

AGENDA FOR THE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MEETING

April 25, 2014

- I. **ATTENDANCE** - The Chair will call the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers, 200 East Main Street, April 25, 2014.
- II. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** - The Chair will announce that the minutes of the January 31, 2014 and February 28, 2014 meeting will be considered at this time.
- III. **PUBLIC HEARING ON ZONING APPEALS**
 - A. **Sounding the Agenda** - In order to expedite completion of agenda items, the Chair will sound the agenda in regard to any postponements, withdrawals, and items requiring no discussion.
 1. **Postponement or Withdrawal of any Scheduled Business Item** - The Chair will announce that any person having an appeal or other business before the Board may request postponement or withdrawal of such at this time.
 2. **No Discussion Items** - The Chair will ask if there are any other agenda items where no discussion is needed...that is, (a) The staff has recommended approval of the appeal and related plan(s), (b) The appellant concurs with the staff's recommendations. Appellant waives oral presentation, but may submit written evidence for the record, (c) No one present objects to the Board acting on the matter at this time without further discussion. For any such item, the Board will proceed to take action.
 - B. **Transcript or Witnesses** - The Chair will announce that any applicant or objector to any appeal before the Board is entitled to have a transcript of the meeting prepared at his expense and to have witnesses sworn.
 - C. **Variance Appeals** - As required by KRS 100.243, in the consideration of variance appeals before the granting or denying of any variance the Board must find:

That the granting of the variance will not adversely affect the public health, safety or welfare, will not alter the essential character of the general vicinity, will not cause a hazard or a nuisance to the public, and will not allow an unreasonable circumvention of the requirements of the zoning regulations. In making these findings, the Board shall consider whether:

- (a) The requested variance arises from special circumstances which do not generally apply to land in the general vicinity, or in the same zone;
- (b) The strict application of the provisions of the regulation would deprive the applicant of the reasonable use of the land or would create an unnecessary hardship on the applicant; and
- (c) The circumstances are the result of actions of the applicant taken subsequent to the adoption of the zoning regulation from which relief is sought.

The Board shall deny any request for a variance arising from circumstances that are the result of willful violations of the zoning regulation by the applicant subsequent to the adoption of the zoning regulations from which relief is sought.

1. **V-2014-18: MITCHELL CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT** - appeals for a variance to reduce the required side yard from 17.5 feet to 10.5 feet in order to expand a detached garage in a High Density Apartment (R-4) zone, within the defined Infill & Redevelopment Area, at 125 E. 4th St. (Council District 1).

The Staff Recommends: **Approval**, for the following reasons:

- a. Granting the requested variances should not adversely affect the subject or surrounding properties and will not cause a health, safety or welfare problem. It will allow a car to be parked in the garage, and will lessen the chances that one will be parked in the driveway because there will be less room for parking without blocking the sidewalk.
- b. Granting the requested variance will not be an unreasonable circumvention of the Zoning Ordinance. Adding 4' in length to the garage will make it useable by modern day standards, allowing vehicles to be parked entirely inside the structure. Additionally, had the garage been an attached structure (rather than detached as it has been for at least 80 years), it would not have required any variances.
- c. The existing location of the historic garage and the increased safety of parking a vehicle in the garage are unique circumstances that justify the requested variances.
- d. Strict application of the Zoning Ordinance would require that the non-conforming accessory structure remain as it has been historically, or that the applicant build an unwanted addition between the historic home and the accessory structure.

- e. The requested variance is not a willful violation of the Zoning Ordinance rather, it is a design response to the unique circumstances of this property that were determined after a building permit had originally been issued. The applicant is seeking the proper regulatory relief so that they can re-apply for a building permit and continue the construction that they began earlier this year.

This recommendation of approval is made subject to the following conditions:

1. The property shall be developed in accordance with the submitted site plan and application, allowing minor modifications, if required, by the Divisions of Engineering; Traffic Engineering; or Building Inspection as a part of the normal permitting procedures.
 2. All necessary permits shall be obtained by the applicant, including but not limited to, a building permit for the residence prior to construction.
2. **V-2014-19: PETER TATE** - appeals for variances to reduce: 1) the required side yard from 18 inches to 6 inches; and 2) the required rear yard from 20 feet to 8 feet, in order to build an addition on the rear of a detached accessory structure (garage) in a High Density Apartment (R-4)/Historic Overlay (H-1) zone, within the defined Infill & Redevelopment Area, at 101 Hampton Ct. (Council District 1).

