



ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
MINUTES OF MEETING OF JANUARY 19, 2010
APPROVED FEBRUARY 22, 2010

Present: S. Bogert, **Chairman;** S. Perley, **Secretary;** O. Gibbs (alternate), J. Tivnan (alternate)

Absent: D. Greski, R. Tautkus, P. Lambert

Staff: S. Saunders, **Planning Director;** K. Snow, **Zoning Technician**

S. Bogert opened the meeting at 7 pm. He announced that the 2 alternates, J. Tivnan and O. Gibbs, would be seated as full board members for the evening.

HEARINGS:

Application # 209-00043
B. & C. Florio

MSL # 374-291-16
88 Morningside Drive

RS Zone
Area Variance

The applicant is requesting an area variance from 235-35(A) in order construct a new entrance area which will protrude into the front setback. The proposal will allow for a front setback of about 7.5 feet; the required setback in this zone is 25'.

Applicant: Doug Hill appeared, along with the applicants, Brendan and Lynn Florio. Judy McShane, a local real estate agent, was also in attendance. D. Hill gave the location of the property and showed a plan of the neighborhood. The property fronts on Lake Opechee.

The Florio's are seeking setback variance to locate a new roof and entry walkway. This will be an open sided entry porch. The front setback is 25' here. The porch eave line will be 12.1' from the side and 25' from the pavement. The face will be at 14.1 ft. D. Hill showed both the existing and the proposed; he showed the ground stone/brick walk from the existing drive to the entry.

The existing walk is 11' ft from the sideline now. The floor of the new entry will be 3' further away from the street line than the present walkway. The eave line of the new roof will be about 1 ft further back than the current walkway; there is no roof over it now. The eave line will be 7' closer to the street than the eave line of the existing building.

This is a 1950's style building, and it has been empty for several years. It needs re-hab badly. D. Hill passed out a photo of the house, which he said was taken some time ago. He thinks it was probably designed for a snow bird as the existing entry is directly below the front pitch of the roof. Snow and ice come straight onto the present walkway. The Florio's and architect Peter Stewart looked at the issue to see what could be done to better this. There is a garage on the north end of the home. The drive comes in with the walk to the right leading to the door. They could not place a new entry there. The other end is where the bedrooms are located.

There is a door in the far back of the garage. The only other entry is in the front. They could not find an alternate location where a conforming entry could be located. The existing building is 5' into the setback now so anything done to the front would require a variance. The entry needs to remain in the middle where it is now located.

The land slopes down on the south end so this is the only place to put the entry. Peter Stewart did the work, and he determined he cannot locate an entry elsewhere. B. Florio has on going back issues and a parent who is wheelchair bound so they want an entry here in order to be able to come in and out easily.

Safer winter access by a walker or wheelchair could be done if this variance is granted. There will be no new enclosed space, and they are just changing the roofline to create a small roof cover over the entrance area.

This is a 0.39 acre lot which was established before current setbacks were in place. The home is already 5' into the setback. The existing uncovered walk is 11' from the sideline of the street.

The lot is bounded on the West by Morningside and on the East by the lake. The abutter to the North is the common beach. The abutters approve of the plan; D. Hill passed out copies of letters stating they were in agreement and agreed to the variance. This application was done under Boccia but the new rules apply for applications taken after January 1.

The area variance is needed and would be consistent with the ordinance as this is consistent with the neighborhood. These homes were built before current regulations were passed. The neighborhood is entirely developed with smaller lots, with most less than 1/2 an acre. D. Hill showed homes, which he shaded in red, those that have an existing setback violation. The pattern in the neighborhood is the smaller lots, with none over .45 acre, and closer to the lot line than currently allowed.

Literal enforcement of the ordinance results in unnecessary hardship as the variance is needed to enable the homeowner safe use of the property. The special conditions are that the non-conformity is already in existence. The property encroaches into the setback, and the neighborhood has similar violations. There is also no place for a safe all weather entry on the north side due to the garage, or on the south because of bedroom locations.

The use of the property is residential. The structure at the eave line will be about 7 ft further out than the existing, which is shown in photographs. The benefit sought is a safe, covered access to the home with no snow/ice coming down onto the entry.

Benefit sought: cannot be achieved in another method as there is no other location for the covered entry due to the sloping ground, and the location of the garage and the bedrooms. The home is oriented around the central entrance and hall way.

