

**Town of Milton  
Board of Adjustment  
March 25, 2008**

**Members Present:**

Marion Jones  
Larry Savage

Margo Goodman  
Alexander Donnan

**Others Present:**

Robin Davis                      John Brady

The Public Hearing was called to order

**Item #1: Public Hearing**

The applicant, Truitt Jefferson, is requesting the following variances for 414 Union St further identified by Sussex County Tax Map and Parcel # 2-35-14.19-33.00. The property is zoned R 1 (Residential).

Marion Jones: If there are no objections because the properties are tied together, I would also like to present Item b concerning the property at 416. Is there any objection to them being combined for the Public Hearing?

Truitt Jefferson: No, it is one deed.

Marion Jones: Exactly, but they are on the agenda as two items and I just want to be sure you have no objections and I'm just going to read through.

The applicant, Truitt Jefferson, is requesting the following variances for 416 Union St further identified by Sussex County Tax Map and Parcel # 2-35-14.19-33.00. The property is zoned R 1 (Residential).

Marion Jones: Now to backtrack just a little. Property number 414 Union St is requesting the following variances:

1. Reduction to minimum lot width from 75' to 60.05'
2. Reduction to minimum lot area from 10,000 sq ft to 7,365 sq ft
3. Reduction to minimum side yard setback from 10' to 6.2' (north side)
4. Reduction to minimum side yard setback for accessory building from 6' to 3.7' (south side)

Property number 416 Union St is requesting the following variances:

1. Reduction to minimum lot width from 75' to 60.05'
2. Reduction to minimum lot area from 10,000 sq ft to 7,365 sq ft
3. Reduction to minimum side yard setback for accessory building from 6' to 2.5' (south side)

Marion Jones: Is there someone here to speak on behalf of the Applicant? Would you please rise and come to the microphone? Would you state your name please?

Truitt Jefferson: I don't live in town but I've been around here for quite a few years. I'm trying to take the property that was originally the Betts Property on which Mr. Betts had built two houses and they had been in our family for a long time and we shared a side yard with 420 Union St. As I get older I need to get things so I can move them around. My daughter is here and I have another one and it's tough to give two houses on one deed if that's what I choose at some point in time. I'm just trying to make them livable. The old buildings are the old, old buildings that were the original structures on that property. If I can save them I'm going to try to. If I can't, another committee will tell me what I have to do. I brought Chuck Adams. He's done the survey work in the drawings and he's more knowledgeable than I am, so here's Chuck.

Chuck Adams: I'm Chuck Adams with Adams Kemp Associates from Georgetown, DE and we did the surveying and location of the improvements on the property. I've prepared a schematic that you have plans for. I have some handouts if you would like to look at them.

Marion Jones: There also appears to be an extra map for anyone in the audience who might want to see something a little closer up. It will stay here at the end of the table if you like. And here's a smaller version. This might be even more helpful.

Chuck Adams: The property is comprised of actually three tax parcels and 412 Union St was its own tax parcel and it indicates the dotted property line that separated it from the one tax parcel that included 414 and 416 Union St and the dotted lines indicate the original property line that separated 416 from 418. What we did was first we looked at the properties and the locations of the existing driveways, the existing improvements and tried to do the best we could with these properties as you see them and equally dividing them, or giving them equal frontage of 60.05'. We did make an application with DEL DOT on the small variation of movements of the driveways on the three properties that front Union St. They are indicated on the drawing and they would be single driveways that would be incorporated into a reconstructed walkway that would start at the beginning of 412 and run up into the corner property of 418. We would tie into an existing walkway there that I believe is in pretty good shape. The driveways would provide access for these individual lots and DEL DOT has approved and issued a letter of no objection of which we have copies. If you would like a copy for the record we could give you one. They all currently have existing utilities which would be sewer, water and electric for each parcel. We feel that not only would it improve the property but it would isolate a different tax billing association with the one parcel having two units on one parcel. Now he will have individual units on each individual parcel so all the utilities would be separate and then all the taxes would be separated for each parcel. That's about all I have unless there are any questions for either one of us.

