

City of Keene
New Hampshire

ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
MEETING MINUTES

Monday, January 4, 2016

6:30 PM

City Hall, Second Floor Committee Room

Members Present:

Louise Zerba, Chair
Jeffrey Stevens, Vice Chair
Joseph Hoppock
Nathaniel Stout
Steve Bragdon, Alternate

Staff Present:

Gary Schneider, Plans Examiner

Members Absent:

David Curran

Others Present:

I. Introduction of Board Members-

Chair Zerba called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM and introduced the Board Members.

II. Minutes of the Previous Meetings – December 7, 2015

Mr. Hoppock made a motion to approve the minutes of December 7, 2015. Mr. Bragdon seconded the motion which carried unanimously with the following correction:

Mr. Bragdon stated that on pg. 3, third paragraph it reads, “Mr. Bragdon replied yes and stated that he has copies of the deed if interested.” This should instead read, “. Mr. Bergeron replied yes and stated that he has copies of the deed if interested.”

III. Unfinished Business –

None at this time.

IV. Hearings:

ZBA 16-01/: Petitioner, Kathy A. Theiss of 6429 Abdella Lane, North Port, FL, represented by Homer S. Bradley of Bradley & Faulkner, P.C. , of Keene, requests a Variance for property located at 708 Roxbury Rd., Keene, which is located in the Rural District. The Petitioner requests a Variance to be permitted to build a structure on the premises to encroach 10 feet into the side setback on the north side toward the Herrick premises.

Stated another way, the structure will be at least 40' from the Herrick's boundary. The structure to be built will encroach 20' into the side setback on the south toward Roxbury Road. The building will be at least 40' from the Roxbury Road with a required setback of 60' per Section 102-791 Basic Zone Dimensional Requirements of the Zoning Code.

Mr. Schneider displayed a map of the Roxbury Road area for the Board. Mr. Schneider stated that the front of the property is actually on Jordan Road. He continued, stating that the northern property line is a side line and noted that the side line in discussion is on Roxbury Road. Mr. Schneider noted that Attorney Bradley was before the Board at an earlier date and a continuance was requested. Mr. Schneider stated that the property has been surveyed since the last meeting. He continued, stating that the position of the house has been determined and variances are necessary due to setback encroachments. Mr. Schneider stated that significant changes to the structure have occurred and all abutters have been notified. Mr. Hoppock asked if the City has a copy of the survey. Attorney Bradley stated that there is a small copy in the packet and proceeded to give Mr. Schneider a larger map for display.

Attorney Bradley approached the Board and stated that he represents Mrs. Theiss. Attorney Bradley specified where the home will be located on the displayed map and drew the location of the pre-existing house on the map. Attorney Bradley noted that the previous house is highlighted pink in the packet and the proposed location is outlined in black. Attorney Bradley stated that a deck will not be added to the house as previously requested. The petitioner is now asking for a Variance permitting the newly designed structure due to setback requirements. Attorney Bradley stated that the house would be more than 40 feet from the Herrick's, (abutters) property line. The new structure would then have a 40 foot setback instead of the required 50 feet. Attorney Bradley stated that the house will be more than 40 feet from Roxbury Road which requires a 60 foot setback. Attorney Bradley stated that the house will be less desirable if it is moved any closer to Roxbury Road.

Mr. Schneider presented an elevation print of the house. Mr. Bragdon asked where the driveway would be located. Attorney Bradley stated that the previous owner did not build on the previous footprint due to a sudden illness and noted that the previous driveway was depicted on an earlier drawing. He continued, stating that the new driveway will run south of Roxbury Road.

Mr. Stout asked where the southern setback is located. Attorney Bradley highlighted the south setback for the Board and stated that it expands up to 60 feet. Mr. Stout noted that due to the angled setback line, the shortest angle at one point will be 20 feet. Attorney Bradley agreed and stated that this qualifies for a Variance under the provisions of the New Hampshire Law. Attorney Bradley noted that the setback encroachment decreases easterly and setback requirements are met on the front of Jordan Road and the back towards the neighbor's lot.

