



ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT BELMONT, NH

Wednesday October 25, 2023
Belmont Mill & Zoom
Belmont, NH 03220

Members Present: Chairman Peter Harris and Members David Dunham, Sharon Ciampi, and Alternate Member Reese Grey

Members Absent: Mark Mastenbrook and John Froumy

Staff Present: Karen Santoro, Town Planner, and Susan Austin, Land Use Administrative Assistant.

ZOOM: Marianne Evans

6:00 Public Meeting

The Chairman opened the meeting at 6:02 pm and welcomed those in attendance and announced that as Chairman of the Belmont Zoning Board of Adjustment, this public body is authorized to meet using electronic means. He said that the Board gave notice to the public of the necessary information for accessing the meeting using Zoom or telephone, and he announced that any party experiencing any difficulty in accessing the meeting at any point, should call 603-267-8300 x 101, and the meeting will be recessed until access can be restored for all parties.

Chairman Harris stated that he would like to remind everyone to be respectful to each other and the Board members and to please direct all questions and comments to the Board. The public will be allowed the opportunity to address the Board during the public hearing.

Chairman Harris appointed Reese Grey as a full member due to the short board.

Abutter's Hearings: Mary LaFarr:

- Request for a variance of Article 5, Table 2 of the Zoning Ordinance to build an 8' x 32' deck approximately 4.7' from the front lot line, where 50' is required. ZBA Case # 25-23Z
- Request for a variance of Article 5, Table 2 of the Zoning Ordinance to build a 5' x 8' landing/deck approximately 27.5' from the front lot line, where 50' is required. ZBA Case # 26-23Z

Property is located at 34 Mountain View Terrace, Tax Lot 121-070-000-000; Residential Single Zone.

Bryan Bailey was present to speak for the application. He stated that this was an existing home, and the applicant would like to add a front facing deck to the home.

He stated that they applicant has met the five criteria for a variance based on the following:

1. The variance will not be contrary to the public interest because: The property is located in a secluded home park, and as such has very limited exposure to public traffic or view.
2. The spirit of the ordinance is observed because: The proposed deck does not interfere with the any abutting structures or general traffic or road maintenance of Mountain View Drive.
3. Substantial justice will be done because: To allow this variance will provide a safer entrance to the front door. The front deck will afford an amenity that is typical of the current lifestyle that is generally associated with the front of the home.
4. The variance would not diminish the value of surrounding properties because: This new construction will increase the value of home and have no effect on the surrounding properties.
5. 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 of the following: The development as a whole that this property is in was created prior to the adoption of zoning. The lots are such a size that the ordinance did not provide for the continual need to upgrade these dwellings in a fashion that is specifically addressing the small lot sizes within the development. The use is an allowed residential use in this residential zone.

Chairman Harris opened the public comment. There was no public present.

Current considerations:

Chairman Harris stated that this property is located within the Aquifer Protection District.

Chairman Harris stated that in order to provide timely notice, provide opportunities for input and consider the interests of other municipalities the Board shall act to determine if the development has a potential regional impact as defined by RSA 36:55. Impacts may include, but are not limited to: Relative size or number of dwelling units as compared with existing stock; Proximity to the borders of a neighboring community; Transportation networks; Anticipated emissions such as light, noise, smoke, odors, or particles; Proximity to aquifers or surface waters which transcend municipal boundaries; Shared facilities such as schools and solid waste disposal facilities.

MOTION:

P. Harris moved that the proposal does not have a potential regional impact.

S. Ciampi seconded the motion.

Vote: All in favor, motion carried (4-0)

Department Response

Building/Code Enforcement Officer: Main concern is there is not adequate room from the street to the edge of the completed deck. Plowing will be forcing snow against the deck which will likely move it.

Assessing: Assessing adjustments resulting from this proposal will occur only on the April 1st assessment date following the recording and/or commencement of project.

Staff Comments:

- Lot is .22 acres
- Lot currently has a manufactured housing unit
- Applicant is proposing
 - a. 8x32 deck addition to the existing home.
 - b. 5'x8' landing/deck addition to the existing home.