This variance would not be contrary to public interest as this is a residential neighborhood and this proposal won't impact that. There are already setback violations in existence on this lot and others in the neighborhood. The opinions of abutters were in favor of the approval and letters were submitted verifying that.

This is consistent with the spirit of the ordinance as this is a residential use in a residential neighborhood. This is a small relief based on the preexisting conditions.

Substantial justice is done as denying this proposal would not serve public interest; it would potentially hurt it. An improved access is accepted as a condition for approving a variance. This won't hurt the city, the neighborhood or the environment. There would be no building on the lake side of the property.

The proposed porch will be almost invisible from adjoining properties. It doesn't project too far out and there are trees. This provides safe access to the home, including those with mobility problems.

The value of surrounding properties will not be diminished. The new entry porch is a safety element and also provides an aesthetic improvement to the home. D. Hill said they feel the proposed roofline gives the front a more contemporary and graceful look. Also take into consideration the impact of what the locals think of the proposal, and all are happy with it.

D. Hill introduced Judy McShane, who has 22 years of real estate experience: S. Bogert asked a few qualifying questions of J. McShane who stated she was the buyers agent, so has a fiduciary responsibility to the buyers.

J. McShane said this is her third transaction with the Florio's; they have improved all of the properties they purchased. They are interviewing multiple contractors to have this done work properly and this will only improve the neighborhood.

D. Hill stated that all standards are met, and that this will be a credit to the neighborhood. The Florio's want to renovate the property and make this good for the entire neighborhood.

D. Hill asked if the Planning Department wanted any of the plans he presented and S. Saunders stated we would take the marked up tax map for our records.

S. Bogert said that D. Hill had mentioned that these homes are in violation; they are actually not in violation, but are non-conforming. D. Hill clarified that he meant that they violate the present ordinance but pre-existed it.

In the photo of the roofline, S. Bogert asked for clarification on where the walkway comes into it. D. Hill showed the board on the plans and said it comes off of the driveway. He showed the edge of the garage door and said the pavement lines up with the edge of the garage door. S. Bogert asked for clarification on the slope of the roof, and said it appears to be the same as what is there now. D. Hill explained. S. Bogert said that the shed roof appears to fall in the same place and D. Hill said the entire walkway is under the "fall zone" now. S. Bogert said he feels snow/ice will fall in the same place.

J. Tivnan asked if there is living space behind the garage and was told there is a pantry area. D. Hill said people would have to pass the cars and enter.

Brendan Florio said you can barely get a car all the way in; the area is not deep. You could not get a wheelchair in this way. There is a doorway into the home, which leads into a narrow hallway, and a wheelchair could not maneuver thru this space. This doorway isn't wide enough to allow wheelchair access.

Public: No one from public spoke for or against the application.

Board: S. Perley asked about the entry and S. Bogert said he doesn't feel this proposal fixes anything. O. Gibbs said it covers the entry so there is no snow in front of the door but still allows it to fall from the roof.

B. Florio stated that the entire walk gets snow and ice off of the roof; there is no way to engineer this so there is no snow/ice on the walk. This is the best way they came up with. They will have a small area, and stepping onto the low porch is much easier to navigate a wheelchair in just this one area. The porch will be level with the entry/foyer into home. They will have a small ramp. This is a vast improvement over current conditions.

D. Hill asked the board to consider the standards for variance. They know this won't solve all the issues but they feel this does solve substantial issues.

S. Bogert closed the hearing to the public at 7:50 pm.

The board had no further questions.

Motion: S. Perley moved to approve application # 2009-00043 for an area variance to construct the covered open entrance way within the 25 ft front setback.

The special conditions are that this is a residential use in a residential neighborhood, and the current non-conformity is preexisting. It predates the current setback requirements. The existing locations of the garage, and bedrooms allows no other area to place the entry.

The benefit sought cannot be achieved in another method. The front of the home is already into the setback, and the entry in the middle is the only place to put this.

This is not contrary to public interest as we received written approval from the abutters and this would improve the neighborhood.

This is consistent with the spirit of the ordinance as this is a residential use in a residential district. There would be no environmental impact to Lake Opechee as the construction would be on the street side.

Substantial justice is done as the porch would be on the street side, not the lake; so there is no environmental impact to the site.

