



TOWN OF HUDSON

Zoning Board of Adjustment



Gary M. Daddario, Chairman

Kara Roy, Selectmen Liaison

12 School Street • Hudson, New Hampshire 03051 • Tel: 603-886-6008 • Fax: 603-594-1142

MEETING MINUTES – November 18, 2021 – approved

The Hudson Zoning Board of Adjustment met on Thursday, November 28, 2021 at 7:00 PM in the Community Development Paul Buxton Meeting Room in the lower level of Hudson Town Hall.

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairman Gary Daddario called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM, invited everyone to stand for the Pledge of Allegiance and read the procedure for the meeting from the Preamble found in Exhibit A of the Board's Bylaws into the record.

Clerk Etienne took attendance. Members present were: Gary Daddario (Regular/Chair), Brian Etienne (Regular/Clerk), Leo Fauvel (Regular), Normand Martin (Alternate), Marcus Nicolas (Regular), Jim Pacocha (Regular/Vice Chair), Dean Sakati (Alternate) and Edward Thompson (Alternate). Also present were Bruce Buttrick, Zoning Administrator, Louise Knee, Recorder (remote) and Kara Roy, Selectman Liaison. For the record all Regular Members voted.

III. PUBLIC HEARING OF SCHEDULED APPLICATIONS BEFORE THE BOARD:

1. **Case 177-017 (11-18-21):** Glenn Michael Lemieux, 2 Bush Hill Rd., Hudson, NH requests a Variance to build a 7 ft. x 21.6 ft. farmers porch which encroaches 3.7 feet into the front yard setback leaving 46.3 feet where 50 feet is required. [Map 177, Lot 017-000; Zoned General (G); HZO Article VII, Dimensional Requirements; §334-27, Table of Minimum Dimensional Requirements.]

Mr. Buttrick read the Case into the record, referenced his Staff Report signed 11/9/2021 and noted that comments were received from the Town Engineer, Elvis Dhima, PE.

Glenn Lemieux came masked to the lectern, introduced himself, stated that they would like to construct a farmer's porch but need a Variance because it would encroach approximately three feet (3') into the front setback.

Mr. Lemieux addressed the criteria for the granting of a Variance and the information shared included:

- (1) *not contrary to public interest*
 - Will not be contrary to public interest

Not Official until reviewed, approved and signed.
Approved 12/09/2021 as Edited

- Adding a farmer's porch will bring more curb appeal and increase property values for self and neighbors
- (2) *will observe the spirit of the Ordinance*
 - Will make the house look nicer and allow opportunity to further connect with the community
 - Will not compromise safety or hinder traffic flow in area
- (3) *substantial justice done*
 - Will raise property value and house will become more visually appealing
- (4) *not diminish surrounding property values*
 - will increase curb appeal and add value to the property
 - will not diminish other property values in the neighborhood
- (5) *hardship*
 - original setback for property was thirty feet (30') and then later changed to fifty feet (50')
 - house is fifty feet (50') and front entry steps and landscaping do not infringe the original thirty-foot (30') setback but are now in the current fifty foot (50') setback
 - the porch will fall out of the original thirty-foot (30') setback

The Google map overview was presented and the proposed porch would be placed along the front of the house to the corner and not extend further than the three (3) steps to the front door. Mr. Lemieux stated that the front bush along the front of the house has already been removed. The Site Plan prepared by Gregg Jeffrey, LLS, of Jeffrey Land Survey, LLC dated October 2021, was posted and showed the 21.6'x7' front farmers porch being 46.3' from the property line.

Public testimony opened at 7:17 PM. No one addressed the Board.

Mr. Martin noted that the house was constructed in 1998, fifty feet (50') from the property line, and asked when the front setback was changed from thirty feet (30') to fifty feet (50'). Mr. Buttrick responded that at one time Collector Roads in Town had the front setback changed to fifty feet (50') but exact date unknown and added that the house meets the current setback requirement. Mr. Fauvel noted that if Bush Hill Road is expanded in the future the porch could end up twenty feet (20') from the expanded road. Mr. Martin asked if there was ledge where the porch is proposed because that could involve blasting and Mr. Lemieux responded that he does not know. Mr. Pacocha noted the Town Engineer's comment dated 11/5/2021 asking the Property Owner to take into consideration locating/possibly relocating the water and sewer service connectors as they are both currently in the front of the house and could be problematic if service is required in the future if under the porch. Mr. Lemieux stated that he is aware of the concern and the water connection will be taken into consideration when the porch is constructed and added that the sewer connection will not fall under the proposed porch.