The Staff Recommends: Approval, for the following reasons:

- a. Granting the requested variances should not adversely affect the subject or surrounding properties and will not cause a health, safety or welfare problem. It will not negatively affect the character of the surrounding neighborhood because the addition will likely be unnoticeable from anyone's property except the applicant's. The Board of Architectural Review has approved the design of the addition and remodel, which ensures that it has met the guidelines for Historic Preservation.
- b. Granting the requested variance will not be an unreasonable circumvention of the Zoning Ordinance. Adding a single post to hold a new roof at the same 0.5-foot setback as the existing structure is a functional necessity; and granting the requested variance from 20 feet to 8 feet will not be an unreasonable circumvention of the Zoning Ordinance because functionally, Ross Avenue is similar to an alley on the applicant's side of the street. Additionally, the garage will not be visible to the street because of the existing privacy fence.
- c. The existing location of the historic garage, the existing privacy fence on Ross Avenue, and the fact that Ross Avenue partially functions as an alley are all unique circumstances that justify the requested variances.
- d. Strict application of the Zoning Ordinance would require that the roof be completely redesigned, which may result in a less aesthetically pleasing and awkward building; and would likely result in any addition to the garage being prohibited. The applicant has already invested much in the design and approvals for this addition through the Board of Architectural Review, which approved the proposed addition on 2/13/2014.
- e. The requested variance is not a willful violation of the Zoning Ordinance, but rather a design response to the unique circumstances of this property, and a natural outcome of the standard permitting review process.

This recommendation of approval is made subject to the following conditions:

1. The property shall be developed in accordance with submitted site plan and application, allowing minor modifications, if required, by the Divisions of Historic Preservation; Engineering; Traffic Engineering; or Building Inspection as a part of the normal permitting procedures.
 2. All necessary permits shall be obtained by the applicant, including but not limited to, a building permit for the garage expansion, prior to construction.
3. **V-2014-22: MELISSA BALL** – appeals for a variance to reduce the required front yard from 300 feet to 140 feet in order to replace an existing tenant home in the Agricultural Rural (A-R) zone, at 5837 Jacks Creek Pike (Council District 12).

The Staff Recommends: Approval, for the following reasons:

- a. Granting the requested variance will not cause a negative effect on the subject property or surrounding properties and will not cause a public health, safety or welfare problem. The proposed placement of the tenant home will actually increase the personal safety and welfare of the farm by keeping a presence at the farm entrance. Furthermore, it will not alter the character of the general vicinity, as there is already a tenant home in this location, and many other properties in this stretch of Jacks Creek Pike have established setbacks in the 100' to 200' range (including Raven Run).
- b. This request for a variance is not an unreasonable circumvention of the Zoning Ordinance but, rather, a

logical outcome of the unique circumstances that prompted the original farm owners to build a tenant home at this location many decades ago. For instance, a principal dwelling unit would be allowable at this location, without the need for a variance.

- c. The existing location of the tenant home, the existing location of the functioning septic system, the existing ponds, the soils, the topography, and the nature of the agricultural operation are all unique circumstances of this farm that justify the requested variance.
- d. Strict application of the Zoning Ordinance would require that the new tenant home be moved to a less desirable location on the farm and will require costly solutions to deal with the loss of the functioning septic system currently in use by the existing tenant home, which would cause them a hardship.
- e. The requested variance is not a willful violation of the Zoning Ordinance. Rather, it is in response to the unique circumstances of this property. No construction has begun and the applicant learned of the need for this variance during the normal building permit process.

This recommendation of approval is made subject to the following conditions:

1. The property shall be developed in accordance with the submitted site plan and application, allowing minor modifications, if required, by the Divisions of Engineering; Traffic Engineering or Building Inspection as a part of the normal permitting procedures.
2. All necessary permits shall be obtained by the applicant, including but not limited to, a building permit for the residence prior to construction.

4. **V-2014-23: SOLOMON VAN METER** – appeals for variances to: 1) reduce the front yard from 8 feet to 0 feet; 2) reduce the rear yard from 6.05 feet to 3 feet; 3) reduce each side yard from 8 feet to 6 feet; and 4) increase the maximum allowable driveway width from 10 feet to 24 feet in order to replace an existing duplex with a single-family residence in a Highway Density Apartment (R-4) zone, within the defined Infill and Redevelopment Area, at 139 Bruce Street (Council District 2).