The proposal won't diminish values but will improve the surrounding properties and give a safety element to the applicant.

J. Tivnan seconded the motion and all voted in favor of approval, 4-0, for the following reasons:

a) Special conditions exist such that literal enforcement of the ordinance results in unnecessary hardship.

i. An area variance is needed to enable the applicant's proposed use of the property given the special conditions of the property; This is a residential use in a residential neighborhood; the current non-conformity is pre-existing and pre-dates current setback requirements. The existing location of the garage and bedrooms allows no other placement of the entry; **AND**

ii. The benefit sought by the applicant cannot be achieved by some other method reasonably feasible for the applicant to pursue, other than an area variance; The benefit sought cannot be achieved in another fashion. The front of the house is already into the setback, and having the entry in the middle is the only place to put this; **AND**

(b) The variance will not be contrary to the public interest; This is not contrary to public interest. The board received written approval from the abutters; **AND**

(c) The variance is consistent with the spirit of the ordinance; This is consistent with the spirit of the ordinance as this is a residential use in a residential district. There will be no environmental impact to Lake Opechee as any construction would be on the street side of the property; **AND**

(d) Substantial justice is done; Substantial justice is done as the porch/entry will be on the street side so there is no environmental impact to the site; **AND**

(e) The value of surrounding properties will not be diminished; This proposal should improve the surrounding property values and give a safety element to the applicant.

Application # 2009-00044

MSL # 103-403-2

SFR Zone

G. Potter

105 Maiden Lady Cove Lane

Area Variance

The applicant is asking for an area variance from 235-35 (A) and (B) in order to add a second story to an existing structure which will be demolished and rebuilt on the same footprint. The current front setback ranges from 5 – 10'. In the SFR the front setback is 25 ft and the side setback is 10 ft. The property is currently non-conforming and is located within the SPOD.

Applicant: George Potter appeared for the proposal. He and his wife have owned the property for 25 years. They currently live in Bedford, NH and come up to visit as much as they can in the summer. This is the second to last lot in Laconia before entering Meredith along the shoreline.

They want to continue to enjoy the property. This was actually 2 lots, which they purchased separately. It was non-conforming, and at some point became merged as one lot. The subdivision was done back in the 50's.

The cottage has 3 sections; the first one was built in the 50's when they purchased it. Potter and his sons later built a second addition. About 10 years ago they had a contractor do the third section. The section on the right hand side is the good side. He comes up to check on it in the winter, but doesn't even rake the roof, and it has lasted all these years. They found severe rot under the older sections as he built the floor line below ground, so there is water damage.

G. Potter said they want to demolish this portion as the rot is very bad along the sills. They would be keeping the exact same footprint, and adding no additional sq footage. They do want to use attic space so you can walk upright, with a normal size ceiling of about 7-8 ft.

There is no change in the footprint at all. They will demolish about 2/3's of the structure. At the highest elevation, they will go up 5.5 ft higher than is now. In the loft they would be adding about 3 ft, and the footings add about 2 ft. The height would be 20.3 ft and the zoning max is 35 ft, so it will be under that.

He said this proposal is pretty much in keeping with the neighborhood. The majority of the residents use the attic area. They access the property through Needle Eye Road in Meredith. Maiden Lady Cove Road is gated in Laconia. In Scenic Cove Cottages, all but one unit are now 2 stories high.

This structure will remain seasonal. He said that he and his wife plan to stay there all summer this year and buy a small condo for the winter. This is built on cement blocks, and they use water from the lake. The Scenic Railroad runs along here. They cannot figure out how to drill a well on the property because of its restrictions.

J. Tivnan asked if they need to go to DES for the Shoreline Protection Act first and S. Saunders said that there were questions with the new rules regarding second story additions. Under the old rules they did, but not under the new rules. She e-mailed the state for clarification but did not get a response yet. She will follow up on that but the board can make this a condition of approval that the permit be obtained, if needed.

G. Potter said he spoke with the state, who said it is not needed if the footprint isn't being changed.

They are adding vertical height to provide higher sill elevation. They will meet codes, and put windows in the front to allow air flow. They have to bend over to store things in the attic. The size is the same, at 646 sf. The rot will be fixed. The new windows will allow for natural light and air flow. There is no other way to

provide the benefits. The floor must be replaced so they would like to get the extra 3 ft upstairs and get the building off the ground at the same time. G. Potter said he has received a lot of help from the city on this.