Attorney Bradley reviewed the criteria for granting a Variance:

Granting the Variance would not be contrary to the public interest:

Attorney Bradley stated that the Variance will not threaten public health or welfare and noted that the neighborhood consists of smaller lots. Attorney Bradley stated that according to the tax code, the Herrick property is 55/100th of an acre. Attorney Bradley noted that this development

will be consistent with the surrounding lot sizes. He continued, stating that a septic tank will be required but it will be city water.

If the Variance were granted, the spirit of the ordinance would be observed:

Attorney Bradley stated that it is a single family neighborhood and the new home will only enhance the surrounding area.

Granting the Variance would do substantial justice:

Attorney Bradley noted that if the Variances are not granted and the landowner cannot build- it will be a tremendous loss. He continued, stating that by building a house the purpose of the ordinance will be preserved.

If the Variance were granted, the values of the surrounding properties would not be diminished:

Attorney Bradley stated that the properties will not be diminished and the neighborhood will actually improve.

Unnecessary Hardship:

- A. *Owing to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area, denial of the Variance would result in unnecessary hardship*
 - i. *No fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property:*
 - ii. *The proposed use is a reasonable one:*

Attorney Bradley stated that the purpose of setbacks is to prevent overcrowding. He noted that this will not crowd anyone and the home will be at least 40 feet from each side. Attorney Bradley noted that there is no additional land available on any side of the lot. He continued, stating that all of the abutter's lots are already at a minimal size.

Mr. Bragdon asked if the house can be moved to the east. Attorney Bradley stated that it can be moved to the east but very little. He continued, stating that the preferred structure was developed because it is similar to the pre-existing house. Mr. Bragdon asked if this change would omit the need for a variance. Attorney Bradley replied no, the Roxbury Road variance is still necessary.

Mr. Hoppock inquired about the date of the old house's demolition. Attorney Bradley was not sure of the date but noted that it lay dormant for some time and once Mr. Theiss became ill he could not rebuild the structure. Mr. Hoppock noted that he remembers it being dormant for at least three years.

Chair Zerba opened the public hearing.

Sherry and Sean Herrick of 15 Jordan Road approached the Board in opposition of ZBA 16-01. Ms. Herrick stated that the previous house was torn down in May of 2012 and presented a Google image. Ms. Herrick stated that she is in opposition of the discussed structure encroaching her property and being 10 feet short of the setback requirement. She stated that the house will be 40 feet from their boundary. Ms. Herrick went over the other setbacks previously discussed.

Ms. Herrick stated that she received a fax from Attorney Bradley at her place of employment and requested that all future documentation be sent only to her home. Ms. Herrick stated that she has not received a copy of the survey and is not sure of the property lines at this time. Ms. Herrick noted that the fax stated that the contractor will be putting the house closer to Roxbury Road and no deck will be developed. She continued, stating that the surveyor pointed out that a 60 foot setback is necessary from Roxbury Road in accordance with the ordinance. Ms. Herrick stated that she hopes her concerns are heard and that town regulations are followed. She continued, stating her concerns of the new structure being twice the size of the old house, a decrease in privacy, encroachment on her land, real estate evaluation issues, and stress.

The Herricks presented a compilation of pictures of their home and the surrounding area along with a hand written map to the Board. The pictures were displayed to the Board members. Ms. Herrick stated that the surrounding lots will not have an invasion of privacy as seen in the pictures but her home will be very close to the structure in discussion. Mr. Hoppock asked Ms. Herrick to point out the boundary line. Ms. Herrick pointed out her boundary line on one of her pictures and noted that most of the vegetation was also taken out by the petitioner. Ms. Herrick noted that the house would be looking directly into her home including her deck. Ms. Herrick stated that she is not sure about her boundary lines after the recent survey. Mr. Bragdon asked how far the house is from the lot line. Mr. Herrick replied that the garage is about 10 feet. Mr. Bragdon noted that the new house does not look much larger than the previous house. Ms. Herrick stated that the previous house was a single story and the proposed house will be two stories with a garage.

Ms. Herrick stated that if the house is facing south then the new structure will have a clear view into her home because it is two stories. Mr. Hoppock asked if a vegetative barrier will help protect their privacy. Mr. Herrick stated that with a two story house a vegetative barrier would not protect their privacy. Ms. Herrick stated that vegetation would take time to grow and the previous home did not strip the neighbors of their privacy. She continued, stating that she and her husband are protecting their investment and their home on 15 Jordan Road has been in her family for over 50 years.

