

**Town of Red Hook  
Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting Minutes  
June 13, 2007**

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 7:10 P.M. by Chairman Timothy Ross.

**ROLL CALL**

Members Present: Timothy Ross, Robert Latimer, Michael Mosher, Corinne Weber  
Members Absent: John Douglas, Jim Hegstetter, Kenneth Anderson  
Also Present: James Ross, Town Board Liaison; Bob Fennell, Building Inspector

**PRELIMINARY BUSINESS**

Minutes of May 9, 2007: Chairman Ross asked for any corrections, additions or deletions to the Minutes. He said that his only comment was that there was a question relative to the findings for Ulster Savings Bank and the Board would be addressing that shortly. Other than that, he said, they look fine to me. He moved that they be filed with the amendment which will be made tonight. The motion was seconded by Rob Latimer and all were in favor.

Planning Board Minutes and Letters: Chairman Ross asked for questions or comments on the Planning Board Minutes and letters. No comments were made.

Building Inspector/ZEO Permits and Memos: The Board reviewed the current Permits and memos.

Mike Mosher asked a question about a mailing regarding wells and septic. Chairman Ross said that the minimum density table presented really refers to maximum density. He said that they did tests of wells and septic in the area and when they got above certain densities, depending on the age of the subdivision, they saw nitrates starting to rise. You can go online and look at that report, he advised Mr. Mosher. It is pretty involved, but there are about four or five pages of good technical material. In an area like Red Hook, it's not as much of an issue he said. With central water, your concentration and pollutants aren't near your well heads. But when you are outside, like coming up Route 9, you have half acre lots with wells and septic.

Comments from the Chairman: Chairman Ross opened discussion on the training announcement which was in the last packet. As you may be aware, he said, we are supposed to get four hours of training a year. We should try to stay with that. He asked Mike Mosher if he had done the certification and Mike said that he had. He then asked Rob Latimer if he had completed the certification from Pace Law School. Rob responded

that he had the materials but had not completed them. Chairman Ross asked if he could try to proceed with that because right now the Board is just certified. We have four members who have passed that, he noted.

7:10 **Clarification of Decision, Appeal 07-04, Ulster Savings Bank Application for an area variance to reduce the front yard building setback on Metzger Road from the required 80 feet to 25 feet.** Chairman Ross stated that the confusion came in relative to the setback from Metzger. The decision ended up being worded just for Route 9. He handed Mike Mosher a copy of the revised Findings and Decision relative to Metzger and asked Mike if he wanted to make a motion to revise the decision to approve the 25 foot setback to Metzger. Rob Latimer said that the Board had granted a 40 foot setback from Route 9. Chairman Ross clarified that the setback was 40 feet from Route 9, but 25 feet from Metzger; that's where the confusion came in, he said. Mr. Mosher made a motion that the Board amend the prior motion to include granting a front/side yard setback on the Metzger side of the property from the required 80 to 25 feet with all four of the other variances remaining as is. There would be benefit to the applicant and no detriment to the community or the environment as a result of that variance, he said. The motion was seconded by Tim Ross, who suggested that rather than amending the original motion, a new motion be made to grant a front yard variance of 25 feet facing Metzger. Mr. Mosher agreed. Chairman Ross asked if there were any further discussion. As there was none, a voted was taken and all were in favor.

Chairman Ross said that the Board would get the Findings out to the Bank and he offered Mr. Dodd a handwritten copy of the new motion. He said that a typed copy would be sent out.