Marion Jones: Well, actually this is the Public Hearing portion and I need to ask if there is anyone in the audience who would like to speak on behalf of the Applicant?

Mary Hudson: I am Mary Hudson and I live at 406 Union St and I would like to state that I am in favor of the changes that Mr. Jefferson is suggesting. He's been a very good neighbor. He has done a lot of things to improve the properties, the buildings. He is constantly making improvements to these and I am totally in favor of it. Thank you.

Marion Jones: Anyone else? Is anyone here to speak in opposition to the Applicant? Let the record show that no one was here to speak in opposition to the Applicant. We, therefore at 7:12, are going to close the Public Hearing portion of the Board of Adjustment Meeting.

### **Item #2: Business Meeting called to order at 7:15 pm**

### **Item #3: Resignation Notice of Chairman/Election of New Chairman**

Marion Jones: We have an Amended Agenda which is going to include the reading of the resignation letter from previous Chairman, Matt Dotterer.

“Dated March 23, 2008

To: The Mayor and Council.

I am hereby tendering my resignation as a member of the Town of Milton Board of Adjustment, effective immediately. Given the poor political tone that has been quite apparent in Milton over the past two years, I no longer wish to serve as a representative of Milton's Government. At this time, I feel I must devote my time towards my family and my commitments to the Milton Volunteer Fire Company, Sussex County Technical Rescue Team, Delaware Wildfire Crew and assisting the Prime Hook Wildlife Refuge with their Wild Land Urban Interface Program.

I appreciate the opportunity that was given to me by those who appointed me to serve on The Board and serve the Town.

Matt Dotterer”

Marion Jones: I discussed earlier with Mr. Brady, the second item under the changed agenda is the election of a new Chairman.

### **Item #4: Swearing in of new members – Alex Donnan, Margo Goodman**

Marion Jones: We actually have two tonight that are going to need to take this Oath.

Alex Donnan: I, Alex Donnan, do proudly swear to carry out the responsibilities of the Office of Member of Board of Adjustment to the best of my ability, freely acknowledging that the powers of this office flow from the people I am privileged to represent. I further swear always to place the public interests above any special or personal interests and to respect of future generations to share the rich, historic and natural heritage of Delaware. In doing so, I will always uphold and defend the

Constitutions of my Country and my State and the Ordinances of the Town of Milton, so help me God.

Margo Goodman: I, Margo Goodman, do proudly swear to carry out the responsibilities of the Office of Member of Board of Adjustment to the best of my ability, freely acknowledging that the powers of this office flow from the people I am privileged to represent. I further swear always to place the public interests above any special or personal interests and to respect of future generations to share the rich, historic and natural heritage of Delaware. In doing so, I will always uphold and defend the Constitutions of my Country and my State and the Ordinances of the Town of Milton, so help me God.

**Items #5 and #6: Additions or Corrections to Agenda**

Marion Jones: Any additions or corrections to this agenda at this time? None? I request a Motion for Approval of the Amended Agenda.

Margo Goodman: Motion to Approve.

Marion Jones: Second?

Alex Donnan: I second

Marion Jones: Let's have a vote.

Alex Donnan Aye

Margo Goodman Aye

Marion Jones Aye

Larry Savage Aye

**Item #7: Approval of Minutes – December 6, 2007**

Marion Jones: You received those in your packages. Has everyone had a chance to review them? Any questions or comments? Is there a motion for approval?

Margo Goodman: Motion to Approve

Alex Donnan: I second

Marion Jones: All in favor?