Ms. Herrick requested a revised plan and that a two story home would decrease privacy. She continued, stating that a compromise should be made and the new structure should conform to the existing neighborhood and the old structure's footprint. Ms. Herrick stated that the other lot sizes in the area are small and has been this way for years. Ms. Herrick stated that it would be very stressful if the Variance is granted and noted that no other lots are being encroached. Ms. Herrick asked what other steps could be taken if the Board is not able to assist in their concerns.

Attorney Bradley approached the Board and stated that the common boundary line is very close to the stone wall on the Herrick's property. Attorney Bradley stated that the new structure would

actually be about 60 feet from the Herrick's house itself and noted that the application qualifies for every one of the criteria for the Variance. Attorney Bradley noted that there is also nothing about privacy in the criteria. Attorney Bradley restated that the new house will increase the value of other homes in the area. Mr. Bragdon questioned the location of the Herrick's house on the pictures presented by the Herrick's.

Mr. Stout asked Mr. Schneider if he had the previously displayed map of the neighboring lots. Mr. Schneider stated that he does not have the map with him but does have the neighboring properties measuring assessments. Mr. Stout noted that there are already lots in the area that do not follow setback requirements and asked if Mr. Schneider has a number as to how many lots do not follow requirements. Mr. Schneider stated that it can be assumed that other properties in the area encroach on the setback lines. He continued, noting that the Herrick's garage is 15 feet from the property line.

Mr. Schneider answered the Herrick's question as to what would happen if the Board passes the application. He continued, stating that anyone has the ability to file an Appeal for a Motion to Rehearing. A Rehearing can occur subject to new information becoming available after the application is discussed or they erred in law. Mr. Schneider suggested legal assistance if anyone files for a rehearing.

Chair Zerba closed the public hearing.

Mr. Stevens stated that prior to the survey; the sketch made it appear that the house could fit on the previous lines. He continued, noting that now it would be very awkward to fit a house within the old lines. Mr. Stevens stated that the size of the house does not seem to be very different than the previous one and the application meets all of the criteria. He continued, stating that vegetation would be helpful for privacy. Mr. Bragdon agreed that the application meets the criteria and moving the house further back would exacerbate the problem of privacy for the neighbors.

Mr. Hoppock agreed that all of the criteria are met and a vegetative buffer would be helpful for privacy. Mr. Stout agreed and stated that the only criteria he would question is the argument for hardship. He continued, stating that the neighborhood is very rural and the character does not change. Mr. Stout stated that the view from the north shows three houses and it is not dense forest. He continued, noting the applicant's circumstances and that the house would have been rebuilt if the owner survived. Mr. Stout noted that the house was taken down in 2012 which is not very long ago. Mr. Hoppock stated that in light of the ordinance, the character of the neighborhood will be the same and property values will increase. He continued, noting that a house is better than a vacant lot.

The Board Members deliberated on how to add a condition referring to a vegetative buffer. Mr. Schneider stated that the Board would need to specify the condition in order for enforcement to occur. Chair Zerba asked the applicant making accommodations. Mr. Bradley stated that he is not able to comment on this. Shane Lampinen (possible buyer) of 81 Arrow Crest Drive, Swanzey stated that a buffer can be developed. Attorney Bradley noted that creating a vegetative boundary in the line of sight is possible but the entire boundary line would be very expensive.

A motion was made by Mr. Hoppock to approve ZBA 16-01 with the condition of an appropriate coniferous boundary line such that it screens the northerly line of sight to the neighbor's house over a reasonable amount of time and planted at the time of construction. Mr. Bragdon seconded with the motion.

Chair Zerba went over the Findings of Fact:

Granting the Variance would not be contrary to the public interest: Granted 5-0.

If the Variance were granted, the spirit of the Ordinance would be observed: Granted 5-0.

Granting the Variance would do substantial justice: Granted 5-0.

If the Variance were granted, the values of the surrounding properties would not be diminished:
Granted 5-0.

Unnecessary Hardship

- A. *Owing to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area, denial of the Variance would result in unnecessary hardship because:*
 - i. *No fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purpose of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property:* Granted 5-0.
 - ii. *The proposed use is a reasonable one:* Granted 5-0.