This won't be contrary to public interest as this will improve the structure. It will improve aesthetics. He provided a letter to all of the cottages in the area so people were aware of what he plans to do. He verified the residences to make sure there are no issues with blocking any views with the increase in height. This will be a better looking structure which will add value to the city's tax base. The proposal won't add a burden to any public or private entities.

The proposal is consistent with the spirit of the ordinance as this allows conditioned use of the property, which they have owned since 1954.

Substantial justice is done as this allows the continuing use and enjoyment of the property. They are not increasing the occupancy, there is no setback change, there is no change to the pervious area, and no change to the septic load. There are trees all over the site which won't be impacted. This is the only place that is developed on the lot. He can't see the neighbors and they can't see him.

The property value should be increased by this as they are removing a substandard and unsafe structure. The building will have a higher value in appearance and style.

G. Potter said they plan to have this built properly by a contractor and enjoy it for many more years.

S. Bogert asked if this is on public sewer or septic and was told septic. He asked if this is 2 bedrooms as the tax card does say 2, and G. Potter said that they use one as a closet now as there are no closets in the house at all. He was asked if they would be adding any plumbing or water in the attic area. G. Potter said he thought about it but decided not to.

S. Perley asked if there is just one bathroom and was told yes and it won't change. They will increase the size of the existing one but there will be no impact on the existing septic. S. Perley asked when the structure was built and was told around 1955. G. Potter said they purchased it from the first owner and have had it since. He said all additions were done legally through the proper departments.

Public: Eileen Sleeper, the next door abutter. They own the last lot in Laconia. She said she is not speaking for or against this but just has some questions for the owner. S. Bogert said to address the questions to the board.

She asked about any additional bathrooms or bedrooms in the house. Her home is hooked up to Laconia septic. She wondered what the age of the septic here is. The homes are on ledge, so it is difficult to have septic here. She wants to make sure there are no additional bathrooms or bedrooms. She asked if 235-18 applies here. Also this is in the SPOD, so she asked about 235-19, and protection of the shoreland cover to maintain water quality. She asked if they would be adding any formal lawn that would require fertilizer. She questioned if the property is located in a flood zone.

G. Potter said he has never done any formal landscaping, and doesn't use chemicals at all. He said he had thought about putting in grass but didn't want to mow. He stated that if he ultimately does decide to put in grass, he won't use fertilizer but there is no intention at this point of doing that. Any grass would be the area down by the Sleeper's. They may replace the large pavers for path with smaller gravel.

He said he has had the septic pumped a few times, and it does date back a ways. He said he was surprised, as he was told it is solid as can be. He has been talking with DPW about hooking up to the sewer line. The closest hookup is on the Sleeper's property through about 150' of ledge. There is another hookup that is under the RR, about 100' away. He said he would love to connect to it but in the meantime the current

septic does work well. He can't cut the trees to get to the hookups. They are not adding more occupancy to the residence. He doesn't rent it out at all.

G. Potter stated he is not sure if this is in a flood zone. S. Bogert asked if 235-18 pertains here and S. Saunders said the building inspector will check that at the building permit time. G. Potter said he doesn't think flooding is an issue as the lake water won't go that high.

No other abutters spoke for or against the proposal.

Board: There were no further questions. J. Tivnan asked about the Shoreline Protection Act. S. Perley said we could make a decision without that, and can make it a condition of approval. S. Saunders said she feels a permit is not needed from the state.

S. Perley questioned the chemical use and S. Saunders said that we do recommend the use of low phosphate when people apply. She said she felt this was fine as the applicant made a statement that he would not use chemicals.

S. Bogert closed the hearing to the public at 8:15 pm.

Motion: S. Perley moved to approve application # 2009-00044 for an area variance to demolish and replace the structure at 105 Maiden Lady Cove Lane on the existing footprint, while going up in height.

The variance is needed due to the special conditions. This is an older home that has had some renovations over the years but weather and time have caused rot and mold, so this needs to be replaced.

The benefit sought cannot be achieved by another fashion. This allows the owner continued use of the residence. He will bring it up to code, and provide more living and storage space without alteration of the footprint. While the property is located in the SPOD there would be no impact to this area, as they would be remaining on same footprint.

