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**BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT**

**MINUTES**

 **Wednesday October 11, 2023**

**7:30pm**

**Present: Peter Cook, Chairman**

 **Archer Batcheller, Vice Chairman**

 **Webb Scales, Member, Clerk**

 **Dan Marcek Jr., Member**

 **Marcia Farwell, Member**

 **Dave Partridge, Alternate**

**Absent: Charlotte Pogue, 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.

**Case 456**

**Peter** read the hearing notice “Applicant Farm Boy Properties, LLC is requesting a Variance from Section 2203.02 of the Brookline Zoning Ordinance to allow a three (3) unit apartment building as a Housing for Older Persons Development on 1.28 acres of land when 10 contiguous acres are required for lot D-73, located at 199 Route 13, consisting of 1.28 acres.”

The fees have been paid and the abutters notified.

Attorney Robert Parodi in attendance with Ben Senter (Owner of Lot D-73), also in attendance John Liska (Abutter).

**Bob** stated that this lot was created before 1973 before Zoning. This is a smaller lot with a 4,500 sf building constructed in 1985.

Applicant, Farm Boy Properties, LLC is requesting a Variance from Section 2203.02 of the Brookline Zoning Ordinance to allow a three (3) unit apartment building as a Housing for Older Persons Development on 1.28 acres of land when ten (10) contiguous acres are required for Lot D-73 located at 199 Route 13.

**Bob** read his summary: The Applicant seeks to convert an existing building of approximately 4,500 square feet to an apartment building consisting of three (3) two bedroom units, each unit being at least seven hundred fifty (750) square feet and as Housing for Older Persons. The existing structure will remain with modifications. The existing structure presently looks like a home and will continue to look like a home. An existing well provides an adequate quality water source. An existing septic system may be utilized or may need upgrading. The existing structure provides enough space for the three (3) two bedroom units and a community room. It is believed the lot meets frontage, setback and open space requirements.

**Public Interest:**

**Granting of the variance would not be contrary to public interest because:**

* The variance request does not conflict with the purpose of the ordinance.
* Granting of the variance would not alter the essential character of the neighborhood, nor threaten public health, safety or welfare or otherwise injure "public rights".
* This is an existing building which looks residential.
* Surrounding properties include residential dwellings.
* Granting the variance would result in fewer vehicles entering from and exiting onto Route 13.

**Spirit of Ordinance Observed:**

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

The fundamental purposes of the Housing for Older Persons Developments Ordinance are stated at 2201.00 of the Zoning and Land Use Ordinance and are as follows:

1. **Purpose and Intent**
2. It is a goal of the Town of Brookline to promote the development of housing designed to meet the special needs of older persons.
3. This ordinance operates as an Overlay Zoning District.
4. It is the intent of the Town of Brookline to provide for the special needs of older persons by allowing for Housing for Older Persons developments with unique dimensional and institutional requirements that meet the social, mobility and safety needs of this age group.
5. Housing developed in this section must be established and maintained in compliance with all applicable state and federal laws with respect to such housing and/or medical care, including the Fair Housing Act, as amended, 42 USC Sec 3601 et seq., NH RSA 354-A:15 and the NH Code of Administrative Rules, Hum 300 et seq.
6. Pursuant to RSA 354-A:15, II and III, it is recognized that prohibitions against housing discrimination do not apply to housing for older persons, which conforms to all applicable rules and regulations.
7. The intent of this ordinance is to foster development of housing for older persons while detailing local planning standards and, where practical, promoting consistency with land use policies in the Brookline master plan, zoning ordinance and subdivision and site plan regulations.
8. It is the intent of this ordinance to regulate the intensity and mix of different types of dwelling units required to meet the needs of those citizens so as to provide ample indoor and outdoor livable space and to retain a sense of personal identity, intimacy and human scale within the development.
9. It is the intent of this ordinance to review the density, scale and spacing of buildings, and the traffic circulation and parking pattern within the development to ensure that adequate light, air, privacy, community space, landscaping and open space for passive and active recreation are provided within the development.
* The granting of the requested variance completely and totally meets the spirit, intent and purposes of the ordinance.
* Spirit of the ordinance is to promote the housing for older people.
* Granting of the variance does not alter the essential character of the neighborhood, nor threaten public health, safety or welfare, or otherwise injure "public rights".

