: Mr. Dan Mikos
Mr. Jim Brush
Mr. Kyle Puchta
Mr. Lawren Pratt
Mr. Curtis Jackson
Mr. David LeCompte

Absent: Mr. Paul Gamble

Also Present: Mr. Mac Martin – City Planner
Ms. Vanessa Bradstreet – Zoning Assistant

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Mikos. The secretary had the roll call and a quorum was present. Mr. Mikos announced the voting members for this meeting would be himself, Mr. Brush, Mr. Puchta, Mr. Pratt and Mr. LeCompte.

2. Approval of minutes from the June 7, 2018, regular meeting. Mr. Mikos asked if there were any additions or corrections to be made. There were none. Mr. Mikos asked for the minutes to be approved by acclamation.

3. BZA-0718-12 – Mr. Blake Baxter is requesting a variance to the required minimum lot size for the property at **1314 Columbia Drive**. The property owner is Tyler Sample and the property is zoned R-1 (Single Family District). APPROVED

Mr. Blake Baxter was present to represent this case. Mr. Baxter explained his request. He explained it was an original platted lot. He stated it was 13,500 square feet and he was wanting to build new home construction on this property. Mr. Baxter stated if you looked at the other lots in this subdivision, it was absolutely the same size if not larger than those other lots. Mr. Baxter stated the lot across the street was identical dimensions. He described a lot that is next door to it and he believed it was 12,000 square feet, 1500 square feet short of that requirement and they were asking for a variance to build on the lot.

Mr. Mikos asked if the house he was going to build would meet all the setback restrictions. Mr. Baxter answered that was correct. Mr. Mikos explained they had seen a lot of cases here from the Bluff Park area period as much of this was developed in the 50's or the early 60's, with much of these properties being developed in Jefferson county, so this board had dealt with many of these variances up there.

Mr. Mikos asked if anyone on the board had any questions. Mr. Brush asked what type of home he was planning to build. Mr. Baxter stated he had done some research on it and it looked like most of the houses on that street were 1700 up to 2200 square feet. Mr. Baxter explained what he was planning to do was a basement home, 1800 main level, and about 400 square feet in the basement, so 2200 square feet.

Mr. Mikos then asked Mac Martin, City Planner, that some of the neighbors were concerned about some drainage issues and asked if the City had noticed any drainage problems there. Mr. Martin stated they did have a communication from the neighbor from the west that they had dealt with drainage issues over the years and had been in communication with our Engineering Department. Mr. Martin stated that if the variance was granted and construction commences on the site, that would be something that they would look at as the home progresses to make sure that we were not unduly dumping any additional water. Mr. Mikos asked if any of the other board members had any questions. There were none.

Mr. Mikos asked if anybody in the audience would like to speak about this variance request. Mr. Joe Molay, the father of the next door neighbor who was out of town with her husband and could not be here. Mr. Molay stated his daughter and son-in-law purchased the home about three months ago. Mr. Molay stated when the house was being sold, the realtor told them nothing could be built on that piece of property because it didn't perk, so that was one of the advantages that his daughter and son-in-law saw in purchasing this home because it would be a little vacant lot. Mr. Molay stated it sat on a hill and did not know how they would be able to put a basement there with only 1300 square feet if they were doing 10 feet on each side of the property line. Mr. Molay stated he felt it would make it real narrow and he didn't know how they could get down. Mr. Molay stated again they were under the impression there was nothing going to be built there and as far as their concerns, it would not suit to what they were looking for when they purchased the home.

Mr. Pratt asked him which property he was referring to. Mr. Molay stated his daughter's house was 1320 Columbia Drive on the corner. Mr. Mac Martin added that it was the basement lot immediately to the northwest.

Mr. Mikos asked if anybody else had any questions. Mr. Roddy Sample, 100 Grand Lake, Pelham, AL, stated he was at the meeting for his son, Tyler Sample, who was out of town. Mr. Sample stated they sold the house to the previous owner, not the current owner, and said the lot was offered to those people at the time but they didn't want to purchase it. Mr. Sample stated that if the realtor represented anything incorrectly to Mr. Molay's daughter, he didn't see how that could affect the sale of this piece of property. Mr. Sample stated it was a separate lot and always had been. Mr. Sample added that as far as being able to build a basement lot, the house that is next door was a basement lot. Mr. Sample stated the driveways would be parallel to the same level to basements and did not see that as an issue.