MOTION:

D. Dunham moved to grant the variance from Article 5, Table 2 of the Zoning Ordinance to build an 8' x 32' deck approximately 4.7' from the front lot line, where 50' is required, based on the following criteria:

1. The variance will not be contrary to the public interest because: The property is located in a secluded home park, and the actual separation from the proposed deck to the edge of pavement is fairly distant.
2. The spirit of the ordinance is observed because: The proposed use doesn't conflict with the explicit or implicit purpose of the ordinance and doesn't alter the essential character of the neighborhood and it does not threaten public health, safety or welfare, or otherwise injure public rights.
3. Substantial justice will be done because: Granting this variance it will allow safer entrance to the front and back doors.
4. The variance would not diminish the value of surrounding properties because: This new construction will increase the value of home and have no effect on the surrounding properties.
5. 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 of the following: The development as a whole that this property is in was created prior to the adoption of zoning. The lots are such a size that the ordinance did not provide for the continual need to upgrade these dwellings in a fashion that is specifically addressing the small lot sizes within the development.
6. Any additional conditions (suggestions of staff).
 - A. All representations made by the applicant during the public hearing are incorporated as a condition of this approval.
 - B. The applicant and owner are solely responsible to comply with the approved plan and conditions of approval. Contractors should be sufficiently warned regarding same.

- C. Approval expires on 10/25/25 if use is not substantially acted on and if an extension is not granted. Approval also expires if use ceases for more than two years.

S. Ciampi seconded the vote.

Vote: All in favor, motion carried (4-0)

Abutter's Hearings: Mary LaFarr:

Request for a variance of Article 5, Table 2 of the Zoning Ordinance to build a 5' x 8' landing/deck approximately 27.5' from the front lot line, where 50' is required. ZBA Case # 26-23Z

MOTION:

D. Dunham moved to grant the variance from Article 5, Table 2 of the Zoning Ordinance to build a 5' x 8' landing/deck approximately 27.5' from the front lot line, where 50' is required, based on the following criteria:

- 1.The variance will not be contrary to the public interest because: The property is located in a secluded home park, and the actual separation from the proposed deck to the edge of pavement is fairly distant.
- 2.The spirit of the ordinance is observed because: The proposed use doesn't conflict with the explicit or implicit purpose of the ordinance and doesn't alter the essential character of the neighborhood and it does not threaten public health, safety or welfare, or otherwise injure public rights.
- 3.Substantial justice will be done because: Granting this variance it will allow safer entrance to the front and back doors.
- 4.The variance would not diminish the value of surrounding properties because: This new construction will increase the value of home and have no effect on the surrounding properties.
- 5.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 of the following: The development as a whole that this property is in was created prior to the adoption of zoning. The lots are such a size that the ordinance did not provide for the continual need to upgrade these dwellings in a fashion that is specifically addressing the small lot sizes within the development.
- 6.Any additional conditions (suggestions of staff).
 - A. All representations made by the applicant during the public hearing are incorporated as a condition of this approval.
 - B. The applicant and owner are solely responsible to comply with the approved plan and conditions of approval. Contractors should be sufficiently warned regarding same.
 - C. Approval expires on 10/25/25 if use is not substantially acted on and if an extension is not granted. Approval also expires if use ceases for more than two years.

Abutter's Hearing-Marianne Evans: Request for a variance from Article 4 of the Wetlands Ordinance to build an 11'x11' cedar framed hard top gazebo 14.6' from the adjacent wetland, where 35' is required. Property is located at 8 Donway Drive, Tax Lot 117-015-000-018; Residential Single Zone. ZBA Case # 27-23Z

Bryan Bailey was present in person, and the applicant, Marianne Evans was on Zoom. B. Bailey stated that they propose to build an 11'x11' cedar framed hardtop gazebo adjacent to the existing mobile home.

Chairman Harris read the history of the lot into the record.