**Substantial Justice:**

**Granting the variance would do substantial justice because:**

* The applicant has an existing property where the use as Housing for Older Persons is a good and reasonable use.
* There will be no harm to the general public.
* The general public gains nothing by denial of the requested variance. The Applicant would be adversely impacted by denial of the requested variance. The granting of the requested variance would prevent an injustice to the Applicant.

**No diminution in values to surrounding properties.**

* As noted, the structure and improvements already exist, including the building, well, septic, and driveway. No substantial changes are to be made the structure and improvements. Rehabilitations of the property will increase its value and that of the surrounding properties.

**Hardship / Special Conditions:**

* The lot was created in 1973 prior to the establishment of the Brookline Planning Board. The building was constructed around 1985.
* The building looks like a residential structure and in fact has historically had residential tenants among other uses such as offices and restaurants.
* The lot is 1.28 acres and not the required ten (10) acres needed for Housing for Older Persons Development.
* The use as Housing for Older Persons is an allowable use in the district.
* As noted, the structure and improvements already exist. The use as Housing for Older Persons is allowable. The only criteria lacking is the lot size. All the purposes and intent of the ordinance are met despite the lot size. There is residential usage of surrounding properties. The granting of the requested variance would be compatible and consistent with existing uses in the neighborhood.

**No fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purposes of the ordinance and the specific application of the ten (10) acre minimum provision.**

-No fair and substantial relationship exists between the purpose of the Housing for Older Persons Developments and the size of this lot as the Applicant meets all of the purposes and intents of the ordinance. The improvements on this lot already exist so this is not a situation where an Applicant is intending to construct, but to convert existing improvement to much needed Housing for Older Persons.

- Nothing in the purposes of the ordinance indicates a need for a minimum often (10) acres of land.

-If this were a ten (10) acres parcel, then a sixty (60) bedroom apartment building would be allowed without the need of a variance.

-The applicant wants to change the existing structure to three (3), two (2) bedroom apartment units using the existing well, septic and drives.

-No substantial changes to the physical structures or improvements are contemplated except for internal renovations of the building's interior.

-The proposed conversion of an existing structure to a three (3) unit apartment building as Housing for Older Persons is both an allowable use and reasonable. Housing for Older Persons is recognized in both Brookline and the State as needed and lacking. The granting of this variance will help fill the need for affordable housing or our older population. See generally, 2023 Regional Housing Needs Assessment by Nashua Regional Planning Commission.

**Proposed use is reasonable:**

The proposed use as Housing for Older Persons is both an allowable, thus a reasonable use, as well as a form of housing which is beneficial to the Town.

**SUMMARY**

The granting of this variance to allow a Housing for Older Persons Development will not unduly or adversely impact the Town.

In granting this variance, the Applicant requests that the Board also find that any building permits needed for this Housing for Older Persons Development be exempt from the Growth Management Ordinance and any such permits issued shall not be counted against the permits allowed under the Growth Management Ordinance Section 1405.

Bob stated if this was a ten acre lot, they could put a 60 bedroom development in, they are only asking for a 6 bedroom development because this lot consists of 1.28 acres. This building can accommodate a community center in the basement area, and they have sufficient frontage.

The property appears as though it was residential as the current owner had to evict someone who had been living at this location. If this variance is granted there will be less traffic going to this property as it was a restaurant.

