



TOWN OF
BROOKLINE, NEW HAMPSHIRE
ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

P.O. BOX 360 – 1 Main Street
BROOKLINE, NH 03033-0360

<http://www.brooklinenh.us>

Telephone (603) 673-8855
Fax (603) 673-8136

**BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
MINUTES**

**Wednesday April 13, 2022
7:30pm**

Present: Peter Cook, Chairman
Archer Batcheller, Vice Chairman
Webb Scales, Member, Clerk
Charlotte Pogue, Alternate (voting for Dan Marcek Jr.)

Absent: Marcia Farwell, Member, Dan Marcek Jr., Member and Dave Partridge, Alternate

Peter read the rules of the hybrid meeting.

- Any meeting attendees participating via Zoom are asked to activate the “mute” function until called upon by the chair
- Meeting attendees via Zoom must use the “raise hand” function under the “reactions” tab to participate in the meeting – and will be permitted to comment once and if called upon by the chair.
- Anyone providing comments during the meeting must first identify their name and address
- The “chat” function for Zoom participants will be disabled by the meeting administrator or otherwise not addressed; “chat” items will not be part of the public meeting/record
- Meeting attendees via Zoom will not be listed as attendees in the minutes (except Board members)
- The meeting’s physical location is the official meeting room. Should technical difficulties arise with the remote portion, the meeting will continue at the physical location.

Peter asked Charlotte to vote for Dan tonight. **Charlotte** agreed.

Nominate Chair, Vice-Chair, and Clerk

Webb made a motion to nominate the present slate of Peter Cook as the Chair, Archer Batcheller as the Vice-Chair and Webb Scales as the Clerk of the Zoning Board of Adjustment. Archer seconded. Vote yes 4-0.

ZBA Case 438

Peter said that the applicant has the right to be heard by a five member board and they have only been able to provide four members. You will still need three yes votes to prevail and not having a five member board is not grounds for an appeal. **Peter** asked if the applicant wanted to continue with the case or table it until the next meeting. **Graham** said he would be willing to move forward with the case.

ZBA Minutes
April 13, 2022

Peter read the hearing notice “**Applicant Graham & Katrina Loff** are requesting a **Variance** from Section **603.02 b.** of the Brookline Zoning Ordinance to allow a shed to be placed in the 15 foot side setback for **Lot G-40-10** consisting of 1.840 acres, located at **90 Russell Hill Road.** ”

Graham said on his property because of the way they cut the trees and the shape of the property this is the best place to put it. **Graham** said if they push it further back the land is sloped down and if they push it forward it will be in a drainage area in the front yard. **Peter** said in your application you have stated it looks good in this location. The aesthetics don’t matter when it comes to a variance, what does matter is health and safety, that is one reason for setbacks.

Archer said details like a drainage swale in the front of the property is helpful in the decision making process. **Kevin** (88 Russell Hill Road) the way the property line is set up it is at a very odd angle and on the opposite side, which is his lot, he has had to do the same thing with his shed. The way the water flow comes down behind Grahams property it flows down to the front of Graham’s lot towards that drainage area in the front. **Graham** said this area in the front has always been wet. **Steve Sacherski** (Building Inspector) said he appreciates that Graham is here today wanting to make this right, according to the IRC codes he doesn’t even need a permit for what he is trying to do. He appreciates that he has come here to do the right thing. **Graham** said he is planning to construct an 8x12 foot shed. **Webb** said the ordinance doesn’t allow structures in the setback and it doesn’t matter if they need a building permit.

Peter read the application:

1. Granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest because:

Applicant Answer: The structure will be past the 30 foot front set back from the road, no sight lines will be obstructed from the road and no additional traffic will be generated.

Peter said that all sounds reasonable. The Board agreed.

Peter read:

2. If the variance were granted, the spirit of the ordinance would be observed because:

Applicant Answer: Due to the way the lot was cleared there is still a line of trees separating the sight lines of the properties and a cleared area will still be behind the building providing an appearance of a 15 foot set back.

The Board had no issues with this.

Graham said there will still leave room for emergency vehicles to get past the shed and the house. **Peter** said they also have to consider the abutters rights.