History:

7/1994 – Building permit (manufactured home)

7/2011 – Building permit (shed)

1/2018 - Mechanical permit (new tank)

6/2021 – Variance granted (replacement of manufactured home; closer to wetlands than allowed)

6/2021 – Variance granted (construction of addition closer to wetlands than allowed)

7/2021 – Building permit (demo/replace MFG home)

10/2022 – Mechanical permit (new tank)

5/2023 – Building permit (gazebo) – denied/Variance required

Current Considerations:

Chairman Harris stated that this property is located within the Aquifer Protection District.

Chairman Harris stated that in order to provide timely notice, provide opportunities for input and consider the interests of other municipalities the Board shall act to determine if the development has a potential regional impact as defined by RSA 36:55. Impacts may include, but are not limited to: Relative size or number of dwelling units as compared with existing stock; Proximity to the borders of a neighboring community; Transportation networks; Anticipated emissions such as light, noise, smoke, odors, or particles; Proximity to aquifers or surface waters which transcend municipal boundaries; Shared facilities such as schools and solid waste disposal facilities.

MOTION: P. Harris moved that the proposal does not have a potential regional impact.

D. Dunham seconded the motion.

Vote: All in favor, motion carried (4-0)

B. Bailey stated that the applicant has met the five criteria for a variance based on the following:

1. The variance will not be contrary to the public interest because: The public will not be affected in any way. This unit is an interior lot and is not visible from any adjacent property.
2. The spirit of the ordinance is observed because: The proposed gazebo is a typical accessory structure associated with seasonal use.
3. Substantial justice will be done because: Granting this variance it will allow the

property owners to utilize their seasonal property in a manner consistent with other units within the condominium development.

4. The variance would not diminish the value of surrounding properties because: The proposed gazebo will be constructed with high grade materials and will be an asset to both the property and neighborhood in general.
5. 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 of the following:
 - a) 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: The proposed gazebo will be placed in such a location to maximize setback distance from abutting dwelling structures and from the wetlands.

D. Dunham asked what the gazebo would be sitting on? B. Bailey stated that it would be crushed gravel. M. Evans stated that they are in the process of building a patio with block.

Chairman Harris opened the public comment. There was no public present.

Department comments:

Staff Comments:

- Lot is .16 acres
- Lot currently has a manufactured housing unit with three season room and detached storage shed
- Applicant is proposing to add a freestanding 11' x 11' cedar framed hard top gazebo

MOTION:

R. Grey moved to grant the variance from Article 4 of the Wetlands Ordinance to build an 11'x11' cedar framed hardtop gazebo 14.6' from the adjacent wetland, where 50' is required, based on the following:

1. The variance will not be contrary to the public interest because: The public will not be affected in any way. This unit is an interior lot and is not visible from any adjacent property.
2. The spirit of the ordinance is observed because: The proposed gazebo is a typical accessory structure associated with seasonal use.
3. Substantial justice will be done because: Granting this variance it will allow the property owners to utilize their seasonal property in a manner consistent with other units within the condominium development.
4. The variance would not diminish the value of surrounding properties because: The proposed gazebo will be constructed with high grade materials and will be an asset to both the property and neighborhood in general.

5. 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 of the following:
 - a) 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: The proposed gazebo will be placed in such a location to maximize setback distance from abutting dwelling structures and from the wetlands.
 - b) The proposed use is a reasonable one because: The proposed gazebo is a typical amenity within a seasonal community. The gazebo will provide for a safe outdoor environment
6. Additional conditions:
 - A. All representations made by the applicant during the public hearing are incorporated as a condition of this approval.
 - B. The applicant and owner are solely responsible to comply with the approved plan and conditions of approval. Contractors should be sufficiently warned regarding same.
 - C. Approval expires on 10/25/25 if use is not substantially acted on and if an extension is not granted. Approval also expires if use ceases for more than two years.

S. Ciampi seconded the motion.

Vote: All in favor, motion carried (4-0)

Abutter's Hearing – Robert Boyd: Request for a variance from Article 5, Table 2 of the Zoning Ordinance to build a 16' x 42' addition to the rear of the existing mobile home approximately 45.6' from the front lot line, where 50' is required. Property is located at 2 Stark Street, Tax Lot 121-098-000-000; Residential Multi Family Zone. ZBA Case # 28-23Z

Chairman Harris read the history of the lot into the record.