Alex Donnan Aye

Larry Savage Aye

Margo Goodman Aye

Marion Jones Yes

**Item #8: Business**

Marion Jones: Again the two properties at 414 and 416 Union St. Unless there is anyone in the audience that needs to hear the business at hand, I will simply surmise and say the Applicant, Truitt Jefferson, is requesting variances for 414 and 416 Union St, identified by Sussex County Tax Map and Parcel # 2-35-14.19-33.00. Again, is there anyone here on behalf of the Applicant that would like to stand and speak and most likely be taking questions from the Board?

I would like to start by asking Mr. Adams a couple of questions. I called Town Hall today and Robin was good enough to get me some information and I am absolutely positive it has been added to this scale-down but frankly, I can't read it so I just want from your big piece if you will confirm for me the dwelling on 412 Union St is at the back line 18.90' from its northern property line?

Chuck Adams: Yes, I verify that it is.

Marion Jones: Okay, please understand that we have a certified copy and I just want you to confirm that for me on the record. So you have a 12.65' at the old line on Parcel 414, which would, if you borrow from 412, make it 16.90' from the side setback?

Chuck Adams: That is correct.

Marion Jones: The Board of Adjustment heard a case, just in brief, several years ago on the 500 block of Chestnut St, the parcels that sit there in front of Cannery Village and I remember clearly, and I felt the same way when I looked at this application, there is certainly non-conformity throughout the neighborhood, there is no doubt about it, but by the time we had finished the request for three variances, they had been reduced to one. Just by some clever interaction and negotiation between the Board and the Applicant. When I looked at this application, what I was hoping to do was bring some possibility to reducing the number of variances you may need. I think the project is an excellent idea. I have a question on a statement that was made. Water and sewer is on each parcel. In concerning 414 and 416, is that the case now or is that when the property splits? Do they share water and sewer at this time and will the water and sewer split and be on each parcel when and if they are divided? I could not tell from the map where those were.

Truitt Jefferson: I can understand that. I think we have fixed the problem with each property having its own sewer and water on each property before this. We made sure that we didn't. I had planned on giving more of 412 to 414, but I can't because of that little black round thing next to the red line.

Marion Jones: Well that little black round thing on my legend is a set iron bar and that is why...

Truitt Jefferson: No, that's a sewer... Well...

Marion Jones: On my plot it's a solid round dot and that's why I'm asking these questions and the question is to 414 and 416 now share a sewer and water system?

Truitt Jefferson: No they're both independent.

Marion Jones: Okay.

Truitt Jefferson: At one point in time there was a question between 412 and 414, but that's all been fixed.

Marion Jones: Okay. Next question for you. I see on the map at the top that I am looking at now that there has been an addition of almost 9.5' or so in the back of the parcel owned by Mary Hudson.

Truitt Jefferson: Yes.

Marion Jones: Was that just a startup? Mr. Jefferson, were you planning on bringing that line all the way across?

Truitt Jefferson: No, no. And that's really not... I'll be glad to answer the question. This is for Mary, but I don't plan on bringing it on across and that's not part of this meeting because we don't need a variance from this Committee for that.

Marion Jones: I understand. I just did not know if it was your intention because it appears that with this whole change in proposed lot lines that actually lot number 3 will be formed, which is actually parcel 32 at this time. Is that not correct?

Truitt Jefferson: What is she asking?

Marion Jones: Okay, down here at the proposed lot number 3 at the corner of Union and Willow. That lot actually does not exist right now, does it? It's part of parcel 32, which is this big huge parcel behind them all.

Truitt Jefferson: Yes.

Marion Jones: That is my reason for asking you about the 10'. In squaring things up it looked like... I didn't know if that was your attempt in the back.

Truitt Jefferson: No.

Marion Jones: Okay.

Truitt Jefferson: This one and 408 (this one right in here) are not my property and a person would not want to buy it. Then we'd have a hiccup in there, so we're just dropping it off there.

Marion Jones: So the piece of land right now at the corner of Union and Willow is actually just a dog leg to the parcel 32 which goes all the way to Mulberry St.

Truitt Jefferson: Yes.