Mr. Mikos asked for a motion. Mr. Brush made a motion to approve **BZA-0718-12**. Mr. Puchta seconded the motion. After a roll call vote, the case was approved unanimously.

4. **BZA-0718-13** - Mr. Blake Baxter is requesting a variance to the required minimum lot size for the property at **1863 & 1865 Buttercup Drive**. The property was recently annexed into the City of Hoover and is in the process of being zoned R-1 (Single Family District). Mr. Baxter is the owner of the property. **APPROVED**

Mr. Blake Baxter was present to represent this case which he stated was a very similar case as the previous case. Mr. Baxter explained he had two lots that were original platted and both were 50 feet across the front, 140 deep, and had acknowledged those were too small to build on so he had these lots combined into 1 lot which was 100 feet across the front, 140 feet deep, making it 14,000 square feet, so that lot size would be identical to everything else on the street. Therefore, he was requesting a variance to build a house on the R-1 status to build on a 14,000 square foot lot.

Mr. Pratt asked if the lot combination had already been completed. Mr. Baxter stated the surveyor had done that and it was on the P&Z agenda for Monday night to be approved. Mr. Mikos reiterated this was done by the county originally. Mr. Brush asked what he envisioned this home looking like. Mr. Baxter answered he was trying to keep it in the same style as everything else on the street. Mr. Baxter said he planned for a 2,500 square foot house, 4 bedrooms, 3 baths, and would sell it in the low 300's.

Mr. Mikos asked if anyone else on the board or in the audience that had any questions or comments. There were none. Mr. Mikos asked for a motion. Mr. Pratt made a motion to approve BZA-0718-13 subject to the lot combination and the rezoning process being finalized. Mr. Puchta seconded the motion. After a roll call vote, the motion was approved unanimously.

5. **BZA-0718-14** – Greg & Cynthia Poole are requesting a variance at their residence located at **3325 Chartwell Road** in order to construct a pool of 260 sq. ft. that together with existing structures will exceed the allowable square footage for structures within the rear yard. The request is for a 170 sq. ft. variance. **DENIED**

Ms. Cynthia Poole, 3325 Chartwell Road, was present to represent this case. Mr. Mikos asked Ms. Poole if in fact they would be willing to remove the metal building at their house. Ms. Poole answered if they had to do that they would remove it. Ms. Poole added they did have a culvert that ran through the middle of their yard to assist with drainage, and they planned to pull the culvert up and make some french drains that would be more pleasing to the eye. Ms. Poole added that they had painted the building the same color as the house and it matched the shutters and aesthetically it was very nice.

Mr. Puchta stated to Ms. Poole that they had stated in their request for the variance that it was one of the smallest pools. Mr. Puchta reminded her that this board was dealing with square feet and asked if there was a smaller pool they could consider. Mr. Lynn Bush, Earl's Pools, owner, then spoke about the pool size. He stated the pool was 12' x 26' with radius corners and was not a rectangle pool, so if you figured the square footage on the pool, it would actually be less than the drawing that was turned in, (which was probably turned in on a radius). He stated this pool had rounded edges and the square footage would be less than that. He stated it was about the smallest pool they could install. He stated this family was investing a lot of money in travertine because they were decorating their backyard.

Mr. Mikos explained the role of the BZA with granting variances when there was a hardship and explained it was hard to see the hardship here. Mr. Mikos asked Mr. Bush if there was a smaller pool that would qualify. Mr. Bush stated if they dropped down from the size they were requesting, it would be pretty much a swim spa. Mr. Bush stated this was the smallest pool they could put in, a 12' x 26' with radius corners so it was actually smaller than that.

Ms. Poole added that someone had mentioned a metal shed and she corrected that stating it was a wood shed. Ms. Poole stated she did not have the dimensions on the shed because she said it was there before they moved in. Mr. Mac Martin, City Planner, stated the outdoor garage (not attached) was 120 square feet.

Mr. Mikos asked if anyone else had any questions or comments. Ms. Poole added she had a letter left by a neighbor giving her support. Mr. Mikos emphasized again that it was not the aesthetics or the type of pool that was the problem. It was the square footage in the backyard. Mr. Puchta added it would have been helpful to have known what the actual square footage of the pool was instead of it fitting into a rectangle.