On a unanimous vote the Zoning Board of Adjustment approve ZBA16-01 with the condition that an appropriate coniferous boundary line such that it screens the northerly line of sight to the neighbor's house over a reasonable amount of time and planted at the time of construction.

ZBA 16-02/: Petitioner, Igor Monteiro, President of Red Devils Soccer Club, Inc. of, Keene, NH, requests a Special Exception for property located at 17 Washington St., Keene, owned by Washington Park of Keene, LLC of 9 Old Derry Rd., Hudson, NH, which is located in the Central Business District. The Petitioner requests a Special Exception to operate a soccer program per Section 102-482 for a recreational activity as a business.

The Board acted as a four member Board. Mr. Stevens recused himself due to a conflict of interest.

Mr. Schneider presented the map of the location in discussion. Mr. Schneider stated that the applicant is interested in using the athletic field which is behind the old middle school. Mr. Schneider stated that there is no primary use of the building at the moment and because there is no primary use, it cannot have a secondary use. Mr. Schneider stated that the applicant has an agreement with the owner to lease the field in order to conduct a soccer program. Mr. Schneider stated that this is in the Central Business District and is considered an outdoor recreational

activity as a business. In the Central Business District this type of use is only permitted with a Special Exception.

Mr. Hoppock asked if there will be any use of other properties nearby lie the YMCA or the middle school. Mr. Schneider stated that the applicant has not asked for these requests and noted that porta-potties will be brought in as well as outside lighting. Mr. Schneider stated that the program will be completely outdoors. Mr. Schneider noted that the application will still have to go to the Planning Department and Historic District Commission.

Mr. Stout asked where the actual field is located. Mr. Schneider stated that it encompasses the middle school. Mr. Stout asked what prevention would take place to ensure parking in the front is not used. Mr. Schneider reviewed allocated parking spaces for the program's use. Mr. Stout stated that the ZBA cannot delineate where the parking will be. Mr. Schneider stated that the Board can ask the applicant this question. He continued, displaying the map which shows assigned parking by the field which is nearby Section 41 which is owned by the City and where City Hall employees park. Mr. Schneider stated that there is no distinguishing mark between the City parking and the middle school parking. Mr. Bragdon noted that the applicant is asking for a Special Exception for the field cover in the lease but not the parking. He continued, stating that the applicant may be able to explain.

Attorney J.R. Davis approached the Board and represents the applicant. He stated that the application is for a Special Exception to allow for a recreational activity for a business. Attorney Davis stated that the parking is in the packet and marked in yellow. These parking areas are in the lease.

Attorney Davis summarized the criteria for a Special Exception:

Attorney Davis stated that this soccer program would be an ideal use and mimics historical uses of the property. He continued, stating that the shape and condition of the field has changed and the program would improve the surrounding area and not diminish property values. Attorney Davis noted that this application would require a site plan review as well and the Planning Department may decide that this application is a change of use. Attorney Davis noted that the applicant is not proposing to expand the field but allow community athletic activities. He continued, stating that there is ample parking immediately adjacent to the field and once approved the applicant would fix the fence as well as maintain the area.

Attorney Davis stated that the hours would be early evening on weekdays and earlier on the weekends which will not affect nearby businesses. He continued, stating that the abutters are mostly commercial and not residential. Attorney Davis noted that some adult league activities may accommodate the space as well. He continued stating that most of the field is surrounded by buildings and the public would not see much of the field due to the buildings and the retention wall.

Attorney Davis stated that two porta-potties will be provided as well and noted that there will be no more than 60 participants on the field at one time but most likely less. Attorney Davis stated that the program will not occur any earlier than 4:30 PM on weekdays and no later than 10: 00

PM. He continued, stating that on weekends the program will occur no earlier than 8:00 AM and no later than 10:00 PM. Attorney Davis stated that the program will take several years to develop.

Chair Zerba inquired about parking. Attorney Davis stated that the lease does provide two parking areas and the applicant is discussing other options with the City. Attorney Davis stated that usage of the field is usually after City Hall has closed and parking should not be a problem. Chair Zerba noted that to use the parking lot provided in the lease, individuals would have to cross the City parking lot. Attorney Davis agreed and stated that there is a small decline to the other lot. Mr. Schneider presented a diagram of the two parking lots.