Marion Jones: I asked the question about the side setback, the yard setbacks, because with the numbers in front of me for proposed lot number 3, the dog leg and the split of these two properties, I calculated, not given the fact that I may not have been able to read all the legend on the piece of survey that I have, I used parcel 32 or proposed lot number 3, who has a 27' side yard setback on its south side, that's by your proposal. You've already proposed to take 19.86' from that property on the south side. If you took an additional 6', you would then take a total of 25.86' adding 3,184.66 sq ft allowing lot number 2 which you are requesting to be a non-conforming, by its square footage, it takes it to 10,549 sq ft and some change. It also takes away your need for a variance for the lot width by increasing it to 85.91'. That's just proposed lot number 2 and because I am having difficulty reading the map, I can't tell if there is any obstruction to pulling that line further north...

Truitt Jefferson: The water and sewer hookups would be a problem, I believe.

Marion Jones: Okay, but hear me out. It would then reduce two items alone on property number 2 and I'll tell you, I applaud you, I think that the split is a good idea. I think it's advantageous to both the property and homeowner, as well as to the Town for its tax base. I think it will be a win, win situation. The properties look good. I've been by them a couple of times, but I just wonder if you would be willing and the lay of the land and where everything is situated, would allow you to take 6 more feet from that piece. It would still have proposed lot number 3, would still have an over 12,000 sq ft space and have 119.30' as its lot width. So you would have conform on that proposed lot on the corner of Willow and Union. Now doing the math as I did at the very last minute, I applied this to the same thing on parcel 414, though there was not as much space to play with. I did come up with if you took an additional 8', because I did notice that your driveway on parcel 34 (or would be 412) is already on its south side and they are using that. So if you took 8' of the existing 18.90' difference, you would gain another 1,081.88 sq ft and it would still bring it up to 8,446 sq ft and some change. Not enough to make the 10,000, but closer than before. And that's part of the reason I asked you about the 10'

in the back. That would just be a given 600 sq ft on both of them, but if that's not an option, it's not an option. What I am trying to do is that even though you have a lot of non-conforming in your district I think it is a good idea to eliminate as much variance as possible. The reason being, you understand these are already non-conforming properties...

Truitt Jefferson: Right. That's why I'm looking at them. I can leave them just exactly like they are and sell two houses together and if they want to put fences in, I'll run the fence right down here, because over time we kind of divided this yard to make it a little better for the house. But...

Marion Jones: And some of these variances may not be avoidable, but some of them may if you haven't set everything in stone.

Truitt Jefferson: If you folks approve them, what detriment do the variances cause?

Marion Jones: Well, that is what the Board is here to determine. The Board is not here to place any undue burden on you. This is just as one member of the Board, this is how I looked at this property and my hope of reducing, just simply reducing the number of variances you are requesting. So again, on property 414 I'm not sure if I was free to do the same math, I noticed the things there but they looked like set iron bars on my pieces, so that to me means survey markers and nothing more. But that may not be the case and that's why we're here tonight and understand this, I am only one opinion of the Board and each one of us here is going to have the opportunity to speak. Those were my issues and I wanted to bring them forward. So I would like to turn it over at this point to other members of the Board to speak.

John Brady: Madame Chair, Robin didn't I have a meeting with you on this application because we talked about the different things and I think the problem when we looked at it and tried to measure it out, was the water and sewer that was in place, because I had talked about where it would only be one variance, but the water and sewer lines did not work for that and that's why I think they went back and played with the figures. Is that my recollection of last fall?

Robin Davis: Yes, the line between 414 and 412 that is the water. Those little dots... That single dot is a sewer line. Mr. Jefferson would not be allowed to move that any closer to the house because it's going to vent the sewer on the wrong property, from 412 onto 414's property. That being a sewer, not an iron plate.

Marion Jones: It's a solid dot on my map and so you'll have to excuse me.