There was some discussion regarding the dimensions. Mr. Mikos asked for a motion. Mr. Brush made a motion to approve BZA-0718-14 with the condition that the shed whether it be metal or wood, is removed from the property. Mr. Puchta seconded the motion. After a roll call vote, the motion was denied by Mr. Pratt, Mr. LeCompte, Mr. Brush, and Mr. Mikos. Mr. Puchta voted "aye. The motion was denied. Mr. Bush asked what the homeowners' options were. Mr. Mikos answer was to build a smaller pool.

6. **BZA-0718-15** – Taylor Burton Company, Inc. is requesting a 2' rear setback variance for the construction of a home at **1820 Valleydale Cove**. The property is owned by Mr. Dean Triantos and the property is zoned R-1 (Single Family District). **APPROVED**

Mr. Taylor Burton, 3239 Lorna Road, Hoover, AL, was present to represent this case. Mr. Burton stated they were building on 8 acres in Hoover. He stated part of this property is in Hoover and some in Shelby County. Mr. Burton stated they went out on the land and picked a spot with the homeowners for the house. Mr. Burton explained he knew he was dealing 8 acres and knew he had a side property line and were about 80 or 90 feet from the side property line. Mr. Burton stated he did not have any idea that he would be controlled by the Shelby County line. Mr. Burton stated the 2 foot variance was for the same property. Mr. Burton stated they were 175 feet from the property line and 124 feet from the property line in another direction, but 33 feet from the Shelby County line. Mr. Burton stated that the property owner owned all of this property, with only one access to the property. Mr. Burton stated there was a lot of elevation change on the property, a dam there that dammed up the lake, and had an area that was not a buildable site. Mr. Burton stated there was not a situation where the land would ever be sold or subdivided. It would be one house on 8 acres and they were asking for a 2 foot variance to get off of the county line.

Mr. Brush asked what the hardship was. Mr. Burton stated the hardship was mainly topography. Mr. Burton stated bringing the house forward gets you into the lake and down a hill. Mr. Burton stated they had gotten the house as high up on the hill as they could, and moved a massive amount of dirt. Mr. Burton said they did get the house as high on the hill as

they could. Mr. Burton stated to bring the house forward more, got them down on the lake, and to bring the house over got them closer to the side line and would still get them taking more trees and moving more, but basically the hardship was the dam, the lake, and the topography of the land where they were building.

Mr. Mikos stated it was their understanding that the original plans were approved by the city and that they were moved after they were permitted and asked if that was correct. Mr. Burton stated that was correct. Mr. Burton stated that after all the permits were approved, they then went in and cleared the land, then literally went out with the homeowner and turned the house around in different directions to see where the best location was for the house. Mr. Burton stated it was a million and a half dollar custom home on 8 acres and he never dreamed until he got a foundation survey that they had encroached on the county line.

Mr. Mikos stated if they annexed the rest of the line, or even two feet, it wouldn't be a problem. Mr. Burton agreed. Mr. Burton stated the homeowner didn't see a reason to annex and didn't want to pay the extra taxes for that property to be in Hoover. Mr. Burton stated all the house taxes would be paid to Hoover but there was more acreage on the back side of the dam that he didn't see any reason to annex.

Mr. Mikos asked if there was anybody in the audience that would like to speak to this request. Mr. Mikos asked Mr. Mac Martin, City Planner, if he felt it was feasible to annex 2 feet to make this happen. Mr. Martin responded there were two things; one being the surveyor plotted that as a property line and the homeowner may own both sides of the property but there was a line that was there describing the northwest edge of Lot 3 and he did think it was feasible and certainly something the city would be interested in to have the sliver or additional acreage annexed into the city and resurveyed to meet all the setback requirements.

Mr. Burton asked to meet the setback requirements, he could then annex 10 square feet, not a 2 foot sliver across the whole line, just where he would meet the setback requirements. Mr. Burton stated it didn't make any sense to go to all that work just to meet the setback requirements. Mr. Burton emphasized he was working for a homeowner that was building a 1 ½ million dollar house in Hoover and wanted it in Hoover. Mr. Burton stated he was not encroaching on any neighbor's property, only his own acreage.

Mr. Mikos asked for a motion. Mr. Brush made a motion to approve BZA-0718-15. Mr. Puchta seconded the motion. With a roll call vote, the motion was approved unanimously.