Archer asked what the current status of this building is. Bob said apartments were rented in the past, but they were not legal apartments, there was also a restaurant, it is empty at the moment. Ben said he had to evict the tenants that had been living there for 13 years. Webb said you stated that there would be no significant changes to the outside of the building, but the Ordinance does require covered parking. Bob said they still need to go to the Planning Board, and they do intend to meet those ordinance requirements. Webb said it will also require 1/4 an acre for a recreational area. Webb stated that this will be a residential use in a commercial district, Housing for Older Persons is allowed in the Commercial Industrial district. Webb asked how many square feet the Community Center would be. Bob said it's about 1,000 sf. Ben said it's a walkout basement no stairs to climb all apartments will be ground level. They are trying to avoid stairs and would like to have all the apartments and the community room ADA compliant. Marsha asked how you would get from the second floor of the building to the common area. Ben said they can drive down the front, or they can walk down the driveway to the front of the building. Webb stated that the ordinance requires it to be ADA compliant. John Liska (Abutter) said this was originally built as a home and was also used as a real estate office. He thinks this would be a great accent compared to what has been there over the course of the last few years. Dan said open space doesn't seem to be part of this plan, there should be 1/4 of an acre that should be open for recreational use. Ben said he can make trails, walkways, and some picnic areas to accommodate for the recreational area that is required. Bob said to the rear of the property is land for the recreational area required. Webb said the Housing for Older Person in a commercial industrial area does not require to have site permitter buffer. Michele Decoteau (Town Planner) stated that buffers are required even in commercial district. She would also note that the entrance for the abutting property uses the same entrance as this lot. Bob said it is up to the Planning Board to determine the buffer that’s not for tonight’s meeting. Ben said they have a smaller lot and are looking to accommodate less bedrooms than the ten acres lots. with10 acres there would be 60 bedrooms and with the 1.28 acres they are only asking to add 6 bedrooms. Michele D. said if you waive the 10 acres can all of these requirements of this ordinance still fit this lot. Webb said even if they waive the 10 acres the Planning Board can still say it doesn’t fit. Peter said we are just dealing with the 10 acre issue at tonight’s meeting. Ben said he believes the restriction, or the 10 acre requirement went with the spirit of saying you can have two bedrooms per acre. If he had 10 acres, he wouldn't need a variance to put 60 bedrooms on this lot. He is only asking for a 6 bedroom unit on a smaller lot. Peter asked if anyone knew why 10 acres was picked when the ordinance was written. Michele stated she thought that was picked to have enough room on a lot where there is enough room for the development on that lot and to have a dynamic social life. You want to have it big enough to be financially viable for a developer to want to come in and build one of these developments. The ordinance was originally written as 20 acres, and they didn’t have any applications for that. It was then reduced to 10 acres. Bob said don’t go beyond what is written in the Purpose and Intent of this ordinance. Section 2201 doesn’t tie it to needing 10 acres. That’s the hardship. Peter said it doesn’t say why it requires 10 acres.

**Webb** said it states right on the top of Ordinance Section 2200 such housing must be well cited and designed to meet the special needs of this age group. The question is can we accomplish that with less than 10 acres. **Dan** said we need to explain that the open space for passive outdoor recreation is an integral part of an older person’s development. Does this lot have enough area for this. **Webb** said he suspects the 10 acres requirement is geared more toward the residential district where you would need more space. That doesn’t apply to this plan because the building already exists. **Bob** stated we are not proposing to build this, it already exists.

**Ben** said he thinks there would be a lot less traffic at this location with three apartments than with the restaurant. The Board had a discussion about the septic. **Ben** said the septic that is there if it is not adequate, he will have it built to what is needed for this application. **Archer** said do you think the property is distinct from new construct of a similar size property and similar number of units in either an industrial commercial zone or a residential zone, would the reason still apply with new construction. **Bob** stated this is unique because the building exists on a smaller lot and the building was there before the creation of the Planning Board.

**Dan** said we want this to succeed because we need this kind of housing, but this is not just about the building it’s about the environment of the development as well.