## **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

7:15 PM **Continuation of Public Hearing for Appeal 07-02, Peter and Joseph Scibelli Application for three area variances to erect a 600 square foot addition to their existing auto repair facility. The maximum building coverage allowed is 15%; applicant is proposing 17%. Expansion of a non-conforming use is allowed up to 50%; applicant's proposed expansion will increase it to 85.5%. A 25 foot rear setback is required; applicant proposes a 16 foot rear setback.** Chairman Ross clarified that this is a continuation and asked if anyone was present who wished to speak for or against the applicant. As there was no response, he asked for comments from the Board. Mike Mosher asked if he could be briefed on the issues. Joe Scibelli explained that basically they want to add two bays to their business. Bob Fennell stated that the problem is that non-conforming uses can only expand 50% and this is bringing them up to 85.5%. You have already expanded your business once, he said, and there are other setback issues too. Yes, Chairman Ross said, there is a 25 to 16 foot rear setback. Mike Mosher asked if this setback was on the west side. Chairman Ross said it is on the north side. The setback is coming toward the village, where the commercial district is. Mike Mosher said that there would be a bay on top of the bay that is already there. You are going two wide.

Chairman Ross asked for comments. As there were none, he asked for a motion to be made. Mike Mosher made a motion to grant the applicant in this Appeal 07-02 approval for an area variance to increase their coverage from 15% to 17%. That is a minor variance for coverage, he said. He also moved to increase the expansion of non-conforming use from 50% to 85.5%, which might not be considered minor but which he said he would address later and to decrease the required setback from 25 to 16 feet on the north side of the property, which he thought was minor. I think, he added, that area looks really nice. It is cleaned up. It is kind of an entrance into the village and relative to what was there, it represents a big improvement. Recognizing the non-conforming use, I still think that it is a clean and attractive operation and I think that this will benefit the applicant with very little detriment to the neighborhood or the community, he said. Chairman Ross asked for further discussion. As there was none, the motion was seconded by Rob Latimer. A vote was taken and all were in favor.

7:30 Appeal 07-06, Kim and Joe Curthoys, Application for the following area variances for an addition to their existing building: increase maximum building coverage from 7% to 20 % and reduce minimum open space from 80% to 69%. Chairman Ross told Kim Curthoys that there were neighbors in the audience who were there for her Public Hearing and asked her if she wanted to come up and briefly explain her project. She had some pictures and asked to submit them. Chairman Ross said that that would help. She said that her application was twofold: number one, there is a piece that has already been put up that turned into a much bigger project than we expected. We had a porch outside the south elevation, she said, and we wanted to screen it in and at the same time we had major leaks inside our house. After talking with Bob Fennell, long term we wanted to make it a four season porch. We actually put up the structure in two days. When we found out our deck couldn't support what we planned on doing, I dropped the ball. A roofer came when he wasn't supposed to, while we were away, and he ended up roofing the property. He also called Bob Fennell without our even knowing. I do apologize for that. Bob Fennell accepted her apology. It was really out of my control, she continued.

Bob recommended that we apply for all the things we plan on doing. However, we don't plan on doing all of them for the next year to three years. Bob Fennell said that's not good, because variances expire. Chairman Ross said you have eighteen months. You had mentioned, she said, that once we apply for a Building Permit, we have a year extension. So if we had one year and eighteen months on the variances that at least gives us a two year leeway.

I have some pictures of our existing house, Ms. Curthoys said, that show the screened in porch and the deck that was underneath it. The next phase is for Larry Garricks to help us design something that is going to add to our house. We are only approved for two bedrooms and we want to keep the two bedrooms. There is only one bedroom which is eight by ten. We want to create a bedroom for us and a bedroom for our son and we hope to have another child. Ms. Curthoys then asked if she could show the Board and neighbors some pictures. Chairman Ross told her she could proceed. She showed the neighbors a picture of the existing house and the porch that she had screened in and then presented some pictures to the Board.

It turned out, she said, that the porch we had couldn't support the weight. So in a two day period we had sonotubes put in to support what we had done. There is going to be twelve inches of cedar to match our house and the rest is glass all the way around, or screen. Mike Mosher asked if the sonotubes were part of the Permit. She said, no, they were not and that is something that I explained to Bob (Fennell). Again she said, I really was the one who dropped the ball. When questioned as to whether there was a footing inspection, Ms. Curthoys said no but she would be happy to dig it up because she knew she had dropped the ball. Rob Latimer said he was curious about the foundation and whether it had passed an inspection. Bob Fennell said that there had not been an inspection. Ms. Curthoys added that they had put in two extra sonatubes that were not required, but had been recommended. I have a full schematic of what we did, she said, and I also told Mr. Fennell that I would be more than happy to dig up any other part that he wants to.