Public testimony reopened at 7:22 PM. No one addressed the Board.

Mr. Nicolas made the motion to grant the waiver as requested. Mr. Pacocha seconded the motion. Mr. Nicolas stated there is no harm to the public, the porch will align with the house and add value to the community and noted that the entry steps will remain.

Mr. Pacocha stated that the criteria have been satisfied, not contrary to public interest, spirit of the Ordinance is observed, does not alter the character of the neighborhood, no harm to the general public, adds value, substantial justice would be done and the hardship is the change increasing the front setback and the infraction is minimal. Roll call vote was 5:0. Variance granted. The 30-day Appeal period was noted.

2. **Case 159-027 (11-18-21)**: Denissa F. Grace, Tr., 15 Barretts Hill Rd., Hudson, NH requests a Variance to allow a lot (after subdivision) with 112.26 ft. of frontage where 200 ft. is required. [Map 159, Lot 027-000; Split Zoned General-One (G-1) and General (G); HZO Article VII, Dimensional Requirements; §334-27, Table of Minimum Dimensional Requirements.]

Mr. Buttrick read the Case into the record, referenced Zoning Determination #21-163 dated 10/12/2021, his Staff Report signed 11/9/2021, and noted that this irregular shaped 15.838 acre-parcel has one residence in the rear of the parcel and the desired subdivision would create one 2.23 acre parcel with 223.04' of frontage with the current driveway along two of its property lines which leaves the current residence with 15.838 acres with only 112.26' of frontage where 200' is required.

Tony Basso, LLS with Keach Nordstrom Associates, Inc. stood masked at the lectern and introduced himself as representing the Denissa F. Grace Revocable Trust. Mr. Basso stated that they seek to subdivide a 15.838 acre-parcel with a single home to create one new building lot. The property has a split zone – General and General-One – with the existing single-family residence in the General (G) Zone and the proposed new lot entirely in the General-One (G-1) Zone with a required two hundred feet (200') of frontage. The lot has relatively steep topography traveling to the South and a utility easement transacts the lot. The proposed new lot of 2.23 acres satisfies the Zoning criteria and the remaining lot (parent lot) would have only one hundred twelve point twenty six feet (112.26') of frontage, which does not satisfy the frontage requirement and needs a Variance.

Mr. Basso stated that the purpose of frontage is to space out development and avoid overcrowding and noted that this is already achieved with the existing house in the rear of the property and only one new house close to the front. Mr. Basso stated that there are other alternatives to subdivide the fifteen (15) acre parcel, like building a home to accommodate more than one single family home, but that is not being proposed. The intent is to leave the parent lot as a single-family large lot with reduced frontage of approximately eighty feet (~80').

Mr. Basso addressed the criteria for the granting of a Variance and the information shared included:

- (1) *not contrary to public interest*
 - Will not be contrary to public interest
 - Will not unduly conflict with the basic purposes of the zoning provisions
 - Will not alter essential character of the area
 - Will not threaten public health, safety or welfare
- (2) *will observe the spirit of the Ordinance*
 - Spirit of the Ordinance is to prevent overcrowding of buildings

Not Official until reviewed, approved and signed.

Approved 12/09/2021 as Edited

- Granting the Variance does not jeopardize public safety and welfare
 - Existing driveway has existed safely for over 40 years
 - New driveway will have access on a parcel with compliant frontage and therefore observes the Spirit of the Ordinance
- (3) *substantial justice done*
- No gain to the public if Variance is denied
 - Driveway has existed for several decades without an adverse impact to general public
- (4) *not diminish surrounding property values*
- Granting the requested dimensional variance and allowing the subsequent subdivision will not adversely affect surrounding property values
 - New homes and new construction tend to improve surrounding home values
- (5) *hardship*
- Because of the special conditions of the property, the restriction applied to the property does not serve the purpose of the restriction in a “fair and reasonable” way
 - There is no fair and substantial relationship between the general public purposes of the frontage requirement and its application to the subject property
 - The new residential lot will be completely compliant with current Zoning regulations
 - The existing lot is relatively large compared to the minimum lot size, and when reduced, will still be more than six (6) times larger than the minimum lot size required
 - Although frontage is reduced, the reduction does not alter the form or function of the existing driveway that serves the existing single-family home
 - Proposed use is a reasonable use given that this property has been utilized as a residential property since the original house construction and is allowed by Right