**Peter** stated they should make a finding that there is no substantial need for ten acres in this particular case. **Webb** said they need to determine why there needs to be ten acres, if you are subject to the residential agricultural zone, you need the space, but because of the different in the way the ordinance is designed to be applied in the commercial industrial zone he doesn’t believe they need that much space. They need an adequate amount of recreational space of which he is not sure how to calculate what is adequate. **Dan** said it states in the ordinance that it should be 20% of the lot. **Webb** read interconnecting walkways, trails and walking paths shall be an integral part of the Housing for Older persons Development.

Peter made a motion that the Board finds no substantial reason for requiring the 10 acres for this proposed development. Webb seconds. Vote yes 5-0.

Peter read:

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

Dan abstained but the remainder of the Board agreed.

Peter read:

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

Dan abstained but the remainder of the Board agreed.

Peter read:

3.Granting the variance would do substantial justice because:

The Board agreed.

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

The Board agreed.

5.Unnecessary Hardship

1. 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:
	1. 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 because:

**Webb** stated that he believes that the use is reasonable and that 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 and therefore he deems that an unnecessary hardship would exist. The Board agreed with the exception of Marica who abstained.

**Webb** asked if they should discuss building permits. **Archer** said yes, they should. **Webb** said they will need permits for renovations, but he doesn’t believe that a renovation permit would count towards the Growth Ordinance. **Archer** agreed. **Michele** stated if you are converting a commercial building into living space it would count toward the Growth Management Ordinance. You will need a building permit to get a CO. **Bob** said we don’t need a building permit the building exists. **Webb** stated you will need an electrical permit and plumbing permits. **Michele** said it’s not an electrical permit or putting on a deck permit its the creating a dwelling unit permit. **Michele** said this will be a change of use. **Ben** said it is a commercial business with residents in the building.

**Eddy Arnold** read Section 1404.00 definitions, building permit, for the construction of a dwelling unit. And because you are changing the use to dwelling units you are constructing.

**Webb** said the application requests that any permits would not be counted toward the growth Ordinance. **Bob** said the same as you had last month with case 454. **Webb** said this request wasn’t noticed with this application. **Peter** said if it wasn’t noticed he is reluctant to address this. The board agreed.

**Webb made a motion that in ZBA case #456 the Board grants the Variance request from Farm Boy Properties LLC to permit a housing for Older Persons Development on lot D-73 consisting of 1.28 acres and not the 10 acres as stated in section 2203.02 of the Brookline Zoning Ordinance. Marcia seconded. Vote yes 5-0.**

**Peter** said your request for a Variance has been granted. You will be receiving written notice of this decision in a few days, and it will be available tomorrow. You, the Select Board, the abutters, and anyone directly affected by this decision have the right to request that the Board hold a rehearing on this case. A request for a rehearing must be submitted in writing to the Town Offices no more than 30 days from today and must fully explain why the Board should grant a rehearing. A request for a rehearing is a necessary precondition for appealing the Board’s decision to Superior Court. In the absence of a request for a rehearing, the decision will become final and unappealable.

**Mail – Letter from Planning Board requesting a rehearing for Case # 454**

**Peter** read a letter submitted by the Planning Board:

“The Planning Board is requesting a rehearing of Case No: 454 dated 09/14/2023.

In accordance with RSA 677:2, the Planning Board qualifies as an entity directly affected by the decision in case 454. The Planning Board is directly affected by the decision because any action taken to develop the property, D-030, would be under the jurisdiction of the Planning Board. Any subsequent approval for development of this property by the Planning Board would rest on the foundation of the ZBA decision. It is important the decision be detailed and complete as to the exact nature and scope of the relief granted to a specific development.

The Planning Board is requesting a rehearing to reconsider the Conditions and Findings of Facts in the written Notice of Decision dated 09/14/2023. The written Notice of Decision for case 454 lacks detail on the type and scope of the development granted the variance and the Findings of Facts does not detail how the relief granted would not unduly impact the town.

The Decision lacks description of the type of development and does not reference the application, conceptual plan, minutes, or any other detail regarding the development. The scope of the decision was not quantified either in terms of a maximum number of units, or in terms of a reference to a specific plan. In addition, there was no date of expiration of the variance if it is not exercised.