Mr. Fennell was asked if it would meet code and he responded that it will require some kind of inspection, as she suggests. In our application, we went for everything we wanted to do, Ms. Curthoys stated. This is a small part of it. The next is building a garage. Ms. Curthoys then asked for the survey map and used that to explain the proposed construction. Right now we park our cars out in front, she said, and our one bedroom is a very small corner here where our son has his bed. We don't have a formal bedroom. We actually sleep in the basement part of the house. What we hope to do is build a unit here where we can come in through our driveway and park in the garage. The garage is going to have twelve foot ceilings because we would like to have the second story overlooking the lake. On the second floor we hope to have a master bedroom, a master bathroom and another bathroom on top or two bedrooms because my son's room will now act as a stairway to get to the second level. I don't have plans for you because I really can't hire anyone until I know whether or not we get the area variance.

Chairman Ross inquired as to where the well is located. Ms. Curthoys pointed out the septic and the well on the map and said that the well is the same well as the previous owner had. We don't plan on upgrading our usage in any way, she said. The house originally had two small bedrooms which were the size of a closet. We opened up that one so that my son could have a little bigger bedroom. But even that is small. His bed just fits in there. Chairman Ross asked if there will be a third bedroom on the second floor. Ms. Curthoys said, we are not adding. I want to make it very clear that we are only having two bedrooms. Chairman Ross reminded Ms. Curthoys that she had said that she was looking for a second floor with a master bedroom and possibly a third bedroom. Ms. Curthoys said that she would like to have her son's room become the staircase to go to the second floor. We will never have more than two bedrooms, she said. There is no need for them. I want one large bedroom for our son and, hopefully, another baby and one bedroom for us. I just want to have a decent sized bedroom for myself and a decent sized bedroom for my son. Our one bedroom is maybe eight by six or eight by seven. It is just big enough to fit his bed in it. Ms. Curthoys then showed the position of the rooms on the schematic. That is the only bedroom in the main part of the house, she said.

Also, on the property we have a bungalow and a studio. I would like the house to touch these, either by a roof or a patio so that the house will be tied together and look like one cohesive house. Ms. Curthoys was questioned as to whether that was what she meant on the application when she said that the changes will bring the house and cottage together. She said yes. The cottage was originally a shed for campers with a toilet and four or five bunk beds, she continued. I don't like having the cottage look. The properties in general are all changing. Everybody has homes that they are living in all the time. They are not summer camps anymore. So I would like our house to look like a real house. As you can see by the size, our main floor is only thirty feet by thirty feet and that is our only living space, plus the basement.

Chairman Ross then opened the Public Hearing and asked those who wish to speak to give their names for the public record. *Derrick Moore* said that he had just bought the property next door. Ms. Curthoys said she wanted to tell Mr. Moore that she had a portable barn where all the construction is going on. Our purpose, she said, is to get that whole area cleared up and we can add a fence in this section. I can't stand those portable Amish barns, Ms. Curthoys said, but because our property is just one level, we have to use that for storage. But your husband runs a business out of that barn, *Mr. Moore* said. No, Ms. Curthoys responded. *Mr. Moore* asked if they had a landscaping business and Ms. Curthoys said, we have a landscaping business, but nothing whatsoever is run out of our property. You are more than welcome to come and have a look at our barn, she said. *Mr. Moore* referred to a tractor being parked in their driveway for the last few months and said that this was annoying. Ms. Curthoys said that this was because they were doing the sand and the clearing for the Country Club.