John Brady: Madame Chair, I'm sorry. This came back as I'm looking at it tonight and I'm saying this looks vaguely familiar. I thought I had a meeting last fall about this and trying to make it just one variance, exactly what you were proposing and unfortunately the physical items on the property prevented it from being one variance. I think because of the measurements between the water and the sewer marks they tried to play with and I think they went a little further than initially because they were able to go into 414 and get a little more land than was initially discussed. As I remember seeing something I think in the 50's and it's now at least 60', if I'm not mistaken.

Chuck Adams: Yes, it's 60.05'.

Marion Jones: Actually, you're borrowing that 4' from 412. Isn't that correct? So the answer is that 412's northern most boundary, or actually 414's southernmost boundary, is as far as it is able to go. Do I understand that when you talk about iron pipes are you

talking about infrastructure, the Town's infrastructure or Mr. Jefferson's pipes on his property?

Truitt Jefferson: It's that little cover you take off where you hook up to Town.

Chuck Adams: It would be a combination. There's a stub out to the main sewer that would come into a clean out and the same thing where the water would come into a water meter pit.

Marion Jones: Okay. Thank you. Are there any comments from any members of the Board?

Margo Goodman: Actually, your conversation captured my questions. Thank you.

Truitt Jefferson: Well, one reason I left a little extra space on 420 at the end of the street here is, I'm getting ready to do some other stuff. I'll probably lose part of this street coming down here for this street here being a little wider and sidewalks.

Marion Jones: You're talking about Willow St?

Truitt Jefferson: Yes, Willow St. Down the road I don't know what's going to happen. There's a corner lot and back on 416 I did plan, if I get my approval, I did plan on, I haven't fixed 416 up and would like to put it through the, not this committee, but I would just like to raise it up and put it back in the same line that it is, raise it up even with the other two roofs, like I did the other ones and put a new wooden porch floor on it and move it 5' north.

Marion Jones: Mr. Savage any questions?

Larry Savage: No I think my questions have been answered?

Marion Jones: Alex?

Alex Donnan: I don't really have a question. I just want to confirm an assumption I guess that is inherently here. I'm assuming these are non-conforming because they pre-date the existing zoning ordinance of 1942?

Truitt Jefferson: Oh yes. These houses were built there back in the early 1900's by a family by the name of Betts.

Alex Donnan: I didn't know.

Truitt Jefferson: This little garage back here was built with them. This is an old horse barn, if you would, that's back there and I just haven't taken them down because if it's a historical district and it's supposed to look something like it, you need some horse barns around and I had to get rid of the barn that was on 412 because it was so rotten and so bad, but I do have plans to put something over here which I hope, if it gets approved and you guys see it, you'll approve of it, but I need to get all of this other stuff done here first. I'm just up to this point now, so logically I've got to come see if you folks let me do it. If you don't, then hey, I just back up and change and go another way.

Marion Jones: Well, keeping in mind oftentimes a non-conforming lot which it already is, which one of them obviously appears it's going to have to remain, but down the line that non-conforming lot creates a situation that a lot of times when other things are wanting to be done on that line, because it is non-conforming it just continues to be non-conforming and the requests made to that property can kind of snowball down and that's why I'm now understanding, from the information, that 414 looks to me like you are still requesting all four of the variances, lot width, lot area, side setback, as well as the accessory buildings side setback. But now I turn to property number 416 and I'm looking at a way, at least in the numbers, and math is not my strong point, but I see a way to eliminate two of the three requests for variance on property 416 and I would like to know

at this point what are these two dots that are on proposed lot number 3, again the dogleg at Willow and Union, if there is anything there that makes me not want to stress again, that I would like to see that lot run pick up an additional 6' to make that lot both in lot width and area, compliant.

Robin Davis: That lot will not be in compliance with width if you only add 6', that will only make it 66'.