History:

10/2006 - Notice of Violation (removal of manufactured housing unit w/o permit)

9/2018 - Building permit (not acted on)

8/2019 - Building permit (new manufactured housing unit)

10/2019 - Mechanical permit (new tank)

9/2022 - Building permit application (denied; variance required)

Current Considerations:

Chairman Harris stated that the property is located within the Aquifer Protection District.

Chairman Harris stated that in order to provide timely notice, provide opportunities for input and consider the interests of other municipalities the Board shall act to determine if the development has

a potential regional impact as defined by RSA 36:55. Impacts may include, but are not limited to: Relative size or number of dwelling units as compared with existing stock; Proximity to the borders of a neighboring community; Transportation networks; Anticipated emissions such as light, noise, smoke, odors, or particles; Proximity to aquifers or surface waters which transcend municipal boundaries; Shared facilities such as schools and solid waste disposal facilities.

MOTION: P. Harris moved that the proposal does not have a potential regional impact.
D. Dunham seconded the motion.
Vote: All in favor, motion carried (4-0)

Department Response:

Building/Code Enforcement Officer: My understanding is only MFG is allowed in this development. More than doubling the size of the MFG housing by stick building seems to be outside of the scope of the restrictions in this development?

Assessing: Assessing adjustments resulting from this proposal will occur only on the April 1st assessment date following the recording and/or commencement of project.

Staff Comments:

- Lot is .184 acres
- Lot currently has a manufactured housing unit
- Applicant is proposing a 16' x 42' addition to the existing home.

Bryan Bailey was present to discuss this application. He stated that this is a corner lot. The applicant is proposing to expand the living space by adding on to the backside of the mobile home. This property is on municipal sewer and water. S. Ciampi noted that the Building Inspector understood that only a manufactured home was allowed on these lots. K. Santoro stated that if it was a deed restriction and it was not the Board's purview to enforce deed restrictions, it is not a restriction placed by the Town.

B. Bailey stated that they applicant has met the five criteria for a variance based on the following:

1. The variance will not be contrary to the public interest because: The lots within the Pleasant Valley Manufactured Home Subdivision were created prior to zoning. Almost all construction that is contemplated within this subdivision requires a variance.
2. The spirit of the ordinance is observed because: The substandard lots in this subdivision typically require a variance to be improved.
3. Substantial justice will be done because: Granting this variance it will allow the property owners to improve their property in a manner consistent with other units within the subdivision
4. The variance would not diminish the value of surrounding properties because: The proposed addition will be constructed with high grade materials and will be an asset to both the property and neighborhood in general.

5. 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 of the following:
 - b) 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: As previously stated, this lot predates zoning and any improvements to almost any improvements to almost any lot requires zoning relief.
 - c) The proposed use is a reasonable one because: The use is reasonable because it will allow the land owner similar relief to many others within the development.

Chairman Harris opened the public comment. There was no public present.

MOTION:

S. Ciampi moved to grant the variance from Article 5 Table 2 of the Zoning Ordinance to build a 16'x42' addition to the rear of the existing mobile home approximately 45.6' from the front lot line, where 50' is required., based on the following:

1. The variance will not be contrary to the public interest because: The lots within the Pleasant Valley Manufactured Home Subdivision were created prior to zoning. Almost all construction that is contemplated within this subdivision requires a variance.
2. The spirit of the ordinance is observed because: The substandard lots in this subdivision typically require a variance to be improved.
3. Substantial justice will be done because: Granting this variance it will allow the property owners to improve their property in a manner consistent with other units within the subdivision
4. The variance would not diminish the value of surrounding properties because: The proposed addition will be constructed with high grade materials and will be an asset to both the property and neighborhood in general.
5. 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 of the following:
 - a) 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: As previously stated, this lot predates zoning and any improvements to almost any improvements to almost any lot requires zoning relief.
 - b) The proposed use is a reasonable one because: The use is reasonable because it will allow the land owner similar relief to many others within the development.
6. Additional conditions:
 - A. All representations made by the applicant during the public hearing are incorporated as a condition of this approval.
 - B. The applicant and owner are solely responsible to comply with the approved plan and conditions of approval. Contractors should be

sufficiently warned regarding same.