*Tom Markunas*, a neighbor, asked if there weren't commercial vehicles parked there as well. Ms. Curthoys said yes, because right now we are taking care of that property, mowing it and clearing it. *Mr. Markunas* said that the vehicles had been there for months. Bob Fennell said that this was the same problem that they had in Rhinebeck. Ms. Curthoys said that this was because they are working on the property. Mr. Fennell said, you use that as an excuse. You always say you are working on a property and you leave your equipment there all the time with the excuse of working on the property. This is not your property, he said.

Mr. Fennell asked how big Ms. Curthoys property is and she responded saying it is .298. He said that it is pretty small for all that equipment. Ms. Curthoys agreed but went on to say that in the last month, they brought in fifty tons of sand to the beach property at the Country Club. We have moved two loads from the property and rearranged all the piles and that is something that we have been doing since the ground has thawed. During the winter, she said, none of our machinery is parked there. It is parked at the home of my sister, who has a major property on Livingston Street. That's where we park our tractors when we are not using them. All the properties and the things that have been there have strictly been related to the work we are doing. For one day every week our tractor is there because we mow the entire property on Route 9. *Tom Markunas* said that he sees a lot of vehicles.

*Mr. Markunas* asked a question about the porch. *Ms. Curthoys* said that right now Tyvex is covering everything, but they hope to put twelve inches of cedar to match the house and the rest would be all glass. *Mr. Markunas* asked if they had a permit or permission for this work. *Ms. Curthoys* responded that they did not, but they have applied. *Mr. Markunas* reiterated that they did not have a Building Permit. She said this was true and that they did apply, but they applied after the fact. She admitted that she definitely dropped the ball on that. She said she called Bob Fennell on that. *Mr. Markunas* said that she and her husband do a lot of construction in Rhinebeck and they know the business pretty well. She said that she was mistaken. She didn't know that you needed a Building Permit to do roofing. Bob Fennell said that they need a permit for the addition.

*Ms. Curthoys* said that she was not at home when the roofing was done and her husband had gone ahead with the work. *Mr. Markunas* said that *Ms. Curthoys'* husband knows construction and real estate very well. She said that he doesn't take care of the business end of it and that it was her fault. I'm the one who does the business and the paperwork, she said. Bob Fennell asked if he didn't know enough to get a Building Permit. *Ms. Curthoys* said that he assumed that she had taken care of it. It was my fault, she said. I can't say that enough. Joe assumed I was taking care of it. He knows he needs a Building Permit, but he also knows that I take care of the business end of things.

Chairman Ross asked what was there prior to this porch. It was just a porch, *Ms. Curthoys* said. Was it a covered porch, he asked. No, *Ms. Curthoys* stated, it was just a plain deck. When I came to Bob, she said, and told him that I had messed up, I asked him what I should do. Right now we really only want to screen this in. A year from now, we would like to make this a four season room. He said that it is better for you to do this all at once and not come back and see us in six months. So we are applying for everything. Turning to the neighbors, *Ms. Curthoys* said that any of you can come and see. None of our work is done out of our home. We do have a landscaping business, but nothing is done out of our home.

Chairman Ross asked the folks in the back if they had any comments. *Mr. Moore* said that he has this large storage shed within six feet of the property line. At the last hearing it was said that if they get a permit to do their building, the shed will be removed. The question was where would it be removed to and they said that they didn't know. It might be on another piece of property. *Ms. Curthoys* said that they do have the right to put it on another piece of property. However, she said, I prefer that we don't because I don't like those sheds period. *Mr. Moore* said, now I hear that it is going to be about two years before you do this building, so that shed is going to be there for another two years. *Ms. Curthoys* said no; the moment this gets completed the shed is coming out of there. *Mr. Moore* said, we are talking two years before that is done. No, *Ms. Curthoys* responded, that's the other addition in the middle. This shed I would like to have removed immediately. *Ms. Curthoys* referred to the schematic to further clarify this point.