Marion Jones: But we've added, we've already used the 19.86' that's being borrowed, plus 6', makes it 25.86' addition to 60'. See they have already said that they will borrow 19.86'. If you add 6' in addition to that, you have totally requested 25.86' or 26'. That gives you an 85.91' width property, which is in compliance. How do you not figure?

Truitt Jefferson: Because...

Marion Jones: I'm sorry, I'm sorry. Is the 19.86' included?

Truitt Jefferson: Included in the 60'.

Robin Davis: Yeah, it's already included in that.

Marion Jones: They are the same in the top and the bottom drawing.

Chuck Adams: Because it was one parcel.

Marion Jones: So we're still up... Okay.

Chuck Adams: And it's 66...

Robin Davis: It's included in the 60'. So you still have that same variance.

Marion Jones: Okay, well you still have then perhaps what I need to look at for math is you're still looking at a 27' setback, side setback, on parcel 418. And, the side setback in R1 is 10'. So I have a calculator and it would be very rough calculating, but...

Chuck Adams: Sewer again.

Marion Jones: Well that's why I'm asking. I can't tell what those pipes are from

Truitt Jefferson: Those two black dots out front if they're positioned right, are the water and sewer coming in, because that's where they come in. The sewer comes right down.

Marion Jones: Can somebody confirm that?

Chuck Adams: Well, if you had 27' and you needed 10' you would have 17' feet available. 17', if under the assumption times 123 doesn't reach 2,700 sq ft, it would still need a variance.

Truitt Jefferson: And then we would be taking away, in my opinion, taking away from this house over here.

Chuck Adams: So it would be 17 X 123, more or less.

Marion Jones: Well, that's an additional 2,091 sq ft, added to...

Truitt Jefferson: I don't think I'm going to take 17' feet off.

Marion Jones: They you are going to have 93.65' and it makes, I would imagine, Mr. Adams without doing the math, what you have to make sure is that you are not compromising lot number 3 in the same way for width or square footage, so I did not calculate that far. That's my mistake in believing that was 25'. I did not allow for that calculation to already be sitting there on the 60.05'. To scale can you tell me what, not only who, can confirm what those black dots are, but how far they are into that property?

Chuck Adams: Well you would still need the 10' from the corner dwelling as a side yard setback, so that would be your limiting factor. Without asking for another variance for that property...

Marion Jones: For that property... There's no sense in causing that by trying to straighten this one out.

Chuck Adams: Right. So we couldn't reach that 10,000 mark either way then.

Truitt Jefferson: Just eyeballing it, I think, the most would be 10'. That's 1,200', that's 8,500'.

Chuck Adams: I believe all of those lots on Chestnut that you referred to, I was at that meeting, they are all under this square footage and they were all under the frontal footage, as well, for those 4 lots.

Truitt Jefferson: This lot down here, I don't know how big it is.

Marion Jones: So property that you propose on the corner is presently 125.30' in the rear. Now if you took that whole 17', which would be a big whack off of that property, then you're still at 108' across.

Truitt Jefferson: Yup, but the house won't look as nice. The house already has a nice big yard down there and that house on that corner, of course I redid the back part and front part and I redid all that I could in there, but that's one of the oldest houses in Town. And it needs some ground around it because it's always been there.

Marion Jones: Well I'm going to assume that you're proposal that's going to go to Town Council will also include the request to make that into its own lot. Is that correct?

Truitt Jefferson: Yes. As I understand it, the Town Council approved the lines of the variances.

Marion Jones: That's correct. Are there any further comments by the Board? Questions of the Applicant? My question to the Applicant is, are you simply stating that there is no room to move that property line?

Truitt Jefferson: Not to give it 10,000 sq ft. I would rather stay with where I am because I'm historical. That other property was 96' with two houses on it. The fence goes right up to it. That's the way it was back in the beginning, if that's the historical district, then rather than try and given them a little more room with modern time for cars and whatever, I can take it right back there. The corner house had a great big lot. If I was really thinking about squeezing dollars, when I fixed that house up, I would have torn it down and put two houses there and I didn't. And if we take the side yard out, we're going to take away from that house because you're going to get a lot more noise from the other house.