The Staff Recommends: **Postponement**, for the following reason:

- a. A postponement will allow the applicant time to further investigate a possible design solution that allows the desired double garage but also addresses pedestrian safety.

5. **V-2014-24: GARY A. HUFF** – appeals for a variance to reduce the required front yard from 10 feet to 8 feet in order to construct a deck, in a Two-Family Residential (R-2) zone, within the defined Infill and Redevelopment Area, at 735 West High Street (Council District 2).

The Staff Recommends: **Approval**, for the following reasons:

- a. Granting the requested variance will not adversely affect the public health, safety or welfare; nor will it alter the character of the neighborhood. The second-story deck will not infringe on the use of the right-of-way of either the subject property or surrounding properties, and it will not be out of character, as other adjoining properties have similar rear decks.
- b. Granting the requested variance will not allow an unreasonable circumvention of the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance because of the unique circumstances of this lot compared to those surrounding it, including the underground utilities that necessitate the need for the additional 2- foot variance.
- c. The configuration of the street at the back of the property, the topographic difference between the street and the second-story deck, the utility easement on the property, and the fact that there is no developable land on the other side of the street are all special circumstances that contribute to justifying the requested variance.
- d. Strict application of the Zoning Ordinance will either deny the applicant the ability to place a functional second-story deck on the rear of the property or will require extremely expensive utility relocations. The two lots that make up this one duplex are the only two properties of the seven that have access to Ty Court and that do not have a second-story deck.
- e. The need for the variance was recognized during the normal permitting process for the deck. There is not any willful violation of the Zoning Ordinance associated with this request.

This recommendation of approval is made subject to the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall obtain all necessary encroachment agreements from the utility companies and Urban County Government prior to obtaining a building permit for the deck.
2. The applicant shall obtain all necessary permits from the Division of Building Inspection for the deck.
3. An administrative action plat shall be filed in accordance with the requirements of the Division of Planning, reflecting the action of the Board.

6. **V-2014-25: SUZANNE FROELICH** – appeals for a variance to reduce the required side yard from 3 feet to 1.5 feet in order to allow a heat pump to be located in the side yard in a Single-Family Residential (R-1E) zone, at 4520 Windstar Way (Council District 9).

The Staff Recommends: **Approval**, for the following reasons:

- a. Granting the requested variance should not adversely affect the subject or surrounding properties and will not cause a health, safety or welfare problem. It will not be out of character with the existing neighborhood, as some of the properties in this neighborhood do have HVAC units in the side yards, due to those yards being greater than the minimum requirement of 3 feet. In particular, there will be a total of 15 feet between the subject house and the neighboring house, with the larger 10-foot side yard on the neighboring property, well in excess of the minimum 6 feet of separation required by the Zoning Ordinance.
- b. Granting the requested variance will not be an unreasonable circumvention of the Zoning Ordinance, as there will be no other obstructions in the side yard; and maneuverability and accessibility around the heat pump unit will not be compromised.
- c. The existing 5-foot side yard on the subject property, in conjunction with the 10-foot side yard on the neighboring property, creates a unique circumstance that justifies the requested variance for the relocation of the heat pump.
- d. Strict application of the Zoning Ordinance would require the HVAC unit to remain in place or for the applicant to find an alternative compliant location elsewhere on their property, which may not be possible or practical.
- e. The requested variance is not a willful violation of the Zoning Ordinance, but rather is a design response to the unique circumstances of this property.

This recommendation of approval is made subject to the following conditions:

1. The property shall be developed in accordance with the submitted site plan and application, allowing minor modifications, if required, by the Division of Building Inspection as a part of the normal permitting procedures.
2. All necessary permits shall be obtained by the applicant, including but not limited to, a building permit for the HVAC relocation prior to that being done.
3. No other obstruction, including a fence, will be allowed in this 5-foot side yard.

7. **V-2014-26: J & R CONSTRUCTION** – appeals for a variance to reduce the required side yard from 10 feet, 3 inches to 5 feet, 4 inches in order to construct an addition to an existing residence in a Single-Family Residential (R-1C) zone, at 298 Lafayette Parkway (Council District 11).