Rob Latimer asked her to ascertain on the schematic which part of the plan was in the future and she did so. She said she just wants to take advantage of what might be approved for green space. Exactly where the deck will go depends on usage because, she

said, I want a professional to design it. I would like to have some sort of a view, she said, or possibly connect these areas. But it is far too early to know how this would work artistically or architecturally. The Board continued to study the schematic. Ms. Curthoys pointed out the location of the Amish shed.

Chairman Ross brought up the question of whether there had been a permit for the shed. Mr. Fennell said that he could not imagine that there was one because it is too close to the line. And if it is that close to the line, it doesn't have a CO. Ms. Curthoys said that the shed had been put in when she moved into the house almost ten years ago and she did not know if the rules had changed since then.

Corinne Weber asked how big is the parcel next door. Ms. Curthoys said that it is a little bit bigger than the one we have. And yours is .29 acres, Chairman Ross stated. He said, I understand what you are trying to do. It's a tiny house and I know that with children you need more space, but the concern which I have is that with this size lot and a second story, even if it's still two bedrooms, you're really starting to max out the capacity of less than a third of an acre relative to the water and sewage systems. Ms. Curthoys was questioned as to what is on this lot right now. She said, nothing is on it now. There's not really much of a difference from the other houses, she continued. It's only my husband, myself and my son. Whether we have one story or two stories, it is still the same number of people.

Chairman Ross responded that that's not really how you have to look at it. You have to look at footprint and size of the structure. What is the capacity of it? If you sell it in ten years and somebody moves in with four kids, then you've got a really intense use on a tiny piece of property. I wish there was a way you could come out and at least see the size of it because it is really one big room Ms. Curthoys said. She said she had gone through the statistics on the other homes, their approvals and the size of their lots, and it is not an extreme relative to anybody who is already there. She said she would be happy to provide the Board with all of the data.

Chairman Ross asked Rob Latimer if he had any specific questions relative to this. He said that right now it appears to be coverage and a variance for a shed that is on the property. Is it coverage or open space, he asked? Ms. Curthoys said that it is open space and if it pleases the Board and it pleases my neighbors, I will have that shed removed in the next week. Our equipment is there based on the good of our community and if that bothers the community and they don't want us mowing, we will be more than happy to move the equipment off the property. When Ms. Curthoys started to address problems unrelated to those before the Board, Chairman Ross focused the discussion on the coverage issue. He said that he would like to research and he would not be in a good position to vote because he was not at the last meeting when there was an initial review. He therefore said that what he was going to do at this point was to continue this Public Hearing to the meeting in July. Ms. Curthoys said that was very good because they are not in any rush. I want to get out, he said, and walk this and look at the particulars of this property. The members of the Board will probably just stop by and look at the place. Corinne Weber asked Mr. Markunas the size of his property. *Mr. Markunas* said that it is

1100 square feet on half an acre. Chairman Ross said that we are going to continue the Public Hearing to 7:20 P.M. on July 11, 2007. We will be stopping by at some point, he said. Ms. Curthoys asked if she would get another letter and Chairman Ross said that we will not re-publicize; we are just continuing it here next month.

## **REVIEW OF APPEAL**

7:50 Review of Appeal 07-07, Robert Burke and Elizabeth Wilkins for the following area variances: to increase height of fence in front yard from the maximum of four feet to six feet; to have finished side of fence not face abutting property and to maintain plantings over the maximum of three feet in height within the required triangle. Chairman Ross explained to the applicants that this is just an initial review. We gather information, take input, set a Public Hearing, ask questions if we want additional information and generally we say we'd like to stop by and see the situation. Pictures are nice; maps are nice, but being there in person adds a lot of validity to the situation.