- C. Approval expires on 10/25/25 if use is not substantially acted on and if an extension is not granted. Approval also expires if use ceases for more than two years.

D. Dunham seconded the motion.

Vote: All in favor, motion carried (4-0)

Abutter's Hearing – Shawn and Tricia Beauchesne: Request for a variance from Article 5, Table 1 of the Zoning Ordinance to allow a veterinary clinic/boarding kennel (canine daycare & boarding) in existing residence and associated fenced area. Property is located at 677 Union Road, Tax Lot 222-047-000-000; Residential Single Zone.

S. Ciampi recused herself because she has a prior financial relationship with the applicant. P. Harris stated that this means they have a short board consisting of three members, so in order for this variance to be granted, all votes must be in favor.

Chairman Harris read this history of this lot into the record.

History:

5/1977 Subdivision

5/1977 Septic application & plan

6/1982 Building permit (addition)

8/1999 Pete's Automotive questionnaire for business listing

2/2009 Email from S. Dalton re: Pete's Automotive no longer in business

2/2021 Application for Home Occupation Business for dog daycare (denied – does not meet Home Occupation requirements)

12/2022 Letter from Town Planner RE: ongoing operation of dog daycare without required approvals

1/2023 Application Review Committee Application for dog daycare

9/2023 Letter from Town Planner RE: follow up to ARC application; ongoing operation of dog daycare without required approvals.

Current Considerations:

Chairman Harris stated that this property is not located within the Aquifer Protection District.

Chairman Harris stated that in order to provide timely notice, provide opportunities for input and consider the interests of other municipalities the Board shall act to determine if the development has a potential regional impact as defined by RSA 36:55. Impacts may include, but are not limited to: Relative size or number of dwelling units as compared with existing stock; Proximity to the borders of a neighboring community; Transportation networks; Anticipated emissions such as light, noise, smoke, odors, or particles; Proximity to aquifers or surface waters which transcend municipal boundaries; Shared facilities such as schools and solid waste disposal facilities.

MOTION: P. Harris moved that the proposal does not have a potential regional impact.
R. Grey seconded the motion.
Vote: All in favor, motion carried (3-0)

Department Response

Building/Code Enforcement Officer: No immediate concerns as long as excessive barking is curtailed.

Assessing: If this variance is granted, will it automatically allow them permission to construct the future accessory structure they are looking for with just a building permit, or will they need additional relief from ZBA?

Staff Comments:

- Lot is 5 acres
- Lot currently has a single-family house with associated patio areas; sheds and animal pens; shared driveway is located on the abutting property.
- Applicant is proposing a dog daycare/boarding kennel in the existing residence and outside fenced in areas.

K. Santoro stated that she wanted to address the comment made by the Assessing Admin. She stated that if the variance for the use is granted the applicants would need to go to the Planning Board for Site Plan Review. It would be be part of the site plan in order for proposed structures to be added to this lot.

Shawn and Tricia Beauchesne were present to discuss their application. T. Beauchesne stated that they were asking for a variance in order to have an at home business which provides a home style dog daycare as well as overnight boarding services for up to 5 dogs at a time in the dwelling. The business is proposed to run from 7 am to 6 pm, with morning drop offs as early as 6 am. The unique features of this property make it particularly well suited for this type of business are it's frontage, large lot size, and seclusion from abutters, which ensures this use will not adversely affect the surrounding neighborhood and will not be visible or audible to the abutters.

Chairman Harris opened the public comment. There was no public comment

K. Santoro stated that the Land Use staff has received a letter from the abutter that they share the driveway with, and they stated that they had no concerns.

T. Beauchesne read her testimony into the record.

1. The variance will not be contrary to the public interest because: The basic zoning objective of the Town of Belmont's Zoning Ordinance are to retain the natural beauty of Belmont. This lot has 5 acres of land, and the proposed development will not alter the visual appearance from the street, and will be consistent in appearance with the surrounding properties.
2. The spirit of the ordinance is observed because: The proposed variance is consistent with the purpose and intent of the Zoning Ordinance to retain the natural beauty of Belmont. No part

of this proposed use is visible or audible from the road. The abutter and right of way owner support this request.