7. **BZA-0718-16** – Mr. Jon Rasmussen, Gonzalez Strength & Associates, is requesting a variance to sign regulations for property at **2311 John Hawkins Parkway** to allow 2 building wall signs with area measurements of 84 square feet and 33 square feet respectively. The property is zoned C-1 which permits one building wall sign measuring 50 square feet. The property owner is Kiritkumar M. Parekh and is zoned C-1 (Neighborhood Shopping District).
TABLED

Mr. Charlie Beavers, 1819 5th Avenue North, Birmingham, AL, 35203, was present to represent this case.

Mr. Beavers stated he had representatives from Gonzalez-Strength & Associates, Jon Rasmussen, Civil Engineer, and Robin Gregory, Landscape Architect, here as well to speak about the case. Mr. Beavers explained they had two previous meetings with staff to make sure they had all their bases covered in order to get this developed if the approvals were granted. Mr. Beavers explained the property was zoned C-1 and had some zoning conditions that were part of the zoning back in 2000 when the property was zoned and they were asking for amendments to a couple of those features. Mr. Beavers stated there were twelve conditions total and they were asking for amendments to two of them. Mr. Beavers stated the C-1 zoning, based on recommendations from staff, would have to have a Conditional Use approval and all that would go through a process which was basically a rezoning process through the Planning Commission which was scheduled for next Monday night, July 9th, and then subsequently to the City Council. Mr. Beavers said whatever happens here at the BZA meeting is extremely important and what happens at the P&Z and City Council level is important as well because it would all have to come together in order for this project to go forward.

Mr. Beavers talked about the Pet Suites Resort project. He explained this was a business which went overboard in catering to folks' pets. Mr. Beavers stated they were not just a boarding facility, but a place where one would bring their pets for a vacation. Mr. Beavers then showed photos of the interior. Mr. Beavers stated each dog would have its' own room with wrought iron gate opened, raised bed with cushy mattress, tv in the room, scheduled play times, special grooming and treats.

Mr. Beavers stated the cost of the development would be a minimum of 3 ½ million upward to 4 million dollars. Pet Suites Resorts also has a couple of other facilities located in Louisville and one in Atlanta. He explained that Hogan Real Estate out of Louisville is a high end developer and does work for companies like Walgreen's, Walmart, McDonald's, Starbucks, Marathon Petroleum, Hobby Lobby, Jimmie John's, and of course Pet Suites.

Mr. Beavers stated when the property was zoned C-1 (Neighborhood Shopping District) back in 2000, part of the deal in order to get the site zoned C -1 was that part of the site would be zoned R-1 (Single Family Residential) and would front on the low side of Pine Rock and houses would be built on the lots on Pine Rock. There would be 12 conditions or restrictions on what could be done on the C-1 portion of the property.

Mr. Beavers explained the site plan had been developed in such a way to best protect the neighborhood as possible. Mr. Beavers stated they wanted input from the neighbors so they invited all the folks on Pine Rock Lane to a neighborhood meeting, went over the proposal, got input from them about what they could do to make it better, etc . As a result of this meeting, they heard back from one neighbor who was present tonight, who had a wide open view of this property as well as Hwy 150 and everything across from it. Mr. Beavers stated they met with him today to see what else they might do as far as landscaping plan. As a result, Mr. Beavers had obtained consent from the developer regarding going ahead and drawing up a landscape plan to incorporate things they had talked to the neighbor about today.

Mr. Beavers explained the level of the lot was going to be lowered so that it was no higher than 4 feet above the plane of the paved surface of Hwy 150. Mr. Beavers stated they had a cut through that would show how low that would be. Mr. Beavers explained the building would be sunk down into the ground in the back so that it would be below the yards of the houses that backed

up to it. Mr. Beavers stated that would give a great opportunity for landscaping and buffering both from sound and vision.

Mr. Beavers stated this was an opportunity to take a site which was stripped of vegetation by the original developer who had brought in a whole lot of bad field dirt which raised the level of the site. Mr. Beavers stated it was going to cost \$700,000 to get the bad field dirt out, and accomplish the lowering of the site. Mr. Beavers explained he felt this was a great opportunity for this site and was a much better use than other things that could go there. He explained this site had been sitting empty for years, with these neighbors having to be exposed to Hwy 150 visually and with the noise. Mr. Beavers explained there would be no activity on the back side of this building facing the neighbors.