The Staff Recommends: **Approval**, for the following reasons:

- a. Granting the requested variance should not adversely affect the subject or surrounding properties and will not cause a health, safety or welfare problem. It will allow a modest addition to the existing home in such a way that the existing setback is maintained. Furthermore, it will not be out of character with properties in the general vicinity, as some (but not all) of the surrounding properties also appear to have existing 5'-6' side yards.
- b. Granting the requested variance will not be an unreasonable circumvention of the Zoning Ordinance. The proposed addition will simply connect the existing home to its garage, allowing a new master suite that is designed to help the resident(s) age in place.
- c. The existing location of the house and garage (in particular, the location of the existing plumbing) and its age compared with that of the Zoning Ordinance, are unique circumstances that justify the requested variance.
- d. Strict application of the Zoning Ordinance would require that the proposed addition be built in an area of the lot that would be more expensive due to the additional plumbing needed, and would have the undesirable effect of making garage access and yard maintenance more difficult.
- e. The requested variance is not a willful violation of the Zoning Ordinance, but rather a design response to the unique circumstances of this property, that were determined during the normal building permit process.

This recommendation of approval is made subject to the following conditions:

1. The property shall be developed in accordance with the submitted site plan and application, allowing minor modifications, if required, by the Divisions of Engineering; or Building Inspection as a part of the normal permitting procedures.
2. All necessary permits shall be obtained by the applicant, including but not limited to, a building permit for the residential addition prior to construction.

8. **V-2014-27: BIG BLUE RENTALS, LLC** – appeals for a variance to reduce the required front yard from 20 feet to 9 feet in order to gain two additional parking spaces for a multi-family dwelling, in a High Rise Apartment (R-5) zone, within the defined Infill and Redevelopment Area, at 145 Transcript Avenue (Council District 3).

The Staff Recommends: Approval, for the following reasons:

- a. Granting the requested variance should not adversely affect the subject or surrounding properties and will not cause a health, safety or welfare problem. In particular, the additional parking spaces and their required landscaping will not cause a sight triangle problem for the subject or neighboring properties.
- b. Granting the requested variance will not be an unreasonable circumvention of the Zoning Ordinance. Allowing two additional parking spaces will make this property compliant with the current minimum off-street parking requirement of the Zoning Ordinance, based on the number of bedrooms provided in this apartment building.
- c. The non-compliance with the current minimum required parking and the existing layout of this residential development are the special circumstances that are applicable in this case.
- d. Strict application of the Zoning Ordinance would require the property to remain non-compliant with regard to the number of off-street parking spaces provided, and continue the hardship he was experienced in fully leasing these six dwelling units.
- e. This request is not a result of the actions of the applicant, nor should they be considered a willful violation of the Zoning Ordinance. The configuration of the development, with the apartment in the rear of the lot and a parking lot in the front; has existed for many years. It was created prior to the current property owner's involvement. The need for the variance was only recognized during the applicant's request for a permit to pave the additional spaces.

This recommendation of approval is made subject to the following conditions:

1. The property shall be developed in accordance with submitted site plan and application; allowing minor modifications, if required, by the Divisions of Engineering; Traffic Engineering; or Building Inspection as a part of the normal permitting procedures.
2. All necessary permits shall be obtained by the applicant, including but not limited to; a paving permit for the parking expansion, prior to construction.
3. The additional parking spaces shall be fully landscaped as required by Article 18 of the Zoning Ordinance.

9. **V-2014-28: DJUAN WHITE** – appeals for a variance to reduce the required front yard from 30 feet to 3 feet in order to construct a front porch, in a Two-Family Residential (R-2) zone, within the defined Infill and Redevelopment Area, at 466 Roosevelt Blvd (Council District 2).

The Staff Recommends: Approval of a variance from 30' to 5', for the following reasons:

- a. Granting the modified variance should not adversely affect the subject or surrounding properties and will not cause a health, safety or welfare problem. In particular, had the vacant properties on either side of the subject property been built with a residence at the previously allowable 15' building line, a variance would not be necessary for the subject property to build a covered porch that projects 8' closer to the street.
- b. Granting this variance will not be an unreasonable circumvention of the Zoning Ordinance, because most homes in this neighborhood have similar porches at a similar setback to Roosevelt Boulevard.
- c. The fact that this property is surrounded by vacant properties and not able to utilize the inherent averaging provisions of the Infill & Redevelopment regulations, along with its existing concrete pad, are special circumstances that apply in this case.
- d. Strict application of the Zoning Ordinance would require the property to remain without a front porch, which would be out of character with the neighborhood.
- e. This request is not a result of the actions of the applicant, nor should they be considered a willful violation of the Zoning Ordinance. Construction has not begun on the covered porch, and the need for the variance was recognized during the building permit review process.