Peter read:

3. Granting the variance would do substantial justice because:

Applicant Answer: It would allow a storage shed to be built in the most logical area of the lot requiring the least amount of yard preparation for proper construction of the shed.

The Board had no issues with this.

Peter read:

4. If the variance were granted, the values of the surrounding properties would not be diminished because:

Applicant Answer: the location of the shed will be similar to others on the street and will be constructed of similar siding and roofing materials to the current house to appear as original construction.

Peter said he believes they would not be diminished. The Board agreed.

Peter read:

5. 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 purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property because:

Applicant Answer: the property that the shed would be closest to is set well back from the joint property line, there are a number of trees separating the sight lines and area already cleared on the property.

and:

ii. The proposed use is a reasonable one because:

Applicant Answer: Due to the slope and position of the Lot and current structures and propane tank and leach field the proposed location is the most logical area of the lot and construction will be of similar materials to the house and location will be similar to other sheds on the road.

Peter asked are there issues with this lot that that make it different from other lots and that makes this the only place for this shed.

Graham said the way our lot was cleared and graded this is the only place that he can put this shed where the land is flat. If they move it forward, there is a drainage swale and if they move it back there is a significant slope. The only other flat spot on his property is his leach field.

Peter read:

b. explain how, if the criteria in subparagraph (a) are not established, an unnecessary hardship would be deemed to exist if, and only if, owing to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area, the property cannot be reasonably used in strict conformance with the ordinance, and a variance is therefore necessary to enable a reasonable use of it.

Applicant Answer: due to the cleared land area, the location of the propane tank and well and leach field any other location would require covering one of the above or substantial and expensive land development to provide a stable and safe location for the shed.

Webb said the ordinance doesn't prevent the applicant from having a shared, and the use is reasonable. **Archer** asked if Webb could see another location for this shed as a possibility on this property. **Webb** said only that the setback are important for all the usual justification and the ordinance does apply to this property. Parts of the ordinance don't prevent the shed the use

is reasonable. **Peter** said he cannot find hardship in question 5 a.

Webb said he believes that the contours of this lot make it unique, and this would be a hardship to place the shed anywhere else. **Charlotte** agreed. **Peter** said he believes the proposed use is a reasonable use for this lot. The Board agreed.

Webb made a motion that the Board finds that they agree with the criteria section 1 thru 4 and they find that the hardship criteria has been met due to the contour and drainage of the property. Archer seconded. Vote yes 4-0.

Webb made a motion to grant the variance to allow the construction of a shed extending five feet into the setback. Archer seconded. Vote yes 4-0.

Case 439A

Peter explained to the applicant that he has the right to be heard by a five member board and tonight they have only been able to provide you with four members. You will still need three affirmative votes to prevail and not having a five member board is not grounds for an appeal.

Peter asked if the applicant wanted to continue with the case or table it until the next meeting.

Jay Chrystal (Applicant) said he would be willing to move forward with case.

Applicant Chrystal, Jay is requesting a **Variance** from **Section 1806.00** of the Brookline Zoning Ordinance and **Section 7.5.01** of the Brookline Subdivision Regulations to permit access for in excess of 4 lots by one common driveway by allowing a shared driveway to service 12 units.

Peter said they cannot grant a variance for a regulation. **Randy Haight** (Meridian Land Service) said that is correct the Planning Board would need to grant a waiver from the regulations. **Randy** said they had gone to the Planning Board about a month ago to discuss a site review Housing for Older Persons application. The zoning allows four 4 housing units off one common driveway. Randy showed the Board the plan with the 4 common driveways with four units off each driveway and he also showed the Board the plan with a loop driveway that has access to each unit. Zoning doesn't allow for the loop to access all 12 units.

Peter read the letter from the Fire Department which stated they would prefer the loop driveway as opposed to the 4 common driveways. **Peter** asked Randy to clarify where the road and the driveway will be. **Randy Haight** (Meridian Land Services) said this will be a road from Route 130 to the hammer head and then it will become a common driveway. **Webb** read Zoning Ordinance Section 1806 Common Driveways.

"A common driveway is permitted to serve as access to all legal frontage lots in all zoning districts in accordance with all other provisions of the Zoning Ordinance and Section 7 of the Town of Brookline Subdivision Regulations to a maximum of four (4) lots."