Mr. Nicolas asked and received confirmation that the Variance is for the existing lot. Mr. Thompson asked and received confirmation that the new lot would have its own separate driveway. Mr. Martin asked if there would be enough room on the new lot for a driveway with the existing wetlands. Mr. Basso responded that those areas represent steep slopes, not wetlands, and were identified to calculate the buildable area for the lot.

Mr. Fauvel expressed concern with setting a precedent if the Variance is granted, and suggested that to compensate, to condition a variance approval for an increased front setback requirement based upon the amount of frontage reduction being sought - approximately a hundred and eighteen feet (118'). Mr. Daddario asked if the increased frontage condition would apply to both the new lot and the parent lot. It was noted that the Variance request before the Board is for the existing lot, after subdivision. Mr. Basso stated that such a condition would pose no problem for his client as there is no intent to further subdivide the remaining parent-lot of approximately thirteen acres.

Mr. Etienne stated that the frontage reduction is egregious and asked why it was not just split in half. Mr. Basso responded that it was just cleaner to have the new lot compliant and create the new lot shape by the existing driveway, which meets the driveway requirements for sight distance, etc., and because the existing house is tucked in the rear of the lot and not visible from the road, the purpose of the frontage requirement is satisfied as only one new home would be visible from the road.

Public testimony opened at 7:44 PM. No one addressed the Board.

Mr. Etienne asked to post the Table of Uses for G and G-1 Zones and noted that the fifteen-acre lot could have many other Uses than as a single-family Residential Use. Mr. Buttrick stated that should the parcel ever change from a Residential Use to another Permitted Use, it would not require ZBA approval but would need to go before the Planning Board for a Change of Use Permit. Mr. Basso added that even though there is no plan to change from the Residential Use, if in the future the lot is sold and an industrial Use is being proposed, by granting this Variance tonight, the lot becomes a legal non-conforming lot and any expansion would require ZBA review and approval. Mr. Buttrick disagreed – yes, the lot becomes a legal existing non-conforming lot of record and construction (if Use is permitted) would just have to satisfy setbacks per ZO Section 334-32, Nonconforming Lots.

Mr. Fauvel made the motion to grant the Variance as requested with the stipulation that the front setback be increased to one hundred seventeen point seven four feet (117.74') for the parent lot to accommodate for the lack of road frontage. Mr. Etienne seconded the motion. Mr. Fauvel stated that the existing house is so far back into the lot and not visible from the street and does not affect the neighborhood and won't affect property values; and the new house proposed to be built with be on a standard lot for the area and new construction has a positive impact on property values; and the increased frontage is to prevent setting a precedent and was calculated by adding the frontage shortage to the already required front setback of fifty feet (50'). Mr. Etienne stated that currently it is a residential neighborhood, that should a change occur in the future, the lot, which becomes a legal non-conforming lot with the granting of this Variance, would need review from the Planning Board. Roll call vote was 5:0. Motion granted with one stipulation. The 30-day appeal period was noted.

Board took a five-minute recess at 7:53 PM. Meeting called back to order at 7:58 PM.

3. **Case 253-017 (11-18-21)**: Phillip C. Nichols, Tr., 23 Schaefer Circle, Hudson, NH requests a Variance to convert a 640 sqft office area above a detached garage into a single bedroom in-law apartment (ADU) where an ADU is not allowed as a freestanding detached structure or as part of any structure which is detached from the principal dwelling. [Map 253, Lot 017-000; Zoned Residential-One (R-1); HZO Article XIII A, Accessory Dwelling Units; §334-73.3.B, Provisions.]

Mr. Buttrick read the Case into the record, referenced Zoning Determination #21-118 dated 7/19/2021 and his Staff Report signed 11/9/2021 and noted that the free-standing detached garage was constructed in 2020 with an office and convenience bathroom that now seeks to convert to a single bedroom Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) which are not allowed in detached buildings. Mr. Buttrick stated that comments were received from the Town Engineer requesting a septic system design

that can accommodate the additional proposed bedroom and also from the Fire Department noting that all construction requirements will be reviewed during the Building Permit review and requested that the location have separate marking/address for fire respondents in case of emergency.