Mr. Beavers then invited Mr. Jon Rasmussen, Gonzalez-Strength & Associates, 2176 Parkway Lake Drive, Hoover, AL, to speak about the signage. Mr. Rasmussen had a presentation in which he pointed out the sign and where it was located. Mr. Rasmussen showed where the building sign was going to be located, facing to the west. Mr. Rasmussen also pointed out the main entrance to the facility and showed a rendering looking from the parking lot into the front of the facility. Mr. Rasmussen then discussed various aspects of their sign building footprints. Mr. Rasmussen stated the combined square footage was a little over 84 square feet. Mr. Rasmussen announced that the owner of the facility has agreed to remove this one, so that variance should be disregarded for the sign variance request. Mr. Rasmussen discussed the outdoor play area, and the fact that they wanted to keep the ingress/egress of the traffic coming in and out separate from the outdoor play area. Mr. Rasmussen stated that was the only place left for the entrance into the building, and they wanted to keep the sign facing that direction.

Mr. Beavers then showed a view of the building from Hwy 150 and discussion ensued regarding signage locations. Mr. Pratt asked if the signage was illuminated. Mr. Rasmussen answered the signage was illuminated. Mr. Pratt asked if that was both monument and the sign on the building. Mr. Rasmussen answered he was not sure about the monument sign, but they could find out. Mr. Rasmussen explained this facility closes and then it re-opens so it did have a down time. Mr. Rasmussen added if there was any kind of condition, he thought the owner would probably be open to having some sort of restrictions placed on the actual illumination times of the signage if the BZA would consider that as part of their application. Mr. Pratt asked if he knew the operating hours. Mr. Rasmussen answered they closed from 6:30 to 8:30 to 9:00 pm and that would vary somewhat depending on when they got the dogs into their suites. Mr. Pratt asked Mr. Rasmussen to go back to the site plan to show where the monument sign was in relation to the landscape plan. Discussion ensued then about the monument sign. Mr. Pratt stated for clarification, the variance request was for 84 square feet for that one sign.

Mr. Mikos asked for them to go back to pictures with the front sign on it. Mr. Mikos asked if there was a way to reduce the size of the paw print. Mr. Pratt asked about the dimensions of the paw print vs. the words. Mr. Beavers stated they could take thoughts back to the owners of Pet Suites with other ideas for the size of the sign, as they wanted to make it work.

Mr. Martin, City Planner, stated what he was showing with the 84 square feet vs. the 50 square foot maximum, they were looking at about a 40 or so percent increase that was being asked for. Mr. Brush added they had come up with a great idea to not have the big dog playing with the ball as part of the signage.

Mr. Beavers stated if he had some idea of what the board was looking for, they would be happy to go back to the owners and discuss other options with them.

Mr. Mikos stated he felt it would be a good idea to continue this case to the next meeting until they had time to go back to the owners and see what they could reduce it to. Mr. Mikos stated he knew they wanted the sign to look proportional but getting them closer to 50 from 84. Mr. Pratt added he would also be interested to see the dimensions of for what they came up with and an understanding of whether or not each, the monument and the building sign, were illuminated or not, and maybe a graphic of the monument sign.

Mr. Mikos also asked them to show the building rendering featuring architectural vertical metal panels. Mr. Martin asked about what point in time did the client change its' logo and discussed the Roswell, GA location where apparently they had detached signage but no building wall signage. Mr. Martin asked for clarification of these changes. Mr. Rasmussen stated he didn't know and Mr. Beavers explained they could find that out before the next meeting.

Mr. Brush asked about the way the parking lot was constructed, basically one way in and one way out, it didn't seem to him that there was much of a hardship or need for a sign that was any bigger because you couldn't confuse where the front door was.

Mr. Mikos asked if anybody in the audience would like to speak about this variance request. Nobody responded. Mr. Mikos asked Mr. Beavers if they would like to table this case. Mr. Beavers answered they did. Mr. Brush made a motion to table BZA-0718-16 until such time additional information becomes available in regards to the signage. Mr. Puchta seconded the motion. After a roll call vote, the motion was approved unanimously.