Peter said our zoning ordinance doesn't address condominiums at all. **Randy** said that is correct. **Archer** said seeing as our ordinance doesn't refer to condominiums it would make sense that they treat it as one lot. A condominiums intent to be a little bit more clustered. We would need to decide as to what constitutes a lot at this point. **Randy** said when they submit this to the State, they will look at these 17 units as 17 lots.

Archer asked why the road is not extended around the whole loop. **Randy** said then you would have a 30 foot setback instead of 15 foot and it would wipe out all the buildable areas. **Webb** had asked about having a cul-de-sac. **Randy** said the Fire Department had said the loop would be better for emergency services. **Jodi Tochko** (abutter 30 Main Street) said she has lived there for

50 years and is concerned with the traffic in this area and the speed and to add this development she believes this is a huge safety concern in this location. **Webb** said you may want to discuss this with the Planning Board also as they are just looking at one piece of this tonight. Right now, they are only looking at the 4 common driveways vs the loop driveway.

The Board agreed to go through the application:

Peter read:

1. Granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest because:

Applicant Answer: The variance would eliminate 4 shared driveways for 12 units by consolidating them into one common shared driveway that would start on one side of the hammer head of the newly constructed town road that will service the development and would reconnect at the other side of the hammerhead.

The Board had no issues with this.

Peter read:

2. If the variance were granted, the spirit of the ordinance would be observed because:

Applicant Answer: Variance would greatly simplify emergency response to the development and would allow for a better flow of traffic than four common driveways, that's providing a safer and more efficient access way to the 12 units.

The Board agreed with this.

Peter read:

3. Granting the variance would do substantial justice because:

Applicant Answer: The proposal for the shared driveway was previously presented to the planning board and the board members were unanimous in favor of this option. The fire department was also in favor of this option. Granting this variance would allow the applicant to address the concerns of the planning board and fire department.

The Board had no issues with this.

Peter read:

4. If the variance were granted, the **values** of the surrounding properties would not be diminished because:

Applicant Answer: Allowing for one common driveway in a loop fashion would remove significant traffic congestion in and around the development and would provide for a significantly can't leave better traffic flow. It provides the best configuration for the development and thus would not diminish the property value of the surrounding properties.

The Board had no issues with this.

Peter read:

5. 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 purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property because:

Applicant Answer: The applicant could proceed with a driveway plan that meets the current regulations; however, strict compliance with the regulation would result in inadequate access from emergency services and would severely limit access by town fire apparatus. An unnecessary hardship is created from attempting to comply with the limitations on the maximum number of four lot taking access from one common driveway. Better emergency access is accomplished by the granting of this variance. In addition, the intention of the ordinance is to limit the number of houses on a dead-end driveway. With the granting of this variance, access would be a loop driveway and the need for any dead-end driveway would be eliminated for the 12 units

and:

- ii. The proposed use is a reasonable one because:

Applicant Answer: The intended design allows for better traffic flow and more adequate emergency service access and would eliminate the need for 4 dead-end private ways. This would enhance the overall visual of this site, as well as the emergency response for the homes within the development.

Webb said he believes this use is a reasonable use. **Webb made a motion that the Zoning Board finds that it would be an unnecessary hardship under section 5A of the application, if the ordinance is followed verbatim since it would then produce an inferior result to the proposed plan. The plan presented with the loop driveway is a better plan. Archer seconded. Vote yes 4-0.**

Webb read section 2203.02 3 (e) of the Brookline Zoning Ordinance which states “ There shall be a minimum of one (1) off-street parking space per dwelling unit. Where deemed to enhance the appearance, design and functionality of the development, shared driveways for up to four (4) dwelling units are acceptable.”

Archer made a motion that in Case 439A the Board Grant the variance from Section 1806 and Section 2203.02 3 (e) of the Brookline Zoning Ordinance to allow access for in excess of four lots by one common driveway, by allowing a shared driveway to service 12 units. Webb seconded. Vote yes 4-0.

Case 439B

Applicant Chrystal, Jay is requesting a **Variance** from Section 2204.01 of the Brookline Zoning Ordinance to permit the applicant to replace a community center with a pavilion shelter and recreation area. For **Lot H-42** consisting of 15.50 acres, located at **23/25 Main Street**.