Philip Nichols came to the lectern, introduced himself, stated that he is a retired Police Officer from the City of Nashua and his wife is a recently retired ATF Controller in Nashua, that they have been residents of Hudson since 1992 and placed an addition to their home in 1999, following all the required permit process, added a pool in 2007, again obtaining all the required permits and began construction of the detached garage in 2020. Mr. Nichols stated that one of the prime reasons for the garage is to house their RV (Recreational Vehicle) and not just leave it parked on the premise when not in use.

Mr. Nichols stated that many trees had to be cut to place the garage and it also included the need to redesign the septic system that is directly behind the house to the left of the new garage and the redesign included connecting it to the garage. The location of the garage is due to the ledge on the property. There is ledge under the pool. The well is in the left front yard

Mr. Nichols stated that the in-law apartment would be for his mother who lives alone in Ohio and where he and his brother were born and raised. His younger brother lives in Tennessee and he took care of their grandmother, who passed away a few years ago. His mother does not drive and public transportation is not an option for her. They stay in touch with her and during a recent facetime call he heard gunshots in the background and that was very concerning. After discussions with his wife, they decided to convert the garage office into living space for her so she can be safe.

Mr. Nichols stated that many properties in the neighborhood have detached buildings and some even have in-law apartments in those detached garages, some with permits and probably some without and one that has been reconverted because the person passed away. Mr. Nichols stated that his request will not disrupt the neighborhood. Many of his neighbors approached him when they received notice and did not have anything negative to say.

The GIS map was posted. Mr. Nichols noted the pool that was installed in 2007 that required the removal of hundreds of trees and ledge was discovered at the four-foot mark that had to be chipped out; between the pool and the house is the septic system; the garage is located to the right of the septic system; and there is ledge along the entire back of his property as well as from the road to his house. The well is located to the left of the house in the front yard.

Mr. Nichols addressed the criteria for the granting of a Variance and the information shared included:

(1) *not contrary to public interest*

- Request is to provide affordable housing for his mother without the need to add more infrastructure and without further land development
- Will not violate the public health safety or welfare or injure “public rights”
- Will not be contrary to public interest

Not Official until reviewed, approved and signed.

Approved 12/09/2021 as Edited

(2) *will observe the spirit of the Ordinance*

- Garage initially constructed to house RV when not in use and negate parking it out in the open and provide personal office space
- Garage is aesthetically pleasing and compliments the house
- After construction began, situation with mother changed and decision made to construct a one-bedroom apartment for her and forego the office

(3) *substantial justice done*

- Mom needs a safe place to live and maintain her independence & privacy
- Many neighbors have been previously granted the same consideration, including 75, 30, 72 & 26 Schaefer Circle, 9 & 12 Potter Road and 1,9,12 & 20 Williams Drive
- No gain to the public if Variance is denied

(4) *not diminish surrounding property values*

- The detached garage fits the neighborhood as many neighbors have detached structures on their property
- These detached structures are aesthetically pleasing and enhance property values
- There will be no additional vehicles or increase in traffic as mother does not drive

(5) *hardship*

- Because of the special conditions of the property – the existing ledge, placement of the septic system and well and pool – there was no other location to construct the garage
- While structure is detached from the primary residence it is there to be part of the primary residence
- Attempting to attach the garage to the current residence is not possible
- The restriction applied to the property does not serve the purpose of the restriction in a “fair and reasonable” way

Mr. Fauvel stated that ADUs in detached structures was discussed at the last Planning Board meeting, noted that the mother is seventy one (71) years old and wider steps should be considered along with the need for two (2) exits. Mr. Daddario asked and received confirmation from Mr. Buttrick that the need for two (2) exits does get covered in the Building Permit process and added that the Building Permit will need to be changed from an office to living space. Mr. Nichols stated that the windows are properly sized and believes that the stairway is large enough to install a chair lift whenever his mom is no longer mobile and active, and there are options for the second exit and he will comply with whatever is needed, noting that no interior work for the living space has not begun.