Mr. Hoppock asked if the City enforces cars parked in the City parking lot. Mr. Schneider stated that the meter enforcement goes through the area and tickets unauthorized vehicles. Attorney Davis stated that when he viewed the parking lot there were no cars that would block the other lot. Mr. Hoppock asked if the landlord of the middle school property has permission to drive through the City lot and get to the other lot. Attorney Davis stated that he is unsure of a right of way. Mr. Schneider stated that the City did not know that they owned the parking lot until recently and a right of way will have to be discussed through City Council or the Parking Division. It is not a City municipal parking lot.

Attorney Davis stated that the field has been used for youth activity for a long time and it would be beneficial for the City for continued recreational use. Chair Zerba inquired about lighting. Attorney Davis stated that it would be temporary lighting. Chair Zerba stated concern with the banners on Roxbury Street. Mr. Schneider stated that the banners will go through the Planning Department and the City has discussed signage with the applicant.

Chair Zerba closed the public hearing.

Mr. Stout stated that he is in favor of the field being restored. Mr. Bragdon stated that he is also in favor and does not see this as a long term program for the area because the property will be developed at some point. The lease is likely subject to sale. Mr. Bragdon stated that no abutters are here to complain as well. Mr. Hoppock agreed and is in favor of the application. Chair Zerba agreed.

A motion was made by Mr. Hoppock to approve ZBA 16-02. Mr. Stout seconded the motion.

Chair Zerba went over the Findings of Fact:

The proposed use is similar to one or more of the uses already authorized in that district and is an appropriate location for such a use. Granted 5-0.

Mr. Bragdon noted that there are no other fields in the area for comparison. Mr. Hoppock stated that the proposed soccer program would be appropriate for the area.

Such approval would not reduce the value of any property within the district nor otherwise be injurious, obnoxious or offensive to the neighborhood: Granted 5-0.

There will be no nuisance or serious hazard to vehicles or pedestrians: Granted 5-0.

Adequate and appropriate facilities will be provided for the proper operation of the proposed use: Granted 5-0.

By a unanimous vote the Zoning Board of Adjustment approve ZBA 16-02.

ZBA 16-03/: Petitioner, Nathan Lyczak of 369 Roxbury St., Keene, requests a Variance for property located at 369 Roxbury St., Keene, which is located in the Medium Density District. The Petitioner requests a Variance to allow the construction of a 10'x16' one story accessory structure (a bicycle shed) directly on the side property line with 381 Roxbury St. per Section 102-791, Basic Zone Dimensional Requirements and Section 102-826 of the Zoning Code.

Mr. Stevens returned to sit on the Board.

Mr. Schneider presented a map of the area in discussion to the Board. Mr. Schneider stated that the shed in discussion was in the middle of construction when it came into Code Enforcement. Mr. Schneider stated that if a tool shed is built and is less than 125 square feet -a building permit is not necessary. He continued, stating that this structure is 10 x16 or 160 square feet and a building permit is needed. Mr. Schneider stated that the roof overhang is counted in the 125 square feet and only one is permitted on a lot.

Nathan Lyczak of 369 Roxbury Street approached the Board. He stated that his family discussed a bike shed for some time and he did not realize that permits were necessary for the size. Mr. Lyczak stated that once Code Enforcement approached him, construction was put on hold. Mr. Lyczak stated that the shed could not be moved because of the topography of the lot and the slope. He continued, stating that his neighbor, Ida Marone, who abuts the property line near the shed, was present for most of the meeting and had to leave but she is in favor of the shed. Mr. Lyczak stated that they have a letter of agreement about the bike shed.

Mr. Lyczak stated that the property is unique because of the fence and the sloping topography. He continued, stating that the vegetation in the summer would hide it from the road and the neighbors. Mr. Lyczak stated that the family tries to minimize car usage as well. Chair Zerba asked whose property the fence falls on. Mr. Lyczak stated that it is Ms. Marone's fence. Chair Zerba asked about the wood shed. Mr. Lyczak stated that this structure did not need a permit. Mr. Lyczak stated that his property line is between the shared fence and the shed. Chair Zerba asked if the shed can be reduced from 160 square feet to 125 square feet. Mr. Lyczak stated that he did consider this and is willing to work with the City.