The Findings of Fact are lacking in detail about how a development on D-030 would not be contrary to the public interest because it would not unduly impact the town. No other variance criteria or facts are presented.”

**Webb** stated he doesn’t believe that anything in this letter presents grounds for a rehearing. He also didn’t see anything that presents flaws in our decision. The letter states the notice of decision is flawed and the minutes from that meeting are not available. He would propose remedying this by having the Board reissue the notice of decision and approving the minutes. **Archer** said he agrees it seems that they just wanted more detail on our decision. **Webb** said all they were asked to decide was whether this HOP should adhere to the Growth Management Ordinance, and they decided it should not. We also made the decision that the permits shouldn’t adhere to the Growth Ordinance. It still needs to adhere to the size of the development, and it will need a community building and recreational area etc. **Marcia** said they still need to go to the Planning Board for all that.

**Peter** said they also stated that we were missing the variance expiration date. **Webb** read “A variance expires within two years from being approved unless the local ordinance allows a greater time period or if such was included within the decision of the ZBA. Further, there is now a six month window within which the variance remains valid following the resolution of a planning application filed in reliance upon the variance.” (RSA 674:33 I -a.) That is all written out for us.

**Webb** said the letter states the decision notice was lacking details on the type and scope of the development granted and that is not what they were asked to review they were only asked to waive the Growth Ordinance for the proposed HOP development. The notice of decision doesn’t have to reflect the findings, they must be listed in our minutes.

**Webb made a motion not to grant a rehearing on the request of the Planning Board. Dan seconded. Vote yes 5-0.**

**Mail – Letter from Selectboard requesting a rehearing for Case # 454**

**Peter** read a rehearing request from the Selectboard:

The Brookline Selectboard is formally requesting a rehearing of Case No: 454 dated 9/14/2023.

As stated in RSA 677:2, the Selectboard qualifies as an entity directly affected by the decision in Case 454. The Selectboard is thereby requesting a rehearing to reconsider the Conditions and Findings of Facts in the written Notice of Decision dated 09/14/2023. We are looking for the details that led to the conclusion that the variance would not be against the public interest and that relief from the Growth Management Ordinance would not unduly burden the town.

The claims that were made in the meeting on 9/13/2023 regarding impact to town services are unfounded and lack merit. Brookline Zoning Ordinance 2202.00 (a) simply requires that "at least 80 percent of the occupied units are occupied by at least one person who is 55 years of age or older." The statements made by the applicant led the Board and the public to believe that this development would have little impact on town services and schools. The fact is that nowhere in our Zoning does it prohibit school­ aged children from living in this development.

Further, the written Notice of Decision lacks mention of the other three conditions that must be met to legally be granted a variance as per Appendix B of the 2022 ZBA handbook. Namely, that the variance would do substantial justice, that the surrounding properties would not be diminished in value, and that a denial of this variance would result in unnecessary hardship.

The written Notice of Decision for this case does not include specific detail on the entire scope of the development and the Findings of Facts does not explain why granting this relief would not unduly impact the town. In particular, the ZBA's decision does not identify how many units will be in this development. While the applicant mentioned 30 units as a possibility, the conceptual proposal presented to the Planning Board in 2021 had the number of possible units varying between 30 and 42, and in correspondence with the Selectboard in 2022, the figure was as high as 48. Also, the decision granted to the applicant doesn't refer to 'Housing for Older Persons' and the applicant could build a standard development with an unspecified number of houses.

Additionally, this decision removes the need for phasing over multiple years. Having an unlimited number of dwellings built in one year could impact not only the schools but the ability of the town to provide emergency services, the ability of the Building Officer to manage the influx of permits the Building Official to manage the influx of permits and to perform the necessary inspections of 30-40 dwellings, and the ability to provide adequate town facility space for general use. This also directly contradicts the will of the Brookline voters, who just recently added Housing for Older Persons to the Growth Management Ordinance.