Randy Haight (Meridian Land Services) said currently there is an existing duplex nearly entirely in the front setback. They could tear that down and make something smaller. The

zoning states a community center needs to be 1,000 sf. He believes that when this ordinance was written they wrote it thinking there would be 30 to 40 units in a Housing for Older Persons Development. The town had a Housing for Older Persons development that was proposed to have 42 duplex units brought to the Planning Board. There was a lawsuit filed and it never went any further. This development will only have 17 units so a community center would be a much larger cost burden for the unit owners to maintain. The town has a number of facilities that are very close that the residents can hold annual meetings at Brusch Hall is across the street, the legion hall, and the Fire Department. They would like to propose a pavilion and a recreation area with shuffleboard instead of a community center. This way they will still have a place to gather. They will also be adding sidewalks to this development. **Peter** asked if you add the recreation center where the house is now, how far away would the furthest house be. **Randy** said about 700 to 800 feet. **Archer** asked if they would have any parking available at the pavilion. **Randy** said yes, they could they did not plan on it. This road will be flat once the construction is finished. **Archer** said this will only be for resident use. **Randy** said yes of course. **Archer** asked how they plan to enforce that being that close to the road.

Tom Quarles (Abutter at 32 Main Street) said he is in attendance tonight to vigorously oppose this variance. To think that the fire department, Brusch Hall, and the legion hall would be a good place to use for a meeting is a non sequitur, they would have to rent these facilities. This ordinance is five pages and describes a comprehensive integrated community where the core is a community center, instead this applicant has treated this community center as a nuisance and is trying to ignore this by way of variance.

Housing for Older Persons has been allowed by zoning since 2003. For many years they have had a 20 acre minimum. There have been two significant changes that were voted in at the 2015 Town Meeting, one was the acreage was dropped from 20 acres to 10 acres and the age requirement went from age 62 to age 55 minimum for one person who lives in the house. The Planning Board minutes do not indicate why that change was made. As a result of that the property owner would have only been able to get a 7 single family home conventional development, he could sell the homes for \$500,000 each and he would gross about 3.5 million. Instead, due to the change in 2015 he is proposing 17 units which he could sell for \$350,000 each that puts his gross revenue at a little over 6 million dollars.

At the 2/17/2022 Planning Board meeting the applicant proposed that the existing building could be made into the community center. That is located on a busy state highway and is nowhere near the proposed units. Now they are proposing an open air pavilion at tonight's meeting. This would not be available to be used all year long. It is also not near the units. This ordinance states it needs to be centrally located and not near the busy road. **Tom** read Zoning Ordinance Section 2204.01 Community Center. "Community Center Requirements. Each Housing for Older Persons development must provide a Community Center intended to serve as the locus of community life and activities for the residents. Whenever possible, the Community Center shall be centrally located in relation to the housing units. The Community Center must be a minimum of one thousand (1,000) square feet in size and must include an activities / social room as well as a kitchen, laundry room and bathroom facilities. The main entrance to the community center must be handicap accessible. The Community Center requires one parking space to be provided per 200 sq. ft. of interior heated space. At least two handicapped parking spaces must be provided adjacent to the handicapped accessible main entrance."

This proposal is not a building, and it is not centrally located both are required. The developer has stated it will cost too much to build the community center. Cost is not a proper criteria for a variance.

Tom read the application:

1. Granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest because:

Applicant Answer: The intent of the ordinance is to provide an area that is “intended to serve as the locus of community life and activities for the residents : A pavilion shelter and outdoor recreation and congregating area would provide a space for community life and activities with less burden of cost, and the public interest would continue to be served.

Tom said that is a selective quote from that part of the ordinance. It needs to have all these different features and you have mentioned cost and that is an improper appeal and its not central location and no reason why. If you read the ordinance you want to have this in a central location.

Tom read:

2. If the variance were granted, the spirit of the ordinance would be observed because:

Applicant Answer: the provisions of a pavilion shelter and outdoor recreation and congregation area would still serve the spirit of the ordinance by continuing to provide a general space for community life and activities for the residents.

Tom said lack of centrality and lack of access to this facility. It is only available in warm weather. It is nowhere near the central core to the humans.