Ms. Roy stated that the septic system was redesigned and asked it if accommodates four (4) bedrooms, three (3) in the home and one (1) in the garage. Mr. Nichols stated that the redesign included the next bigger sized tank in order to accommodate waste from the RV. Mr. Buttrick stated that the size of the septic tank and leach field are based on the number of bedrooms. Mr. Nichols stated that he will check with the installer to confirm that it will accommodate four (4) bedrooms.

Mr. Nicolas asked and received confirmation that the RV will be housed in the newly constructed garage. Mr. Fauvel asked if 5/8” drywall was installed and Mr. Nichols

stated that the interior work has not yet been done but the plan is to install 5/8" drywall to separate the original plan to create an office and noted that the interior stairway going to the second floor is planned to be completely boxed off.

Mr. Martin referenced the aerial view and that several lots have detached structures. Mr. Daddario asked Mr. Nichols if the addresses given to criteria 3 & 4 also meant that they contained ADUs and Mr. Nichols responded that those addresses represent lots in the neighborhood that have detached buildings and that he only knows of the lot at 26 Schaefer Circle had a legal in-law apartment above in the detached garage and when their parent passed the apartment was discontinued.

Mr. Pacocha stated that, in his opinion, this is not an ALU (Accessory Living Unit) or an ADU (Accessory Dwelling Unit) but a detached dwelling unit that would render the lot non-conforming. Mr. Buttrick stated that is the reason for the Variance – for the ADU to be permitted in the detached garage instead of the main residence with an interconnecting door – and this is a lot of record and does not believe it would render the lot non-conforming – and, in essence, it would be a separate dwelling unit.

Discussion continued on the connection. Mr. Fauvel asked of the septic system connecting to both living units would satisfy the criteria. Answer, no. Mr. Fauvel asked if a roof connecting the two living units would suffice? Mr. Buttrick stated that is not an acceptable solution. Mr. Nichols stated that there is seventeen feet (17') between the house and garage. Question raised whether a condition of approval could be that the variance is valid for the mom only – a lifetime tenancy. Mr. Pacocha stated that unlike Special Exceptions, Variances run with the land and stay forever.

Mr. Etienne stated that placing apartments on top of detached buildings is one way to provide affordable housing without having to build apartment complexes but there are downsides too, like more traffic to a neighborhood and providing off-street parking. Mr. Etienne stated that it is interesting that this Case comes before the Board at the same time the Planning Board is discussing potential changes for ADUs and added that if the Board grants this Variance, there could be sweeping implications with others in Town seeking the same relief, citing this Case as setting precedent, before the Town's Planning Board assesses the situation and present Zoning Ordinance changes for the Town to vote upon.

Mr. Daddario agreed, to a point, and noted that anyone wanting to add a living unit in their detached garage would need to come before the Board for a Variance and they too would have to satisfy the Variance criteria. With regard to this Case, Mr. Daddario stated that the hardship criteria, in his opinion, has been satisfied based on the land – the existence of ledge, the placement of the septic system, the location of the swimming pool and the well– which dictated where the garage could be constructed which did not allow it to be connected to the residence.

Mr. Buttrick recapped the history. The Building Permit was initially filed for that two-stall unit garage with a private office above with a convenience bathroom, then the situation with Mr. Nichols' mother changed and Mr. Nichols asked if the office could be converted to an ADU and, unfortunately, the term ADU perpetuated and required a Variance, but in hindsight, what should have been processed was a request for a second dwelling unit, which would also require a Variance.

Public testimony opened at 8:45 PM. No one addressed the Board.

Mr. Etienne made the motion to grant the Variance with the stipulation that the detached living unit must comply with all the other ADU (Accessory Dwelling Unit – Section 334-73.3) requirements with the exception of the physical connection and the separate address prohibition to allow a distinguishing address for emergency access. Mr. Daddario seconded the motion. Roll call vote was 4:1. Mr. Pacocha opposed. Variance granted with stipulations. The 30-day appeal period was noted.

IV. REQUEST FOR REHEARING:

No requests were presented for Board consideration.

V. REVIEW OF MINUTES: 10/28/21 Edited Minutes

Motion made by Mr. Etienne, seconded by Mr. Nicolas and unanimously voted to table review of the Minutes to the next meeting (12/9/2021).

IV. OTHER:

1. Welcome new Alternate Members

Warm welcome extended to the Alternates.