This recommendation of approval is made subject to the following conditions:

1. The property shall be developed in accordance with submitted site plan and application (amended to allow a 10' deep front porch) allowing minor modifications, if required, by the Division of Building Inspection as a part of the normal permitting procedures.
2. All necessary building permits shall be obtained by the applicant, prior to construction.

10. **V-2014-29: PATRICK B. & LISA A. SMITH** – appeals for variances to: 1) reduce the required front yard along Chenault Road from 30 feet to 15 feet in order to build an in-ground pool; 2) to increase the maximum height of a fence in the front yard from 4 feet to 6 feet in a Single-Family Residential/Neighborhood Design Overlay (R-1C/ND-1) zone, at 138 Chenault Road (Council District 5).

The Staff Recommends: **Approval**, for the following reasons:

- a. Granting the requested variances should not adversely affect the subject or surrounding properties and will not cause an issue regarding public health, safety or welfare. In particular, the fence height variance will not cause a sight distance problem for the subject or surrounding properties; and the unique shape of this lot necessitates that the large front/side yard of this property be used as other properties traditionally use their rear yards.
- b. Granting the requested variance will not be an unreasonable circumvention of the Zoning Ordinance. The rather large front/side yard serves the purpose of a traditional rear yard for most properties.
- c. The unusually odd shape of this lot, and the fact that 75% of the proposed fence is allowed to be at the requested height, are significant and special circumstances that apply in this case.
- d. Strict application of the Zoning Ordinance would require the property owners to either design a much smaller pool or undertake an expensive sewer line redirection project to build a pool within the required setbacks.
- e. This request is not a result of the actions of the applicant, nor should they be considered a willful violation of the Zoning Ordinance. Construction has not begun on the pool, and the need for the variance was recognized during the building permit process.

This recommendation of approval is made subject to the following conditions:

1. The property shall be developed in accordance with the submitted site plan and application; allowing minor modifications, if required, by the Divisions of Engineering; or Building Inspection as a part of their typical and normal permitting procedures.
2. All necessary permits shall be obtained by the applicant, including but not limited to; a fencing permit and a building permit for the pool, prior to construction.

D. **Conditional Use Appeals**

1. **C-2014-12: FOTIOS MORAITIS** - appeals for a conditional use permit to establish a pawn shop (including vehicles) in a Highway Service Business (B-3) zone, at 1536 (aka 1538) N. Limestone (Council District 1).

The Staff Recommends: **Approval**, for the following reasons:

- a. If the recommended changes are completed by the applicant, then granting the requested conditional use permit should not adversely affect the subject or surrounding properties and, in fact, will have a positive effect by increasing both pedestrian and vehicular safety over the existing non-compliant parking situation.
- b. All necessary public facilities and services are available and adequate for the proposed use.

This recommendation of approval is made subject to the following conditions:

1. The property shall be developed in accordance with the submitted application and a revised site plan, as noted below.
2. All permits, including but not limited to a Zoning Compliance Permit, Right-of-Way Encroachment Permit, Building Permit, Paving Permit, and Certificate of Occupancy, shall be obtained by the applicant from the Divisions of Planning, Building Inspection, & Department of Public Works prior to construction.
3. The parking lot shall at all times be maintained to meet the minimum requirements for landscaping and lighting in the Zoning Ordinance.
4. The sidewalk/median along North Limestone shall be enlarged and an accessible sidewalk installed in accordance with the staff exhibit on file; or as amended by the Department of Public Works as a normal part of the Right-of-Way Encroachment permitting process.
5. The front parking lot shall be re-stripped to establish a minimum of 75-degree angled parking, with a one-way drive aisle in accordance with the staff exhibit presented to the Board; or as amended by the Department of Public Works as a normal part of the Right-of-Way Encroachment or Paving permitting processes.
6. The rear parking lot on the subject property shall have wheel stops installed to delineate enough

- parking spaces to meet the minimum required parking for all uses on the subject property.
- 7. Landscaping shall be installed on the northern half of the property to meet the minimum requirements of vehicular use area screening required by Article 18 of the Zoning Ordinance.
- 8. Storage shall be maintained only as an incidental or accessory use to the principal use of the pawnshop.
- 9. The applicant shall have 4 months to obtain the necessary permits, complete construction prior to receiving a final Zoning Compliance Permit for this use. If the conditions are not complied with within this time period, the conditional use will be re-docketed for the next available meeting for further review by the Board.