The proposal is not contrary to public interest as this would improve the quality of the structure. There are no immediate abutters so the increase in the elevation is not a factor here.

This is consistent with the spirit of the ordinance as this allows the continued use of the property, which the Potter's have owned since 1954.

Substantial justice is done in granting the variance as this allows the continued use of the residence, and the owners can enjoy their property without increasing the occupancy, the setbacks, or the septic load.

Surrounding property values will not be diminished as this is an upgrade to the area.

The board is adding a condition that the permit from the state will be obtained if required. This is to be done before the building permit is issued. The Planning Department must be satisfied that this meets any state conditions.

O. Gibbs seconded the motion, with all voting in favor of approval, 4-0, with the following criteria:

a) Special conditions exist such that literal enforcement of the ordinance results in unnecessary hardship.

i. An area variance is needed to enable the applicant's proposed use of the property given the special conditions of the property; This is an older home that has had some renovations over the years but due to rot and mold now needs replaced; **AND**

ii. The benefit sought by the applicant cannot be achieved by some other method reasonably feasible for the applicant to pursue, other than an area variance; The benefit sought cannot be achieved in another fashion. There is no other location on the lot. The property will be brought up to current codes, while providing additional living and storage space without altering the footprint; **AND**

(b) The variance will not be contrary to the public interest; Rebuilding this structure will improve the quality. There are no immediate abutters so the increase in the roof elevation is not a factor for view; **AND**

(c) The variance is consistent with the spirit of the ordinance; This will allow the continued use of the property, which the applicant has owned since 1954; **AND**

(d) Substantial justice is done; Granting of the variance allows the continued use of the residence, and the owners can enjoy the property without an increase to the occupancy, the setbacks, or the septic load; **AND**

(e) The value of surrounding properties will not be diminished; The rebuilding of the structure will be an upgrade to the area.

The board also added the condition that any state permits shall be obtained, if required, before the building permit is issued.

**Application # 2009-00045
P. Gianunzio**

**MSL # 17-155-2
2623-2635 Parade Road**

**RR1/RR2 Zone
Use Variance**

The applicant is seeking a use variance from 235-42-(E) for street trees.

Applicant: Regina Nadeau appeared along with the Gianunzio's, Pat and Michael. She showed the location on the plan. She gave the history of the project. This is a commercial greenhouse with farm stand. This past year they got permitted for a composting operation and also amended their application to replace a burned barn. Part of the Planning Board approval is to supply street trees. After discussion with the Planning Department they found they need to meet that requirement.

They have frontage of 770 ft on Hilliard and 500 ft on Parade Road, which means 12 trees on Parade Road and 17 on Hilliard Road. They were told there was no screening of the compost operation needed. There are open fields here now. Trees are located on the opposite side of Parade Road. This area is a rural residential corridor, where the purpose is to promote agriculture and the cultural character of the area. They feel this is consistent with the neighborhood.

The ordinance recognizes that certain businesses are allowed in this corridor. Landscaping and street trees apply to residential developments. R. Nadeau said she assumes this was added to make city property have a country feel. This is already in a rural area with that feel.

If applying this criteria, it would create hardships for the client. P. Gianunzio feels this would cost about \$27K to plant these trees and he is in the business himself. The previous site plan has always provided for display areas along the frontage on Parade Road. Trees would shield the display areas if placed along Parade Road and on Hilliard Road would provide shade to the greenhouses which is not what is needed in a greenhouse.

Photographs were provided by R. Nadeau. She said that trees provide a buffer and bring a rural feel. The trees are already across the street. She showed a buffer for the neighbors. Hilliard Road is wooded along the side of the road. Further up the road, towards middle, she showed trees on the property. One photo

showed the corner where it is wooded along the road frontage. Another photo was taken by the material storage area and shows the tree buffer line. Another showed the tree line and conservation land.

If the purpose of the ordinance is to provide a buffer area, this property already has adequate natural buffer. To add rural character where there is commercial development doesn't seem applicable.

The special condition is that this is a commercial enterprise which is located in a rural area; agricultural use belongs there. Planting trees along the frontage would make the operation have to move further into the property.

Literal enforcement of the variance would be unreasonable because buffers already exist for the road frontage. Across the street the land is undeveloped; there is plenty of green along the front; this is not in urban area.