Tom read:

3. Granting the variance would do substantial justice because:

Applicant Answer: the development is limited to 17 units and the cost of building and maintaining a community center structure would be a potential burden to each unitowner. The cost of the build for a pavilion shelter and recreation area would be substantially less burdensome for the unit owners and the longterm maintenance and costs of same would continue to be much less that the costs of maintaining, heating and repairing a building structure.

Tom said again here is the appeal to the cost. This is the developer’s burden and not the unit owners.

Tom read:

4. If the variance were granted, the **values** of the surrounding properties would not be diminished because:

Applicant Answer: The replacement of a Community Center by a Pavilion Shelter and outside recreational area will not have any negative impact on the surrounding properties. It

will actually have a more positive impact on the surrounding properties. It will actually have a more positive impact on the surrounding properties by limiting the number of structures and preventing the crowding of an additional building on the subject site.

Tom said he takes issue with the statement “ It will actually have a more positive impact on surrounding properties” Ignoring that the centrally location of this building.

Tom read:

5. 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 purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property because:

Applicant Answer: The applicant could proceed with a Community Center that meets the current regulations; however, strict compliance with the regulation would result in an overburdensome cost impact for the unit owners. It is believed that the ordinance regarding Housing for Older Persons was intended to address larger developments than the one in question. This project only contains 17 units and strict compliance with regulations would result in higher longer term fees for the unit owners, as well as higher initial costs. It is the intent of the applicant to keep the units more generally affordable. An unnecessary hardship is created from attempting to comply with the requirements of a community center for such a small number of units.

and:

ii. The proposed use is a reasonable one because:

Applicant Answer: The applicant would still adhere to the spirit of the ordinance by providing an improved area for community life and recreational activities for the residents but would be able to offer more affordable units.

Tom said they are still stating they would like to keep costs down. It states “There is no evidence that this ordinance was intended for a larger development.” The verbiage about the community center has been unchanged since the creation of this ordinance.

Tom read: *The applicant would still adhere to the spirit of the ordinance by providing an improved area for community life and recreational activities for the residents, but would be able to offer more affordable units.*

Tom said again an improper appeal of the cost issue and he takes issue with the merit of them saying this is an improved area for community life it is not centrally located, and it is only available in the warmer months.

b. explain how, if the criteria in subparagraph (a) are not established, an unnecessary hardship would be deemed to exist if, and only if, owing to special conditions of the

property that distinguish it from other properties in the area, the property cannot be reasonably used in strict conformance with the ordinance, and a variance is therefore necessary to enable a reasonable use of it.

Applicant Answer: the unnecessary hardship in this instance is created by strict compliance with the ordinance. the property cannot be reasonable used as an affordable option for older person.

Tom said again this speaks to the uniqueness of the property. There is nothing unique about this property. It is similar to the adjacent properties in the downtown area. The only unique thing is the applicant keeps referring to is the cost issues and also there are meeting rooms available in town. They are considering an offsite meeting location, ignoring the required central location of the community center. He takes issue with the applicant's answer. He believes that this proposal is contrary to the spirit of the ordinance.

Brendan Denehy (31 Mason Road) said speaking as an individual resident and not a town elected official, he supports the idea of a pavilion and a recreation area, but he does not support the location. He also does not support replacing the community center. He was on the Planning Board when they came up with the change to this section, they were concerned with the town not having enough large lots to meet the requirement of the ordinance. The rationale was that the Housing for Old Persons units tend to be smaller. They could use the community center for gatherings like birthday parties and/or football parties etc. His concern with the house being torn down and having it put in this location is that it would be closer to the direct abutters than it would be to the units that it would be servicing. He would support the community center to be centrally located and a pavilion with a recreation area. He would encourage him to not tear down the existing historical house and would suggest he makes it into two of the units. **Peter** asked why they changed the age from 62 to 55. **Brendan** said at the time Valerie (Town Planner) had reached out to developers and they said the ordinance was too restrictive.

Jay said the state regulation was also 62 and they changed it to 55 around that time. **Jodi Tochko** (30 Main Street) said age 55 is relatively young. 62 was much more reasonable.