With respect to the substantial justice test, it is unclear what, if any, substantial justice is being achieved through this decision. What is special about this lot that necessitates the granting of a variance from the Growth Management Ordinance? Why is this lot different than any other lot that would normally be denied a variance from the ordinance?

Finally, what is special about this lot that proves a hardship would be incurred if the variance was not granted and how has the applicant proven that development could not proceed without the granting. Of this variance? RSA 674:33, I(b)(S) provides the criteria for establishing unnecessary hardship.

In summary, the Brookline Selectboard is appealing the decision of the Brookline Zoning Board of Adjustment in Case No: 454 due to the lack of phasing, lack of specified number of units allowed, and the disregard of the Brookline Growth Management Ordinance.

Respectfully submitted, Brookline Selectboard

**Webb** reviewed section 2202 a “Housing for Older Persons Development. at development intended and operated for occupancy by persons 55 years of age or older where at least 80% of the occupied units are occupied by at least one person who is 55 years of age or older, the facility publishes an adheres to policies and procedures that maintain the developments statues as an age restricted community in the facility or community complies with the rules adopted by the state Commission for human rights from verification of occupancy.” **Archer** stated only one occupant has to be 55 and or older but there is no new evidence stating how many school age children that would be there. **Webb** said he believes that they pointed out to the developer that it is likely that there would be school aged children in this development. **Peter** said they had specifically referenced the 30 unit proposed HOP. **Webb** said they state there would be an impact on the town’s ability to provide emergency services and an added burden to the Building Inspector and the ability to provide adequate town facility space for their general use. **Archer** stated without granting the variance this could still be built, it would just be built over time. **Dan** said if this is phased, the town could account for that increase in demand for town services over time. **Peter** reviewed the original application. **Archer** said he is sympathetic that the decision notice doesn’t state it is for a HOP development. **Webb** said we need to change the decision notice to state that they granted this as long as they build an HOP. **Webb** stated it was argued tonight that there is a need and value to this kind of development. The applicant bluntly stated if this wasn’t granted, they would not be able to build this. **Webb** said the state said any perk that the HOP gets the Work Force Housing should get that also so we added the HOP development to the Grown Management Ordinance under duress last year. He doesn’t believe that our decision in case 454 contradicted what the Brookline voters wanted. **Archer** stated that the voters had put in the HOP provision, and we had a developer state they would not be able to build it unless it doesn’t have to adhere to the Growth Ordinance. **Webb** said the Selectboard wished they had taken the burden of the Building Inspect and Emergency Services into account more than we did. He believed that they reached the decision and weighed in on that and he doesn’t find that to be enough compelling evidence to need a rehearing. He does believe they need to correct the decision notice. **Eddy** asked if the draft minutes could be emailed to the Selectboard if they are not approved at tonight’s meeting.

**Peter** read the condition “that this development be granted with the condition that this development is exempt from the Growth Ordinance and the Building Permits issued to the application for this development will not be counted under the Brookline Zoning Ordinance Section 1405.4”.

**Archer** so we need to change the condition to state an HOP Development. They applied for an Elderly Development and did not reference the HOP Development Ordinance, only the Growth Ordinance.

**Peter** said the flaw is in what they applied for. **Webb** we should have said the waiver from the Grown Ordinance should have been for the Housing for Older Persons. **Dan** said they didn’t take into account the emergency services, but they did account for the Building Inspector. Also, who is going to make sure the people that live there will be 55 or older. **Webb** states that is all laid out in the Ordinance under section 2206 Complains.

**Webb made a motion to grant a rehearing at the request of the Selectboard. Marcia seconded. Vote yes 5-0.**

**Adjourn**

**Marcia made a motion to adjourn at 10:05 pm. Dan seconded. Vote yes 5-0.**

**Peter Cook, Chairman, \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Archer Batcheller, Vice-Chairman, \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Webb Scales, Member, Clerk, \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Dan Marcek Jr, Member, \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Marcia Farwell, Member, \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Minutes submitted by Kristen Austin.**

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