Mr. Hoppock asked if Mr. Lyczak looked over the criteria for the application and asked him to speak to this.

Mr. Lyczak went over the criteria:

Granting the Variance would not be contrary to the public interest:

Mr. Lyczak stated that the shed was created with architectural thought and in an area of the lot that is the least obtrusive. He stated that the neighbors are only able to see part of the roof in the winter.

If the Variance were granted, the spirit of the ordinance would be observed:

Mr. Lyczak stated that his lot is unique because of the nature of the hillside topography.

Granting the Variance would do substantial justice:

Mr. Lyczak stated that his family is trying to minimize vehicle usage and use bicycles more.

If the Variance were granted, the values of the surrounding properties would not be diminished:

Mr. Lyczak stated that the immediate neighbor has signed a letter of agreement about the bike shed but this was not given to the City.

Unnecessary Hardship:

B. Owing to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area, denial of the Variance would result in unnecessary hardship

iii. No fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property:

iv. The proposed use is a reasonable one:

Mr. Lyczak noted that most of the land is unusable due to the sloping topography.

Mr. Hoppock noted that the setback Ordinance is in place to minimize density of the neighborhood and Mr. Lyczak needs to speak to his unique property and why a Variance is necessary. Mr. Lyczak stated that if the shape of the land were different, it would be a different story. Mr. Hoppock agreed that because of the topography of the land the shed would not add to the density problems.

Mr. Stevens asked about building the structure on the property line. Mr. Schneider stated that this is allowed on the side and rear setbacks. Mr. Stout asked about the building permit. Mr. Schneider stated that if the ZBA approves the application, then a building permit would need to be applied for. Mr. Stevens asked if the overhang of the roof is accounted for when discussing the property line. Mr. Schneider stated that this Board would not discuss this issue and stated that the applicant noted that the structure is on the property line not over. Mr. Lyczak stated that he did not survey the property line however. Mr. Schneider stated that if the roof was over the line, it would be a civil issue. Mr. Stout stated that the Variance would then be void if the neighbor brings the applicant to court.

Chair Zerba closed the public hearing.

Mr. Stout asked if all abutting neighbors were notified. Mr. Schneider replied, yes. Chair Zerba noted that Ms. Marone was also here in support but did not get to speak at the meeting. Mr. Hoppock stated that the applicant barely meets the criteria and is concerned with creating a floodgate problem with neighbors. Mr. Bragdon agreed but is not concerned about precedence.

A motion was made by Mr. Bragdon to approve ZBA 16-03. Mr. Hoppock seconded the motion.

Chair Zerba stated that she is in favor of the application and stated that no one will see the fence or the walkway from the street. Mr. Stevens stated that his biggest concern is approving something that has already been constructed.

Chair Zerba went over the Findings of Fact:

Granting the Variance would not be contrary to the public interest: Granted 5-0.

If the Variance were granted, the spirit of the Ordinance would be observed: Granted 5-0.

Mr. Hoppock noted that this structure will not change the character and is consistent due to the topography.

Granting the Variance would do substantial justice: Granted 5-0.

Mr. Stout noted that the bike shed will help limit the number of cars. Mr. Hoppock stated that a loss to him is not gained by the general public.

If the Variance were granted, the values of the surrounding properties would not be diminished:

Granted 5-0.

Unnecessary Hardship

- B. Owing to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area, denial of the Variance would result in unnecessary hardship because:*
 - iii. No fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purpose of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property: Granted 5-0.*
 - iv. The proposed use is a reasonable one: Granted 5-0.*

Mr. Hoppock noted the hardship with the topography of the lot.

On a unanimous vote the Zoning Board of Adjustment approve ZBA 16-03.

V. New Business

Chair and Vice-Chair elections:

Mr. Stevens stated that Tuesday mornings for meetings no longer work for him. Mr. Hoppock offered to be the Vice-Chair.

Mr. Bragdon made a motion to nominate Louise Zerba as Chair of the ZBA and Joe Hoppock as Vice-Chair of the ZBA. Mr. Stout seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

VI. Communications and Miscellaneous

VII. Non Public Session (if required)

VIII. Adjournment

Chair Zerba adjourned the meeting at 8:43

Respectfully submitted by:

Lana Bluege, Minute-Taker

January 4, 2016