Chairman Ross said, we did have several pieces of correspondence on this and I've had a chance to go through them. I did not have a chance to go through the letter from Mr. Close today; but this is not a Public Hearing. This is just an information gathering tonight. He asked the applicants to give the Board a brief description. Mr. Burke said, we had a fencing company put up a six foot fence along our border with Mr. Makenzie due to ongoing problems with Mr. Makenzie. We did it as a reaction to these problems. We put the fence up because it creates a border and helps the situation. Ms. Wilkins said that there had been a lot of confusion with the contractor. She acknowledged that the fence was the wrong way around and stated that they have agreed to turn it around so that the good side faces the abutting property. However, she said, we would still like to keep it high. Chairman Ross clarified that the fencing contractor will correct the facing of the fence; however, you still want to apply for the variance for the height within the front yard setback.

Ms. Wilkins said, we have two sides facing the road and we are not really clear why the side yard facing Mr. Makenzie is considered a front yard. Chairman Ross said that if it is 75 feet back from the road, it is considered part of your front yard. There is a four foot limit in that, until you get back 75 feet from the road and that's the reason you asked for a variance. He asked if the fencing contractor is from the area and Ms. Wilkins said that he is. Chairman Ross said that this is not the first time a fencing contractor has put the nice side in. It is clear in almost all towns, he said, that the nice side is supposed to be out. Chairman Ross advised the applicants, I wouldn't do anything until we get through the process with the variances; however the facing of the fence is clear.

The members of the Board studied the map submitted by the applicants. *Kevin Makenzie*, next door neighbor, asked if he could speak. Chairman Ross clarified that this is not the Public Hearing portion, but said he could make a comment. *Mr. Makenzie* said, I was home the day they put up the fence. Halfway down the fence line, I said to the fencing contractor, the fence is backwards. He said, I know. The good side is always supposed to be facing out. I said that I have a problem with that. So he stopped working on the fence

that day. So halfway down it stopped. Then I went into town and got a copy of the zoning regs to make sure that in fact what I thought was true really was true. It turned out that it was. I also talked to the contractor. I told him that is going to be a problem because it is backwards. And I e-mailed you guys the morning of the day that fence was only half constructed. I said that if you get down here right away, today, you could save some work.

Chairman Ross said that the way we are going to approach this is, between this meeting and the next meeting, as many of us as can are going to try to get down and look at it in person. What I would ask you folks to do is to make sure you have an understanding with your fencing contractor that the good side is supposed to face out. Ms. Wilkins said that he knows that. Chairman Ross said, we will look at the safety concerns within the triangle. Bob Fennell said that you have to look at those plantings, too, because the County told us they own those plantings. Chairman Ross concurred that they do; they are 35 feet from the center line of the road. Mr. Burke said that there is no sight issue from Mr. Makenzie's property, at least in terms of getting out or onto the driveway. *Mr. Makenzie* said that sight was never part of the complaint.

Mr. Burke and Ms. Wilkins submitted several photographs and proceeded to discuss them with the Board. *Mr. Makenzie* said that it is not a line of sight issue from his driveway. It has nothing to do with my driveway, he said. When you are at the stop sign, you can't see across the intersection. Mr. Burke said he talked to the man who has been maintaining the bushes for years. Those plantings have been there and have been above three feet for as long as anyone in the neighborhood can remember. Mr. Burke submitted a picture of a car which had lost control coming down Barrytown Road. He said that the only reason the car didn't hit our well and then the forsythia is because there is that little blockage there. Chairman Ross said that when you are heading south on Anandale and River Road, at that point it is hard to see down that way. *Mr. Makenzie* said that it is a County issue and they are going to come and figure it out. Chairman Ross agreed, saying that the County will make the final call on that issue.

Mr. Burke said that this is what precipitated us putting the fence up. When unrelated concerns were then raised by Mr. Burke and Mr. Makenzie, Chairman Ross focused attention on the specific issues under consideration by the Board. Suffice it say, he summarized, that you wanted the fence as a separation. You wanted the fence for personal reasons. We are going to look at what benefit the fence is to you, what detriment it is to the neighborhood and what detriment it is to the safety of the highway. Mr. Burke then submitted to the Board a letter from another neighbor. He said that other neighbors have also offered to come to the Public Hearing or send letters. Chairman Ross said that if they can't get to the Public Hearing and they want to support, it certainly doesn't hurt to have them send mailings. Similarly, he continued, if there is somebody who doesn't like the fence, either show up or submit something in writing to the Public Hearing.