Tony Tochko (30 Main Street) said at 55 years old you are still apart of the working force in the community. There will be traffic coming in and out of there all day.

Archer asked why they chose the existing house area for the pavilion and not the center of the loop. **Randy** said it is a flat area and the center of the loop will be used for snow storage. They do not believe that this site warrants a community center. The ordinance says, if possible, to place it in the center. **Webb** said they need to decide tonight if this community center is important to this to this ordinance, if it is not, then they as a board can argue uses like this.

Archer said the applicant believes that some sort of center is needed in this proposal. **Jay Chrystal** (Applicant) said the people that are moving into these units are living on a fixed income and adding a community center will add to their monthly burden. The intended spirit was if they did not have to build the community center and they created a place for them to gather at it would keep their monthly costs down. He was looking at the ongoing cost for the unit owners. **Webb** said they are trying to build a small housing for older persons development and that does not work under this ordinance. **Peter** agreed. **Buddy Dougherty** (Ruonala Road) said he is listening to Mr. Quarles speaking against this proposal. There is no one there speaking for this proposal and that is why he is calling. You are getting bogged down by one person.

Peter said they are dealing with an ordinance that does not fit. He is in favor of this project, but he believes this section of the ordinance is flawed.

Webb said they still need to go through the points, he is puzzled, the first question they are going to ask is it contrary to the public interest and he does not know how to answer this. The second question is about the spirit and until they can find what the community this ordinance is supposed to deduce, they cannot speak to the spirit and then they have the hardship question. This he cannot answer question one as to this being contrary to the public interest or question two the Spirit of the ordinance and they still the hardship question under question 5.

Webb said the ordinance is specific that it wants, a 1,000 sf community center with bathroom facilities and laundry facilities. He would have to do some reading to see if they have the power to remove this requirement. **Peter** said he believes this sort of development is needed in the town and people are looking for this kind of development, but they have never had to grapple with this ordinance. **Randy** said he believes when the Planning Board amended this ordinance in 2015, they were trying to reduce the requirements and they overlooked the Community Center. **Webb** said he is not sure that this was an oversight. **Archer** said the question is what they can do; can we adjust an entire building away as apposed to adjusting a parameter.

The Board agreed to start going through the application.

Peter read the application:

1. Granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest because:

Peter said if they grant this would it be against the public interest and if so, is that all public or just the residents of this development. **Webb** thought that Brendan's statement that the community center will serve as additional area for the residences to be a compelling argument. This can be used by all the residents in this community, if their houses are modest, they could use this building for gatherings or parties and a Pavilion could only be used during certain times of the year. **Archer** said he believes the most relevant public would be the people who live in this development. **Webb** said a pavilion would not be enclosed and there would be no facilities. **Webb** agrees that the ordinance is flawed but he also believes the Community Center would be key to this development. He is leaning towards not granting this variance. He believes the spirit of this ordinance is to create a community, this statement is strewn throughout this ordinance. **Webb** he also does not want this to be the end run around building condominiums in town. **Archer** said he is ok with the public interest. **Charlotte** said she does not believe that a pavilion is adequate to the public interest, and it does not serve the community.

Peter read:

2. If the variance were granted, the spirit of the ordinance would be observed because:

Peter said is you read the purpose and intent of this section removing this would not meet the spirit. **Archer** said although the community center is not specifically mentioned in the purpose and intent section of the Housing for Older person's section. **Webb** said it is included in Section 2204.01 it is clear as to what the intention of the community center. **Archer** said the community center should be the focus of community life. **Charlotte** said she does not agree that it meets the spirit.

Webb made a motion to deny this variance request from section 2204.01 of the Brookline Zoning Ordinance asking to replace the community center with a pavilion shelter and recreational area for lot H-42 consisting of 15.50 acres, located at 23/25 Main Street. Archer seconded. Vote yes to deny this variance 4-0.

Adjourn

Webb made a motion to adjourn at 10:27 pm. Charlotte seconded. Vote yes 4-0.

Peter Cook, Chairman, _____

Archer Batcheller, Vice-Chairman, _____

Webb Scales, Member, Clerk, _____

Charlotte Pogue, Alternate, _____

Minutes submitted by Kristen Austin.

ZBA Meets when needed on the second Wednesday of the Month.