8. **BZA-0718-17** – Mr. Jon Rasmussen, Gonzalez Strength & Associates, is requesting a variance to building area regulations for property at **2311 John Hawkins Parkway** to allow a building 14, 240 square feet, or 16.7% of the total lot area on the site. The property is zoned C-1, which permits a building to cover a maximum of 12% of the lot. The property owner is Kiritkumar M. Parekh and is zoned C-1 (Neighborhood Shopping District).
APPROVED

Mr. Charlie Beavers, 1819 5th Avenue North, Birmingham, AL 35203, was present to represent this case. Mr. Beavers stated this property was under contract for this development contingent upon receiving all the necessary approvals. Mr. Beavers stated he would like to leave a hardship and would like to invite Mr. Robin Gregory, Landscape Architect, Gonzalez-Strength & Associates to come up, go over the site plan and explain the landscape plan, and they would address how they were going to protect the neighborhood with respect to the building and also to go over what they had discussed with one of the neighbors, Mr. Jim Pecco, about other things they had agreed to add and work with him on.

Mr. Beavers had a document that showed the property had been reduced showing where the edge of the property was at that time and how much was lost. There was a taking, reducing the size of the property and the boundary had gotten somewhat skewed but he didn't know that that was an issue for this particular size of building, but the size of the lot certainly is. Mr. Beavers emphasized had the lot not been taken, this property maintained its' size that it had when it was

created and planned for retail development, this building would have fit within the limitations. Mr. Beavers stated it would have allowed 14,000 + square feet in excess of what is being requested here. Mr. Beavers stated that was his articulated hardship with respect to this property.

Mr. Beavers stated he believed they could show the size of the building will be somewhat of a help to the neighborhood because it would provide a bigger block of sound absorption from Hwy 150. They believed they could show this particular developer in the way he was willing to site the building on the property and install landscaping, would give a very good buffer for the entire site and for all those neighbors to make their situation better so that the size of the building did not create a negative but actually was a positive.

Mr. Beavers stated one other feature was the building would have an emergency type door on the back wall up against the neighborhood, but there was no other access. Mr. Beavers explained there wasn't a driveway back there as the developer had decided to sprinkle the building, alleviating the need for a driveway for fire trucks. There would be purely landscape back there for a buffer.

Mr. Robin Gregory, Gonzalez-Strength & Associates, Landscape Architect, then presented the Landscape Plan. Mr. Gregory then presented the plan and what types of trees would be planted. Mr. Gregory mentioned a sanitary sewer easement existed in one area. Mr. Mikos asked if the current owner owned the property back when the county took a portion of the property. Mr. Beavers stated he did not think so. Mr. Mikos asked Mr. Martin, City Planner, if he had been working with this group on this development. Mr. Martin answered he had been working with them and had come up with a list of several items such as variances, conditional use approvals. Mr. Martin stated they were going to need approvals beyond administrative capability, therefore, this was their first stop and P&Z would be on the next Monday evening where they would deal with the rezoning issues to remove some of the conditions placed on the property with the C-1 zoning ordinance and also the Conditional Use request itself. Mr. Martin stated that once past the Planning Commission if they recommended approval, then it would go to the City Council probably looking at the second meeting of August.

Mr. Mikos asked if it was true that this building fit on the property if the county had not taken the right of way. Mr. Beavers answered he had the numbers and could verify it. Mr. Martin added that he could verify and had examined the UAB development just to the east, the multi-story building that has some medical offices in it, and did find the building covers approximately 16% of that lot. Mr. Martin stated the CVS site came in with just under 12% building coverage, and if you went to the east, the Express Oil Change was about 10% of its site coverage, the strip center just the east of that was about 22 to 23% of the site coverage there. Mr. Martin did point out that the Express Oil Change and the strip center were in the C-2 zone, a different zoning district. Mr. Martin stated there was a certain character already established on the north side of John Hawkins Parkway consisting of the strip center and the UAB center.

Mr. Pratt asked about the sanitary sewer line clipping the building and wondered how they were addressing that. Mr. Rasmussen explained they were relocating the sewer line. Mr. Pratt asked questions about the height of the building, parapets, and floor plans. Mr. Pratt asked about the possibility of decreasing the length of the building so that they would not need a variance for coverage. Mr. Beavers stated they had discussed that issue to Pet Suites but they needed this amount to make it work.

Mr. Mikos asked if anyone else, BZA Board Member, or in the audience, have any other questions or comments. Mr. Mikos asked for a motion. Mr. Brush made a motion to approve BZA-0718-17. Mr. Puchta seconded the motion. After a roll call vote, the motion was approved unanimously.

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Vanessa Bradstreet
Zoning Assistant