2. **C-2014-14: BILL MEADE** - appeals for a conditional use permit to operate an outdoor recreational facility (a botanical garden) in the Agricultural Rural (A-R) zone, at 9086 Old Richmond Road (Council District 12).

The Staff Recommends: **Postponement**, for the following reasons:

- a. There is a pending Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment designed to provide greater clarity in the regulation of all outdoor recreational activities, in the A-R zone and all others. The staff strongly prefers that the current application for a Conditional Use Permit postpone until the ZOTA has been fully considered by the Commission, and ultimately, by the Urban County Council.
- b. The staff can not report to the Board that all necessary facilities are available and adequate to serve the requested conditional use permit. In particular, the majority of off-street parking proposed to serve this use is located more than ¼ mile south of the proposed zoological garden, requiring patrons to cross a federal highway, and climb a 65' slope to reach the facility. There appears to be space available on the subject property for more vehicular parking than is proposed by the appellant.

3. **C-2014-15: TIM HUBER/RAMSEY DEVELOPMENT** - appeal for a conditional use permit to establish an assisted living center for seniors in a Planned Neighborhood Residential (R-3) zone, at 2930 Spurr Road (a portion of) (Council District 2).

The Staff Recommends: **Approval**, for the following reasons:

- a. Although collector and arterial streets do not currently exist to the subject site, the arterial street is expected to be completed by the time construction of the requested assisted living facility is completed. In addition, collector street connections are proposed to be constructed by the applicant and/or the developer by the time this requested conditional use is set to open. Therefore, with these facilities in place, ensuring a connected street system in this area, granting the requested conditional use permit should not adversely affect the subject or surrounding properties, or this residential neighborhood. Adequate off-street parking will be provided on-site for the use of the new building proposed.
- b. With the completion of all necessary local, collector and arterial streets, all public facilities and services would be available and adequate for the proposed use, since this location is "grandfathered" under the Capacity Assurance Program (for sanitary sewer service).

This recommendation of approval is made subject to the following conditions:

- 1. The site shall be developed in accordance with the submitted site plan, provided that the cul-de-sac shown for Cielo Vista Road is replaced by a street aimed so that an intersection may be provided either to Estrella Drive or to the collector street to the west of the subject site.
- 2. All necessary permits shall be obtained from the Divisions of Planning, Engineering and Building Inspection prior to construction and occupancy of the building.
- 3. A storm water plan for the site shall be accepted by the Division of Engineering prior to any construction.
- 4. The collector street to the west of the subject site shall be constructed, and dedicated as a public street, prior to the issuance of an Occupancy Permit.
- 5. Otherwise, Screening of the parking lot, as required by Article 18 of the Zoning Ordinance, is to be installed prior to the issuance of an Occupancy Permit.
- 6. Any back-up power generator on this site shall be located at least 100' from any single family home on adjacent property, and shall be landscaped and screened from adjacent residences.

4. **C-2014-21: SOLAR ECLIPSE, LLC** – appeal for a conditional use permit to construct a parking area accessory to an adjacent P-1 zone in a Planned Neighborhood Residential (R-3) zone, at 2101 Palomar Trace Drive (Council District 10).

The Staff Recommends: **Postponement**, for the following reason

- a. Additional information concerning the preliminary grading plans and potential extent of retaining walls is necessary to assess the impact that this proposed conditional use will have on adjoining properties.

E. **Administrative Reviews** - None

IV. **BOARD ITEMS** - The Chair will announce that any items a Board member wishes to present will be heard at this time.

V. **STAFF ITEMS** - The Chair will announce that any items a Staff member wishes to present will be heard at this time.

VI. **NEXT MEETING DATE** - The Chair will announce that the next meeting date will be May 30, 2014.

VII. **ADJOURNMENT** - If there is no further business, the Chair will declare the meeting adjourned.