3. Substantial justice will be done because: Granting this variance will allow the owner full use of their property and provide a needed service to the community. Granting this variance will do substantial justice because it will allow for productive use of the property, while providing responsible growth in the community.
4. The variance would not diminish the value of surrounding properties because: The property is currency naturally insulated and isolated large from the abutting properties; there are large undeveloped areas surrounding the proposed outdoor portion of the daycare.
5. 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 of the following: The subject property has special provision that distinguish it from other properties in the area. The property has no road frontage and is surrounded on two sides with undeveloped properties.
 - a. 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: the special conditions of this property, the lack of frontage, large lot size, and transitional feel, distinguish this property from other properties in the area preventing the property from being used in strict conformance with the ordinance. This proposal fits the spirit of the ordinance and provides a needed service to the community.

Chairman Harris stated that in the past the Board has had to deny requests like these when there were negative abutters. He noted that there were no complaints from abutters tonight. If this is approved tonight, this will also need Site Plan approval, therefore there will be another chance for abutters to speak.

MOTION:

D. Dunham moved to grant the request for a variance from Article 5, Table 1 of the Zoning Ordinance to allow a veterinary clinic/boarding kennel (canine daycare & boarding) in existing residence and associated fenced area. Property is located at 677 Union Road, Tax Lot 222-047-000-000; Residential Single Zone.

1. The variance will not be contrary to the public interest because: The basic zoning objective of the Town of Belmont's Zoning Ordinance are to retain the natural beauty of Belmont. This lot has 5 acres of land, and the proposed development will not alter the visual appearance from the street, and will be consistent in appearance with the surrounding properties.
2. The spirit of the ordinance is observed because: The proposed variance is consistent with the purpose and intent of the Zoning Ordinance to retain the natural beauty of Belmont. No part of this proposed use is visible or audible from the road. The abutter and right of way owner support this request.
3. Substantial justice will be done because: Granting this variance will allow the owner full use of their property and provide a needed service to the community. Granting this variance will

do substantial justice because it will allow for productive use of the property, while providing responsible growth in the community.

4. The variance would not diminish the value of surrounding properties because: The property is currency naturally insulated and isolated large from the abutting properties; there are large undeveloped areas surround ding the proposed outdoor portion of the daycare.
5. 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 of the following: The subject property has special provision that distinguish it from other properties in the area. The property has no road frontage and is surrounded on two sides with undeveloped properties.

- a) 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: the special conditions of this property, the lack of frontage, large lot size, and transitional feel, distinguish this property from other properties in the area preventing the property from being used in strict conformance with the ordinance. This proposal fits the spirt of the ordinance and provides a needed service to the community.

6. Any additional conditions

- A. All representations made by the applicant during the public hearing are incorporated as a condition of this approval.
- B. The applicant and owner are solely responsible to comply with the approved plan and conditions of approval. Contractors should be sufficiently warned regarding same.
- C. Approval expires on 10/25/25 if use is not substantially acted on and if an extension is not granted. Approval also expires if use ceases for more than two years.

R. Grey seconded the motion.

Vote: All in favor, motion carried. (3-0)

S. Ciampi returned to the table.

Minutes of September 27, 2023

MOTION: P. Harris moved to approve the minutes of September 27, 2023 as written.
S. Ciampi seconded the motion.
Vote: All in favor, motion carried (4-0)

Appointment:

MOTION: S. Ciampi moved to appoint Elizabeth Stewart as an alternate member of the Town of Belmont Zoning Board of Adjustment.
D. Dunham seconded the motion.
Vote: All in favor, Motion carried (4-0)

Staff Report

No staff report.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: D. Dunham moved to adjourn at 7:44 PM.
S. Ciampi seconded.
Vote: All in favor, motion carried (4/0)

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Susan Austin". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Susan M. Austin
Land Use Assistant