The proposal is not contrary to public interest as this promotes use of the land, and agriculture. If you are going down Parade Road, you see the beautiful open fields. Closer to Laconia, you see lots with scrub trees. Trees are already established and there is adequate buffer to the neighbors. Those have been there for about 7 years, with the only new thing being the compost operation, which is hidden from everyone's sight.

Public: No one spoke for or against the application.

Board: J. Tivnan said that when they came before the board for the mulch operation with the exit to Hilliard Road, the abutters wanted some way not to see this operation. He was told there is no abutter on Hilliard Road, the abutter in question was on the other side. S. Perley said street trees would not shield anyone here.

S. Bogert said planting trees under power poles is not good for anyone. J. Tivnan said planting on Parade Road would take away from their property and what they are doing here. S. Bogert said Hilliard Road is undeveloped, being class 6, so he is unsure if can be called a road. S. Saunders said it is not a non-road. The applicant has signed a maintenance contract with the City. R. Nadeau said it is not called a non-road; they maintain it, and the trees don't benefit anyone. It is not maintained in winter. P. Gianunzio said it is gated, so there is no access.

S. Bogert closed the hearing to the public at 8:45 pm.

S. Perley asked for clarification; would the ZBA be modifying a change made by the Planning Board. She was told no, they would be granting a variance to the street tree requirement in the Zoning Ordinance.

Motion: S. Perley moved to approve application 2009-00045 for a variance from the street tree requirement.

Special conditions exist as the site is rural, with a commercial/agriculture use. It is surrounded by large parcels of open land. Some of the lots are wooded and some are open fields. Requiring the street trees would not be consistent with the general area. Trees would not enhance this property as most of the fields are not treed. Trees already exist on the property.

There is adequate buffer here now so not requiring the street trees won't take away from the rural nature. There would be little benefit derived from planting the trees. The values of surrounding properties won't be diminished as there would be no adverse impact on surrounding properties.

J. Tivnan seconded the motion and all voted in favor of approval, 4-0, for the following reasons:

a) **Special conditions exist such that literal enforcement of the ordinance results in unnecessary hardship.**

i. **The zoning restriction as applied interferes with a landowner's reasonable use of the property, considering the unique setting of the property in its environment.** This is a rural site, with a commercial/agricultural use which is surrounded by parcels of open land, the street trees would shade the green houses, pertinent to the agricultural operation on site.

ii. **No fair and substantial relationship exists between the general purposes of the zoning ordinance and the specific restriction on the property;** Requiring the street trees here would do little to increase the rural nature of the property; **AND**

iii. **The variance would not injure the public or private rights of others;** Granting the variance does not injure the public or private rights as trees currently exist on the property serving as adequate buffer; **AND**

(b) The variance will not be contrary to the public interest; There are already trees that exist on this property, which currently serve as natural buffers; **AND**

(c) The variance is consistent with the spirit of the ordinance; Requiring the street trees would not be consistent with the general area as there are many open lots; the trees would not enhance the property; **AND**

(d) Substantial justice is done; There would be little benefit derived from the planting of these street trees; **AND**

(e) The value of surrounding properties will not be diminished; There will be no adverse impact on any surrounding properties.

NEW BUSINESS: Elections of ZBA officers was discussed; they will be held at the February 16, 2010 meeting.

MINUTES: The minutes from the ZBA meeting of October 19, 2009 were reviewed. S. Perley moved to approve the minutes as written, with the second by J. Tivnan. All voted in favor of approval, 4-0.

The minutes from the site walk of October 27, 2009 will be reviewed at the February meeting.

OTHER BUSINESS: S. Bogert asked if CVS had filed anything yet and S. Saunders said yes, they filed with the courts on the Administrative decision regarding the determination on sign frontage. S. Perley asked if they would come back to Zoning, and S. Saunders said she doesn't think so. S. Bogert said the Court would either deny or send it back to the ZBA. S. Saunders said in talking with our lawyer, the zoning ordinance is unclear, so the applicant has to look at the entire ordinance. S. Perley said the intent is clear. S. Saunders said we can amend the ordinance after the lawsuit, if needed.

S. Bogert requested that the board members have a list with the member's term information supplied to them.

ADJOURNMENT: S. Bogert made the motion to adjourn the meeting with the second by S. Perley. All voted in favor and the meeting adjourned at 9 pm.

Submitted By:

Kristine Y. Snow, Zoning Technician