Marion Jones: Is there any particular reason you are refusing to split the properties at this time?

Truitt Jefferson: Because I want to put in some fences, know where the lines are. I want to go back once I get my barn up and my garage on 412, I want to go back and start a little bit of landscaping. I kind of took it all down because I rent them. It's easier to maintain, but I need to go back and start making them look nicer. I want to run some fences and try to dress it up a little bit. If I have to work with where I am, I have to work with where I am.

Marion Jones: Just out of curiosity, are both of those parcels on one tax bill?

Truitt Jefferson: Yup, one deed. Sometimes I defer a little bit on one but there's one deed every time I get the assessment. It really confuses the assessor because they try to assess the lot twice. But it will make all that stuff clear and I'm sure my taxes may go up. Whatever it is, it is. But it's one deed. Those two outbuildings, one person said one needs to be torn down. That's the one on 414, but maybe when we cut it off once and put a sill in it way back many years ago and it was kind of all rotting out and a tree coming up in it, but I got some stuff in there that I want to use for my garage, but if I can fix it I

will, just because it's old. The other garage that's down is the garage that was there. It's too narrow but it's going to have a lot of extensive repair, but I'll try to repair it. If the Town says to tear it down, then two variances just wash away, because down where the new garage is going back to the old barn was 4' from the fence and instead of coming here and asking for it, I'm going with the 6'. I did that so I had room to fix it on that property, rather than having to put a ladder in the neighbor's yard.

Marion Jones: You just don't see that very often. Well, I thank you. If there's no other questions from members of the Board, if you would like to have a seat we will do a little business. We would be open to further discussion, but at this time if there are no further questions, is there a Motion to Accept the Variance? Let's be clear we will talk about property 414 Union St first and the 4 requested variances.

Margo Goodman: I make a Motion to approve as presented Parcel 2-35-14.19-33.00 for 414 Union St (Item a).

Marion Jones: We have a Motion to Approve:

Larry Savage: I second the Motion.

Marion Jones: Are there any questions or discussion? Alright, there's a Motion on the table for Parcel 414 a. The minimum lot width from 75' to 60.05'; minimum lot area from 10,000 sq ft to 7,365 sq ft; minimum side yard setback from 10' to 6.2' on the north side; and, the reduction to the minimum side yard setback for the accessory building from 6' to 3.7' on the south side. We'll have a roll call vote starting with:

Alex Donnan	Yes
Larry Savage	Yes
Margo Goodman	Yes
Marion Jones	Yes

On the Application for property 416 b, do I have a Motion to Accept the Requested Variances?

Margo Goodman: I make a Motion to Accept Application b, property 416 Union St.

Alex Donnan: I second the Motion.

Marion Jones: Any discussion? This is for the variances to 416 b the reduction to the minimum lot width from 75' to 60.05'; minimum lot area from 10,000 sq ft to 7,365 sq ft; and the minimum side yard setback for the accessory building from 6' to 2.5' on the south side. We'll have a roll call vote starting with:

Alex Donnan	Yes
Larry Savage	Yes
Margo Goodman	Yes
Marion Jones	Yes

Congratulations!

Truitt Jefferson: Thank you.

Margo Goodman: I would like to commend you. I think this is very admirable and an active move on your part to do this.

Truitt Jefferson: Yes.

Marion Jones: And as I said to you before the meeting, the properties look very nice and I have little doubt or question that those would certainly be looked at by their age in the expansion of the Historic District. So, congratulations.

**Item #9: Adjournment**

Marion Jones: Is there any other business for the Board? As there are no other items, I call for an adjournment.

Margo Goodman: I make a Motion to Adjourn the Meeting.

Larry Savage: Second.

Marion Jones: So moved.

Meeting for the Board of Adjustment was adjourned at 7:54 pm