2. Special Meeting – January 13/2022?

Mr. Buttrick stated that there is a need for a special meeting on a complicated Case that started out as Code Enforcement and one of the abatements from the Court was to bring it to the Zoning Board for a relief via Variances and Special Exceptions. The Applicant would like to have five (5) Voting Members. Mr. Buttrick noted that Member Nicolas is an abutter and therefore will be recusing himself. Mr. Buttrick took a poll on who is available on 1/13/2022 and only four (4) Members would be able to attend. A second date of 1/20/2022 was explored and seven (7) Members could attend. Special meeting set for 1/20/2022. Members asked to have paperwork early and the presence of Town Counsel. Special Meeting set for 1/20/2022

3. BoS Conflict of Interest Packet

Mr. Buttrick noted that the information was sent out electronically as well as print in the Supplemental Meeting Packet, provided a recap of the scenario that occurred in Manchester where a voting member spoke out on social media as opposing the project prior to its public hearing, asked everyone to sign for the receipt of the information, Town Counsel's letter and noted that it does contain good information.

4. When an Alternate Votes

Mr. Buttrick stated that in a recent Case, Alternate Martin was appointed to vote in Mr. Etienne's absence and that Case was continued to the January meeting. The Board's Bylaws is silent. There are two (2) possible scenarios: (1) the Regular Member (in this instance, Mr. Etienne) could familiarize himself with the Case and sit as a Voting Member at the continued meeting or (2) the Alternate Voting Member (in this

instance, Mr. Martin) could be appointed to vote. Discussion ensued. Ms. Roy stated that it is more fair to the Applicant to have the same Voting Members. Mr. Buttrick agreed. Mr. Etienne concurred and recalled an earlier Case when he was absent and upon his return at the following meeting he recused himself because even though he had read all the material, he had not heard the testimony.

Mr. Buttrick presented proposed change to the Bylaws, Section 143, Disqualifications A-G with a change to G. and a new H. for direct or indirect abutters disqualify/recuse. No changes were suggested. Mr. Buttrick noted that any change to the Bylaws requires two (2) Public Hearings.

5. The Clerk Position

Mr. Buttrick stated that the position of Clerk has traditionally been performed by an Alternate Member, but the Board has been without Alternate Members and Mr. Etienne has been performing the function; however, it is challenging to participate in a meeting discussion and take the required notes. Mr. Etienne concurred.

Mr. Buttrick noted that the Bylaws do not specify details for the Clerk position, except that it is a position filled/voted on every year. Mr. Buttrick noted that Alternates can and do participate in discussion in Board discussion up to the point of deliberation. Mr. Buttrick suggested that the Alternates should be rotated to perform the Clerk function. Mr. Etienne stated that the rotation would serve to build the bench of experience among the Alternates. Discussion arose and scenarios explored, for example when an Alternate is designed to Clerk but is then appointed to Vote, controlling and monitoring the rotation. Mr. Buttrick to draft proposed language for the Bylaws.

6. Proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendments for Consideration by PB

Mr. Buttrick stated that the Planning Board (PB) met and ranked the list accumulated for possible Zoning Ordinance (ZO) amendments and referenced the list in the Supplemental Meeting Packet. In brief, the list included: housing for older persons; discontinue Article 13; change to the small lots in the TR Zone to either allow sheds in the setback or reduce the setback; building height in the I (Industrial) Zone; definition of "buildable area" needed; mixed use in the B (Business) Zone and Dual Use on a lot; split Zone; Table of Uses, Home Occupation for Day Care to allow outdoor noise/use; ADU (Accessory Dwelling Unit) size/square footage and detached structures; Split Zone parcels; uplit lighting on signs; cell towers still in Table of Uses even though Town voted to change from Special Exception to CUP (Conditional Use Permit) from the Planning Board; and display parking in the setback

7. Town Counsel Questions for Grigas Street Extension

Mr. Buttrick asked if there were more questions to pose to Town Counsel for the Grigas Street extension pertaining to the 8 Lindsay Street Case.

8. Next ZBA Meeting – December 9, 2021

Motion made by Mr. Etienne, seconded by Mr. Nicolas and unanimously voted to adjourn the meeting. The 11/18/2021 ZBA meeting adjourned at 9:37 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Gary M. Daddario, ZBA Chairman