

## HARRISONBURG BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS

The Harrisonburg Board of Zoning Appeals met in regular session in the City Council Chambers on Monday, July 22, 2019, to approve the minutes of the May 6, 2019 Board of Zoning Appeals meeting. Members present were Matthew Phillippi, Glen Stoltzfus, Thomas Jenkins, Dany Fleming, and Gil Colman. Also present were Rachel Drescher, Zoning Administrator and Frank Hopkins, Zoning Inspector.

Mr. Phillippi called the meeting to order at 4:00 PM. The first and only item of business was the approval of minutes from the prior meeting.

Mr. Stoltzfus: I have a few items for corrections.

On page 5, under Mr. Rodriguez, it says “that makes sense because any business”. I think that is supposed to say “that does not make sense”.

Mr. Fleming: I would be reluctant, since this is someone who is not present, to make any changes to that.

Mr. Stoltzfus: Under Mr. Stoltzfus, “I do not find that there **is** a hardship created”. The word “is” is missing.

On page 6, the fifth paragraph reads, “[t]his is not in my staff report, but today a previous property owner contacted me. Craig Smith, called, and, first off, said he not received any complaints...” This should say “he **had** not received”. On the bottom of the page, under Mr. Fleming, “That would one of the prominent questions” should read “That would **be** one of the questions”.

On page 7, under Mr. Blatt, about 10 or 12 lines down it reads, “Maybe you all have may remember him.” I am not sure what he is trying to say. Further down, “[t]his was one the changes...” should read “one **of** the changes”. I have another question about that paragraph, “[t]he property owner has a by-right permit”. I do not understand that one, but we will not address that one right now.

Mr. Phillippi: I do not think that was necessarily a missing word.

Mr. Stoltzfus: That was just a statement that I do not understand.

On page 8, near the bottom, under Mr. Phillippi it reads “[t]here is only unit”. Did you mean only one unit?

Mr. Phillippi: Honestly, I would have to hear the recording. I bet it was supposed to be “there were only three units”, but I do not know how that was heard on the recording.

Mr. Stoltzfus: I do not know if they are going to go back and listen to the recording and look at that closer?

Mr. Fleming: Staff will go back and review that? Yes? OK.

Mr. Stoltzfus: On page 11, under Mr. Fleming, it reads “[y]ou mentioned... Mr. Byrd here was the architect for my house.”

Mr. Phillippi: He was referencing Mr. Byrd as a friend of his.

Mr. Fleming: He was my architect.

Mr. Stoltzfus: That is probably ok. Down at the bottom, under Mr. Riner, it reads “[t]hey main floor is apartment B”.

On page 16, under Mr. Stoltzfus down at the bottom, starts “[c]an you reiterate what the former owner”. I think I meant “former owner **said** about the changes they **made in the** basement”. There are some words missing there.

On page 17, under Mr. Fleming, fourth sentence down, “then not have written I that way”.

Mr. Fleming: Probably “it”. “I” should be “it”.

Mr. Stoltzfus: That is all I have.

Mr. Fleming: One reference in relation to the first case, on page 3, under one of my quotes, the third line reads, “[l]ike you said, Mr. Fleming”. That would be me referencing me. I do not know if that is my line there or someone else said that.

Mr. Phillippi: We can check that. We can make the motion to accept the minutes with the recommended changes.

Mr. Fleming: I move to approve the minutes, as amended.

Mr. Jenkins: I second.

Mr. Phillippi: All those in favor of the minutes, as amended, say “aye”.

The Board unanimously approved the minutes.

OLD BUSINESS:

NONE

NEW BUSINESS:

NONE

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:11 PM.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman

Respectfully submitted,

\_\_\_\_\_  
Vice-Chairman

Nyrma Soffel

Staff representative

---

---

---

DRAFT