

## MINUTES OF MEETING

### HOOVER BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

**Date:** September 27, 2021  
**Time:** 5:30 P.M.  
**Place:** Hoover Municipal Center  
**Present:** Mr. Curtis Jackson  
Mr. Dan Mikos  
Mr. David LeCompte  
Mr. Kyle Puchta  
Mr. Jim Brush  
Mr. Lawren Pratt  
Mr. TJ Dolan

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

#### 1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Mr. Mikos asked if anyone had any additions or corrections to the minutes from the August 23, 2021, BZA meeting. There being none, Mr. Mikos asked for the minutes to be accepted by acclamation.
3. BZA-0921-15 – Mr. Richard Johnson, representing Blackridge Partners LLC, is requesting a 3’ side yard variance to the 10’ setback at property located at 1892 Blackridge Road. The property owners are Blackridge Partners LLC, and is zoned PUD PR-1 (Planned Single Family District). (**APPROVED**)

Mr. Jonathan Belcher, representing Blackridge Partners, 3545 Market Street, Hoover, AL, was present to represent the case. Mr. Belcher explained the purpose of their request was they were over the side setback by a little less than 2.4 feet. Mr. Belcher stated when they first discovered this, he spoke to their surveyor and they determined they had used, in error, some stakes that were set for a previous home site. Mr. Belcher stated they had ordered a foundation survey once the framing had begun and discovered the error. Mr. Belcher stated, when looking at the site, they were fortunate in that there was an equal distance between the houses, approximately 36’, and the houses had a consistent view. Mr. Belcher asked the board to consider and approve their variance request.

Mr. Mikos asked if any of the board members or anyone in the audience had a question. Mr. Puchta made some comments regarding the case.

Mr. Mikos asked for a motion. Mr. Brush made a motion to approve BZA-0921-15 with Mr. Puchta seconding the motion. On voice vote, Mr. Pratt abstained from the vote, and the remaining board members voted unanimously to approve the case. Mr. Mikos stated the variance had been approved.

4. **BZA-0921-16** – Jonathan & Caroline Catanzano are requesting a variance to allow a garage addition to extend (15') into the required 35' setback for the purpose of a garage addition at property located at **500 Lacey Lane**. Mr. & Mrs. Catanzano are the property owners and the property is zoned R-1 (Single Family District). (***CONTINUED***)

Mr. Jonathan Catanzano, 500 Lacey Lane, Hoover, AL, was present to represent the case. Mr. Catanzano proceeded to explain his case which currently had an existing carport. He explained they wanted to enclose the carport to make it living space and add a two car garage. He stated they had 2 sheds in the backyard they would like to get rid of and overall give it more curb appeal. Mr. Catanzano stated they had spoken to neighbors and had gotten good feedback. Mr. Catanzano stated they wanted to make it more aesthetically pleasing.

Mr. Mikos spoke about the issues of them being on the corner lot and asked if they could put it on the other side of the house. Mr. Catanzano explained the bedrooms were located on that side as well as some other reasons why this would not be a good idea. Mr. Catanzano stated their existing utilities and septic tank were also located in that area.

Mr. Brush asked about what was behind their house. Mr. Catanzano stated there was a 10 ft AL Power easement along the north property line and also with the orientation of the garage behind the house, it favored the driveway coming off Hawksbury and they were concerned about visibility issues with that option.

Mr. Pratt asked the secretary if there had been any responses from the neighbors. Ms. Bradstreet answered no.

Mr. Brush asked if they had given any consideration for reducing the size of the garage so it would come close to fitting in the space available. Mr. Catanzano answered he didn't know that approximately 11 feet would help them very much square footage wise.

Mr. Mikos asked Mr. Martin if the setback was platted. Mr. Martin answered that was correct. Mr. Martin stated the zoning issue of the 35 foot setback was in place for both front yards. Mr. Martin stated the 35 front building line had been platted along both streets so if the board decided to grant the variance, then that would need to be remedied. This property was Lot 1 of the Shades Plateau Estates 2<sup>nd</sup> Sector subdivision.

Mr. Martin also talked about the dimensions in the drawing shown on the screen. Mr. Catanzano stated the current dimension of the garage was 24' wide and the depth was 30'. Mr. Catanzano stated they were still in discussion with the architects on the actual depth but the width was pretty much a standard 24'.

Mr. Martin stated there may be some concerns about a visibility issue to Hawksbury. Mr. Martin stated he could get with the city's Engineering Department to look at that subject matter if need be if the applicant wanted to continue the case and give them a little more time.

Mr. Mikos asked the applicant if he wanted to continue the case in order to come up with some other options. Mr. Catanzano decided to continue the case to look at some alternative options.

5. **BZA-0921-17**- Mr. Brad Oster, representing Corporate Boulevard Video, LLC, is requesting a variance to allow a free standing sign at 98 square feet and 30' in height in lieu of the allowed 55 square feet and 20' in height for property located at **105 Inverness Corners**. The property owner is Corporate Boulevard Video, LLC, and is zoned PC (Planned Commercial).

Mr. Brad Oster, 3509 Westbury Place, was present to represent the case. Mr. Oster stated the original sign had been knocked down by a storm last December. Mr. Oster stated they were looking at putting the same sign back up and had come to the realization of how bad the visibility was for his building. He proceeded to explain all the different elevations affiliated with his building. He also described the previous sign was 98 square feet. Mr. Mikos asked Mr. Martin about why they would have had such a large sign.

Mr. Pratt asked if they had done any visibility studies from the location of where they wanted to put the new sign. Mr. Oster stated that was why they wanted to be larger than 55 square feet due to the brick sign that was out front. Mr. Oster also mentioned the utility servitude that was everywhere around the building.

Mr. Martin also shared information about a tree being removed in the area where they were planning on replacing the sign. Mr. Oster stated he was unaware of when the tree had been taken down.

Mr. Mikos asked if there were any other comments from the board or audience. Mr. Puchta spoke to the applicant regarding the large request for the sign, and Mr. Oster stated again they were simply trying to replace the sign that was there.

Mr. Puchta asked the applicant again if he would consider keeping the original height and keeping the sign at what the code requirement was at 55 sq. feet. Mr. Oster stated he would amend his request to reflect that.

Mr. Mikos asked if anyone in the audience wanted to speak regarding this request. There were no questions. Mr. Mac Martin noted if there was going to be a new sign, that the property owner should do something about taking down the abandoned sign and brick base that was left behind.

Mr. Mikos asked for a motion. Mr. Brush made a motion to approve BZA-0921-17, as amended to read that the square footage allowed for the new sign be limited to 55 square feet according to code and that the brick work remaining from the old sign be removed from the property. Mr. Puchta seconded the motion. Mr. Martin noted for the record that the height was increased from 20 feet to 30 feet as well. Mr. Mikos asked if there were any other questions. A roll call vote was taken and the variance was approved unanimously.

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned.