



Town of Plaistow
ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
145 Main Street - Plaistow, NH 03865

ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
MEETING MINUTES
August 27, 2020

The meeting was called to order at 6:32 PM

Dan Lloyd, Vice Chair, read the following:

The Plaistow Zoning Board of Adjustment, due to the COVID-19/Coronavirus crisis and in accordance with Governor Sununu's Emergency Order #12 pursuant to Executive Order 2020-04, this Board is authorized to meet electronically, and these reasons shall be reflected in the minutes.

Please note that there is no physical location to observe and listen contemporaneously to the meeting which was authorized pursuant to the Governor's Emergency Order. However, in accordance with the Emergency Order we are confirming that we are:

a) Providing public access to the meeting by telephone:

Members of the public wishing to attend this meeting electronically may call the following conference call number 1 (562) 247-8422 Access Code: 900-532-276

b) Additional public access by video or other electronic means will be available as follows:

We are utilizing the GoToWebinar platform for this electronic meeting. All members of the Board have the ability to communicate contemporaneously during the meeting through the GoToWebinar platform, and the public has access to contemporaneously listen and, if necessary, participate in this meeting by clicking on the following webinar address <http://plaistowaccess.com/zb-remote>

c) Providing public notice of the necessary information for accessing the meeting

Legal notice was sent to all abutters for each application and was published in the Eagle Tribune newspaper, with information on how to access the meeting.

d) Providing a mechanism for the public to alert the public body during the meeting that a member of the public wishes to speak or be recognized during any public comment or public hearing.

The GoToWebinar platform has both a "raise your hand" and Q & A feature that allows attendees to alert that they have a question. Please note that all questions submitted through the Q & A feature must contain your address and will be read into the record.

e) Other access to the meeting: The meeting will also be broadcast on Plaistow Access Cable Channel 17 and will be livestreamed on the town website at www.plaistow.com.

f) In the event that the public is unable to access the meeting via conference call or GoToWebinar, the meeting will be adjourned and be rescheduled at a later time.

Roll Call: Peter Bealo, *Chair – excused*
Dan Lloyd, *Vice Chair, attending remotely, no others present*
John Blinn, *excused*
Jonathan Gifford, *attending remotely, no others present, departed 7:52pm*
Gary Ingham, *attending remotely, no others present*
Ethan Conley, *attending remotely, no others present*
Jim Unger, *Alternate, attending remotely, no others present*

Also attending remotely: Dee Voss, *Administrative Assistant, no others present* and Barbara Burri, *Alternate Member Candidate*

★ Ethan Conley and Jim Unger were appointed as voting members for this meeting – 5 voting members.

Review and Approval of Minutes from July 25, 2020 Meeting

★ J. Gifford moved, second by E. Conley to approve the minutes of the July 25, 2020 meeting. There was no discussion on the motion. Roll Call Vote: D. Lloyd – yes; J. Gifford – yes; G. Ingham – yes; E. Conley – yes; J. Unger – yes. The vote was 5-0-0 U/A.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

#20-20: A request from Rte 125 Cottage Plaza, LLC and Gerald Carbone for a variance from Article V, §220-31 and Table 220-32B(B) to allow the conversion of the first-floor commercial space to residential apartments, a non-permitted use. The property is located at 93A Plaistow Road, Tax Map 27, Lot 26-1 in the C1 District. Gerald R. Carbone is the property owner of record.

An email from Attorney Thomas MacMillan, counsel for the applicant, requesting a continuance was read into the record. The reason for the request was to seek written concurrence for the application from the owner of the second condo unit associated with this parcel.

D. Lloyd stated that matter #20-20 is continued to September 24, 2020, same time and location.

#20-21: A request from Mammoth Acquisition Co., LLC for a variance from Article V, §220-32I(A) to permit a structure to be placed within 12.3' feet of the property line on Main St, where 50 feet is the minimum. The property is located at 2 Main St,

Tax Map 24, Lot 43 in the C1 District. The property owner of record is AC Plaistow, LLC, Dick Anagnost, Manager.

Ari Pollack, Esquire, *Gallagher, Callahan and Gartrell*; Michael Malynowski, *Allen & Major Associates*; and Michael Coffman, *Mammoth Acquisitions Co., Inc.* were present remotely for the application.

A. Pollack reminded that they had been before the Board in June with applications for setback relief from Plaistow Road (Route 125), Haseltine Street and Main Street. At that time the Board and members of the community voiced a number of concerns regarding the applications, particularly with the lines of sight for traffic on Route 125, as well as general traffic issues in the area. He offered that the revised plan they were offering at this meeting was designed to answer those concerns.

M. Malynowski noted the following:

- The building has been pushed all the way back to meet the setbacks from Route 125 and is realigned to be parallel to Haseltine Street
- The proposed building has been placed over the footprint of the existing building
- The over-sized, one-way driveway access on Haseltine has been redesigned to be narrower to prevent undesirable traffic movements
- There are twenty-eight (28) parking spaces provided
- They are requesting three variances, two for the setbacks from Main Street and Haseltine Street and the third request is for signage
- The proposed location still allows for them to be able to meet the Planning Board's Site Plan Review Regulation (SPRR) for the landscaping buffers

A. Pollack explained about the uniqueness of the property noting the following:

- The property is triangular shaped and bordered by roadway on all sides
- There are no shared property boundary lines with any privately-owned parcels
- Building on the property is confined to within a fifty (50) setback from all directions making for a very small, and unworkable building envelope
- The existing +/- 2000SF non-compliant structure could not be built today in its current location without relief
- Not many of the uses permitted in the Commercial 1 District would be able to function on this parcel without relief
- The proposed 5150SF building is similar to the design and layout of other Convenient MD locations
- The Board's previous concerns about the closeness to Haseltine were understood to be related to the proposed proximity to Route 125 of the former plan. That has been relieved by pulling the building back to meet the setback from Route 125
- The parking is located adjacent to Main Street
- The setback from the Route 125 property line is proposed to be seventy (70) feet
- The proposed location avoids alteration of the site over the state line

- TEC, Inc. examined the intersection and submitted a report that shows that the proposed use will not adversely impact traffic in the area, based on trips per day counts

A. Pollack provided the following information in support of meeting the criteria for the granting of a variance:

- Granting the variance would not be contrary to the Public Interest because the proposed use is permitted in the Commercial 1 District and the existing structural improvements are equally non-conforming in terms of setbacks.
- The Spirit and Intent of the Ordinance is preserved because setbacks are intended to distance and separate uses and structures, which in this case is adequately provided by the triangular shape of the parcel and its three-way frontage.
- There is Substantial Justice in granting the variance because while the lot can support safe access, on-site parking, utilities and landscaping, the lot is irregularly shaped and cannot be reasonably improved without continuing some existing non-conformity.
- Surrounding Property Values will not be diminished because the proposed use is permitted by right in the Commercial 1 District and the existing structure (to be razed) is nonconforming to a similar degree. The site will be professionally designed, lighted and landscaped in keeping with the Plaistow Site Plan Regulations.
- Literal enforcement of the provisions of the ordinance would create an unnecessary hardship because the irregular shape of the triangular lot, and having frontage on three public streets, yields an unreasonably small building envelope within which to improve the property.

A. Pollack summarized that the property is small and unique in its triangular shape which cannot be reasonably developed without relief.

D. Lloyd asked if the Board had any questions.

J. Gifford asked if there were more up-to-date traffic related numbers than the 2015 ones provided in the TEC report. He noted that there had been a great deal of construction that had happened and there have also been changes related to the COVID-19 pandemic.

A. Pollack that they went back to the last baseline pre-COVID and the numbers were the most conservative.

Liz Oltman, Director of Transportation and Planning at TEC, Inc explained that the 2015 volumes used to create the report are conservative and even data collected eight (8) months ago would be higher than what would be seen today. She noted that she was comfortable the proposed use would be a minimal impact. L. Oltman added that higher volumes of other traffic in the area makes the impact of this use a lower one percentage-wise.

G. Ingham offered that five years ago much of the traffic in that area used Main Street to access Route 125 in both north and southbound directions. Since then most of the traffic is directed down Haseltine, because Route 125 can no longer be accessed southbound via Main Street.

A. Pollack offered that they have tried to address the traffic concerns of their previous application. He suggested that traffic and sight distance matters were more in the purview of the Planning Board.

J. Gifford noted that since the application was for a setback variance he thought it was important to consider sight distances. He expressed concern over the interaction of this site's driveways with other driveways on Main Street. He added that the 2015 traffic numbers are not reflective of today's traffic, the larger entrance and the additional traffic created with the new businesses in Haverhill.

M. Coffman explained that this permitted use is predicted to generate approximately 70 vehicle trips over a twelve-hour period. He offered that this would be an immeasurable impact to the volume of traffic.

D. Lloyd asked what was the size of the Convenient MD locations in Exeter and Windham.

Kevin Correia, Convenient MD, responded that both the Exeter and Windham locations have smaller footprints as they were built prior to Convenient MD expanding their available services. He said that he wasn't sure, but estimated that they were +/- 4,000Sf in size.

D. Lloyd asked if the building would be a single or two (2) floors.

K. Correia replied that the service area is a single floor and there would be room on a second floor for records and storage.

J. Unger noted that the proposed building setbacks gave the site a more of an urban feel. He added that he couldn't think of another commercial building that was as close to the road.

A. Pollack replied that the proposed building is set back farther than the existing structure and reiterated that there was a unique building envelope associated with this lot.

J. Unger offered that the existing building slopes away from the road and the proposed building is more than twice the size of the existing building.

J. Gifford expressed concern with the two-way traffic on Main Street and the addition of new businesses with driveways on Main Street.

There was a discussion about the Main Street intersection with Route 125. It was noted that if you follow Main Street to the end you can only go northbound on Route 125, though it was noted that there are those who still turn left to go southbound.

A. Pollack reminded that they would be discussing any traffic-related matters with the Planning Board and they were trying to get relief for setbacks from this board.

M. Coffman asked that the Board focus on limited amount of traffic that this proposed use would generate. He suggested that granting the setback variance that would allow Convenient MD to build on the site would ensure that a much higher traffic-generating coffee shop or fast food business doesn't go on the site.

E. Conley offered that they applicant had done a good job modifying the plan and pulling the building back from Route 125. He acknowledged that it is a tough site, and they had addressed the site line issues with Route 125, but it was still a tough site.

G. Ingham reminded that they had previously granted a variance for Main Street and now the applicant is back for a 12.5' setback.

M. Coffman noted that the new variance request for Main Street was in response to the Board's concerns about the previous application's proximity to Route 125.

M. Malynowski offered that the Main Street sight distance is 50 feet off the edge of the pavement, which is sufficient distance, including for the existing driveways.

E. Conley offered that he could see both sides, if the building is compliant with the setbacks it doesn't fit, and he could see another way to fit the building as is designed. He added the applicant had at least addressed the Route 125 concerns.

J. Gifford noted that he could appreciate that they had moved the building, but he wasn't sure that the requested encroachment was in the best interests of Plaistow.

K. Correia offered that he had the correct numbers for the Exeter and Windham locations. Windham is 5,000SF and Exeter is 6,000SF and both are located in multi-tenant, retail spaces as opposed to this stand-alone location.

D. Lloyd offered that because they would be taking this building down, he looked at the location as if there wasn't a and empty lot.

J. Unger noted that he compared the setbacks of the proposed building to the existing.

D. Lloyd asked if there was anyone wishing to speak in favor of, or in opposition to the application.

D. Voss read a petition submitted by Mo Morrill, reporting to have over 200 signatures attached into the record. The petition cites the historical significance of the building once known as the 1837 North Parish Meetinghouse and opposes the granting of the variances.

D. Lloyd noted that Plaistow does not have an historical district designation in zoning, and therefore the Board cannot consider that in their discussion. He added that the matter before them is the setbacks only.

J. Gifford added the historic character out of the discussion, anyone would plan on taking the building down, the issue is still with the proposed setbacks and the impact on sight distances.

Mark Foynes, 73 Old County Road, noted that he is an historian and had written a book which included information on this building. He offered the building as considerable historic value which should be ignored and should be preserved. He noted that the building was constructed in the days before the trolley system was in town and he hoped that the developer would consider preserving the building. Mr. Foynes added that the building is a gateway landmark for the community and it would be a shame for it to be lost.

G. Ingham offered that Plaistow has never enacted a Historic District, and while it's a good argument, under the law he cannot take the historic relevance of the building into consideration.

Lynne Jeffries, 12 Ridgewood Road offered that she did not believe that the applicant met the variance criteria. She noted that it seemed directly contrary to the public interest that a twelve (12) foot setback would be adequate where fifty-feet is required.

M. Foynes added that the Board should require the applicant to stick to the letter of the law.

A. Pollack reiterated the Board's response to the question of the historic significance of the building and noted that there are no protections. He added that the variance process exists for properties such as these with challenges to their development. He added that it's difficult to get a medical office in without relief because when you press on one side it pushes on another.

M. Coffman added that they understand that Board's concerns about the traffic and that was why they hired the traffic engineer to provide the information. He reminded that their memo states that this site meets the standards and can function well and safely.

There were no additional hands raised online and the public hearing was closed.

DELIBERATIONS:

★ J. Gifford moved, second by G. Ingham, to grant the application for a variance from Article V, §220-32I(A) to allow a structure to be built within 12.3 feet for the front property line along Main Street for the property located at 2 Main St, Tax Map 24, Lot 43.

Discussion:

Public Interest:

J. Unger noted that the public was definitely not happy with the application, but for historic value, which is not within the Board's jurisdiction.

D. Lloyd offered that the applicant could tear down the building any day and turn the property into a parking lot because there are no protections for historical properties.

J. Unger added that asking to only meet 20% of the setback as a lot.

G. Ingham noted that it would put the building on the street, which he felt was contrary to the public interest.

J. Gifford offered that the 12.3' was the issue for him, it was just too close and on that edge of the property with everything else going on, including a residential house across the street, it was just too close. It added that when in the horse and carriage days that the building was constructed the minimal setback wasn't the issue. He added that it wasn't the right building for the lot.

G. Ingham expressed concern with vegetation cars couldn't be seen.

E. Conley offered that it was a tough lot and not much could be built there.

Spirit and Intent of the Ordinance:

D. Lloyd offered that he didn't see how eliminating the frontage was in keeping with the spirit and intent of the ordinance.

Substantial Justice:

J. Gifford offered that he could see a gain to the public if there wasn't another facility located less than two miles away.

J. Unger added that there was already an existing office building that could be rented.

J. Gifford reminded that they shouldn't look at voting to keep the building as is.

Surrounding Property Values:

All agreed that there would most likely not be any decrease in surrounding property values.

Unnecessary Hardship:

D. Lloyd suggested there were other uses for the property that wouldn't require a variance or at least not as large a variance. The current building offers use of the property.

J. Unger offered that there was a big difference between the required 50 feet and what was being asked of them to approve.

Findings:

- The application is contrary to the Public Interest in that granting the variance would create a line of sight issue, particularly with the additional driveways on Main Street.
- The application is contrary to the Spirit and Intent of the ordinance in that eliminating the frontage does not provide for enough separation from the roadways, which diminishes lines of sight and creates public safety issues.
- There is not substantial justice in granting the variance in that the loss to the public safety is not outweighed by the gain of a larger building that intrudes into the setback. There is already a long-term commercial business use on the property, which indicates that there can be a commercial use of the property.
- The surrounding property values will not be diminished by the proposed location of the building in the setback.
- While the property has a unique shape, there is currently a structure on the property that indicates that commercial use of the property is possible, therefore there is no hardship.

Roll Call Vote: J. Gifford – no; G. Ingham – no; E. Conley – no; J. Unger – no; D. Lloyd – no. 0-5-0 and the motion to grant does not pass.

#20-22: A request from Mammoth Acquisition Co., LLC for a variance from Article V, §220-32I(A) to permit a structure to be placed within 14.3' feet of the property line on Haseltine St, where 50 feet is the minimum. The property is located at 2 Main St, Tax Map 24, Lot 43 in the C1 District. The property owner of record is AC Plaistow, LLC, Dick Anagnost, Manager.

#20-23: A request from Mammoth Acquisition Co., LLC for a variance from Article IX, §220-59.A(2) to permit an attached building sign to be 10.5% (175.3 SF) of the building façade where 5% is the maximum allowed. The property is located at 2 Main St, Tax Map 24, Lot 43 in the C1 District. The property owner of record is AC Plaistow, LLC, Dick Anagnost, Manager.

A. Pollack, noting that without the Main Street setback variance the other applications did not support the concept and requested to withdraw them without prejudice.

#20-24: A request from Denise Laratonda/Refreshing Paws for a variance from Article V, Table 220-32G(B)(2) to allow a care and treatment of animals use, namely a retail dog grooming business, a non-permitted use. The property is located at 134 Newton Rd, Tax Map 70, Lot 20 in the ICR district. The property owner of record is Northland Mall, LLC

Kevin Hatch, LLS, Cornerstone Survey, representing Northland Mall, LLC and Denise Laratonda, Refreshing Paws.

It was noted for the record that agent letters from both Northland Mall, LLC and Denise Laratonda had been received.

K. Hatch noted the following information for the Board:

- The application is to allow a dog grooming business at the Northland Mall
- Table 220-32G does not list Care and Treatment of Animals (CTA) as a permitted use, therefore it is assumed not to be permitted
- There has been a dog training facility in the mall since 2015
- The CTA use is permitted in the Commercial 1 District by Special Exception
- There have been two (2) previous dog grooming businesses in this mall prior to the change in zoning to prohibit them, but it's too long ago to be grandfathered
- The proposed use is not similar to the dog training or kenneling, because the dogs are not there for long periods of time.
- The application for the variance is to permit the use in the district as it is allowed by special exception in the Commercial 1 district.

K. Hatch offered the following in support of the criteria for the granting of a variance:

- The proposed variance will not be Contrary to the Public Interest because it will allow a low impact use in the existing unit where a dog grooming business has been in the past, and in the same mall that an existing dog care facility presently exists. The use will be located entirely indoors and will have no effect on abutting properties.
- The Spirit and Intent of the Ordinance is preserved because the intent of the ordinance is to limit conflicting uses within the zone. This mall has had dog grooming services in the past and currently has a dog grooming facility. The proposed use does not conflict with the surrounding uses and meets the spirit and intent of the ordinance.
- There is Substantial Justice in Granting the variance because granting the variance allows the property owner a reasonable use of her land without any negative effect on surrounding properties. It will allow the business owner a practical location for her existing business without impacting a residential area with additional traffic. The facility is well suited for a commercial business like this.
- The Values of Surrounding Properties will not be Diminished because the dogs will be kept indoors for short periods of time, no outdoor use of the property is

- proposed. The property is surrounded by a landscape buffer and or fence, and the dogs will be dropped off from the main parking lot.
- Literal enforcement of the provisions of the ordinance would result in an Unnecessary Hardship because dog grooming is not listed under “allowed uses” but meets the definition of a retail business which is an allowed use in this commercial plaza, to not grant this variance would be denying the property owner a reasonable use of her property. The proposed use is limited to 2 full-time employees, plus the owner, with limited numbers of dogs on site at any one time.

There was discussion about the 2018 Town Vote that eliminated the use in the Integrated Commercial Residential (ICR) District, while leaving it as a use by right in the Industrial District and by Special Exception in the Commercial 1 (C1) District. It was further noted that the use is restricted to a standalone condition. It was noted that the recent nature of the Town’s vote was something to be considered.

K. Hatch acknowledged the changes in the ordinance, as well as the conflicts that some care and treatment of animal uses can cause with other uses. He noted that this use would be completely enclosed, not like a doggie day care where there would be more impactful conflicts.

E. Conley questioned if the other tenants will be disturbed by dogs barking.

K. Hatch noted that the property owner’s office is just one door down from this unit and that will allow them to monitor any problems.

D. Lloyd noted that the existing dog training facility was grandfathered to be there.

K. Hatch added that the business owner has been speaking with some of the other businesses to let them know of her plans. He also noted that the second variance request was to allow the use in a strip mall and that all his answers to the variance criteria were essentially the same responses.

D. Lloyd asked if the Board had any additional questions on the variance request. There were none. He asked if there was anyone speaking in favor or, or in opposition to the application. There was no one and the public hearing was closed.

DELIBERATIONS:

★ E. Conley I moved, second by G. Ingham, to grant the variance request from Article V, §220-32G(B)(2) allow a care and treatment of animals use at the property located at 134 Newton Road, Tax Map 70, Lot 20.

Discussion:

The Board members expressed frustration at not knowing what the discussion was that prompted the Planning Board to propose the Zoning Ordinance change the eliminated the

care and treatment of animals use in the ICR District. It was suggested that it had much to do with the noise and odors that can be associated with such a use.

The Board reviewed the criteria for the granting of a variance with the following findings:

- The proposed use will not be contrary to the Public Interest because this is a low impact use

There was additional concern expressed over the Town Vote that eliminated the use expresses the public's interest and whether or not granting the variance would be contrary. It was noted that lumping all care and treatment of animal uses into a single category was punitive to lower-impact uses such as the proposed one. It was suggested that this use would not have an impact to the other businesses in the plaza

- The Spirit and Intent of the Ordinance is Preserved because...

There was discussion that without knowing the reasoning behind the change it is difficult to assess whether or not the spirit and intent are preserved. There was reluctance to penalize the applicant only to find out that the change was targeted for more impactful uses.

- There is substantial justice in granting the variance because

It was again noted that there was a public vote to remove the use from the ICR District. It was difficult for the Board members to assess substantial justice without knowing the rationale behind the change. It was suggested that many changes to the ordinances are passed strictly because they are proposed by the Planning Board.

- Values of the Surrounding Properties will not be Diminished because this is a commercial use in a district that allows commercial uses.

E. Conley offered that there were no representatives from the existing businesses in the plaza who expressed concern about the variance. He added that if they had an issue they could appeal.

It was explained that the notice of the public hearing would have been sent to the plaza property owner and not to the individual businesses.

- Literal enforcement of the provisions of the ordinance would result in Unnecessary Hardship because...

D. Lloyd offered that there would be a hardship to the business owner.

J. Unger noted that the ordinance was too broad and inclusive of too many care and treatment of animal uses that didn't have the same types of impact.

J. Gifford offered that he could see part of the reason for the 2018 vote, he just couldn't necessarily justify it when it came to this specific use. He added that he could see where some uses would impact any food service businesses, and that may have been the concern of the voters in 2018.

D. Lloyd reminded that a variance would run with the property and if granted would allow all care and treatment of animals uses in the future, unless the Board decided to put a condition on an approval of this variance.

The Board discussed its frustration with not having a rationale for the ordinance change. It was noted that in some circumstances not allowing a certain care and treatment of animals use, particularly depending on the other uses, was appropriate, but the strict enforcement against this particular low-impact animal use seemed punitive.

After discussion it was decided that a variance could be granted with the condition that it be applicable to this use, in this unit only.

E. Conley withdrew his motion, G. Ingham withdrew his second. A new motion was proposed.

★ E. Conley I moved, second by G. Ingham, to grant the variance request from Article V, §220-32G(B)(2) allow a care and treatment of animals use at the property located at 134 Newton Road, Tax Map 70, Lot 20, with the following condition:

- This variance is applicable to this applicant only and if the business is discontinued or leaves the variance is expired.**

Roll call vote: G. Ingham – yes; E. Conley – yes J. Unger – yes; D. Lloyd – yes; J. Gifford - yes. The vote was 5-0-0 U/A.

#20-25: A request from Denise Laratonda/Refreshing Paws for a variance from Article V, Table 220-32B(D)(10) to allow a care and treatment of animals use, namely a retail dog grooming business, in a strip mall, which is not permitted. The property is located at 134 Newton Rd, Tax Map 70, Lot 20 in the ICR district. The property owner of record is Northland Mall, LLC

K. Hatch offered that the second variance request was to allow the use in a strip mall and that all his answers to the variance criteria were essentially the same responses.

D. Lloyd asked if the Board had any additional questions that had not been addressed in the first variance request. There were none. He asked if there was anyone speaking in favor or, or in opposition to the application. There was no one and the public hearing was closed.

DELIBERATIONS:

It was consensus of the Board that their findings for this application wouldn't be any different than they are for the related variance application.

★ D. Lloyd moved, second by J. Gifford, to grant the variance request from Article V, §220-B(D)(10) allow a care and treatment of animals use in a strip mall, at the property located at 134 Newton Road, Tax Map 70, Lot 20.

- *This variance is applicable to this applicant only and if the business is discontinued or leaves the variance is expired.*

Roll Call Vote: E. Conley – yes J. Unger – yes; D. Lloyd – yes; J. Gifford – yes; G. Ingham – yes. The vote was 5-0-0 U/A.

Other Business:

Barbara Burri, former member, and applicant for alternate member of the ZBA was introduced to the members of the Board. All welcomed Ms. Burri.

★ D. Lloyd moved, second by J. Gifford, to recommend to the Board of Selectmen that Barbara Burri be appointed as an alternate member to the ZBA.

Roll call vote: J. Unger – yes; D. Lloyd – yes; J. Gifford - yes G. Ingham – yes; E. Conley– yes. The vote was 5-0-0 U/A.

There was no additional business before the Board and the meeting was adjourned at 8:48 PM

Respectfully Submitted:

Dee Voss
Administrative Assistant