We are going to schedule a Public Hearing for July 11, 2007 at 7:50 P.M. Mr. Burke said that he would not be available on that date and asked for an alternate date. Chairman Ross said that the Board only meets once a month; however only one of you needs to be

here. He asked Ms. Wilkins if she could be make it and she said she could. Chairman Ross said that otherwise it would be in August. Mr. Burke said that he would be happy to make it within August, if you can do it. He said he would like to be present. Chairman Ross said that we can schedule the Public Hearing for August 8<sup>th</sup>. *Mr. Makenzie* objected, saying he has an attorney on a retainer. Chairman Ross said that the applicant has the right to request moving the date back and scheduled the Hearing for the first time slot, 7:20 P.M., on August 8, 2007. He also advised everyone that all the neighbors within 300 feet will be notified by certified mail. He said that he was going to try to get down there within the next week or so. Addressing Mr. Makenzie, Chairman Ross said, I will probably knock on your door too and look at it from both sides.

8:10 Review of Appeal 07-08, Douglas and Donna Coons application to decrease required twenty foot rear and side setbacks to three feet for existing twelve by twelve storage building. Chairman Ross invited the applicants to come up and explain the reason for their application. He explained that this is an initial review and next month will be the Public Hearing. He asked if the building is in the back right corner and Mr. Coons said it was the back left and pointed it out on the schematic. Chairman Ross asked how long it had been there and Mr. Coons responded, fourteen years, since 1993. There is a stone wall fence that is the boundary line, he added. It is on the right if you are coming in off Aspinwall. Chairman Ross asked if these lots go out to 9G and Mr. Coons said they did. Mrs. Coons said they are in the process of selling their home and they want to make sure everything is in order. Mr. Coons said, to tell you the truth when I built it, I came down to get a Permit. I said I want to build it closer to the line than is permitted and I asked for a variance. I was told to just go build it. And I did. And now I am thinking of selling the house and I want to get all the ducks in a row and all the paperwork right.

Rob Latimer said, then we are not talking about any construction. No, it's already there, Mrs. Coons replied. Chairman Ross reiterated that it has been there for fourteen years. The Board then studied the map submitted by Mr. and Mrs. Coons. Bob Fennell said that it was illegal when they put it there. Mrs. Coons said they own the lot adjacent to it, which is just half an acre. Nothing has been built on it. Chairman Ross said that the Public Hearing would be set for 7:15 P.M. on July 11, 2007. Mrs. Coons said that they want to get everything lined up so that when they sell the house, they don't have any legal hassles. Bob Fennell verified with Mr. and Mrs. Coons that there had not been a Building Permit. Chairman Ross asked if there was never a permit or a CO, do we need one now? Mrs. Coons said that Steve Cole (Zoning Enforcement Officer) was working on that. Mr. Coons said that he had gotten a CO, but for some reason the Building Permit was put on 76 Manor Road, which is that vacant lot next to us. So I've got to get that changed now. Mrs. Coons said that Steve is working on all that. Bob Fennell said that that was not a problem. Mr. Coons clarified that the Building Permit was for the house, not for the storage building. I didn't get the Building Permit for the storage building, he said, because they said just build it. Chairman Ross said to the members of the Board, we want to just stop in to look at it.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Chairman Ross asked if there were any other items. Copies of a training session announcement were passed out to the members of the Board. A motion to adjourn was made by Corinne Weber, seconded by Rob Latimer and all were in favor. The meeting was adjourned at 8:25 P.M.

Respectfully submitted by,

Sheila Franklin  
Clerk of the Board