GILFORD ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

MINUTES

JUNE 22, 2021

**CONFERENCE ROOM A**

**7:00 P.M.**

The Gilford Zoning Board of Adjustment met on Tuesday, June 22, 2021, at 7:00 p.m. The public, the applicant, and Board members were able to join via GoToMeeting.

Chairman Scott Davis led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Members present were Chairman Scott Davis; Vice-Chairman Bill Knightly; Regular Members Andy Howe, Larry Routhier, and Adrianna Antonopoulos; and Alternate Member Kevin Hayes.

Also present were Sandra Hart, Technical Assistant, and Daniel Tousignant, Building Inspector/Code Enforcement Officer.

**1. Applications**

**1.1** **William J. Fidler 2020 Family Tr.**

**Application #2021000276** - Applicant is seeking a Variance from Article 5, Section 5.2 Special District Standards, 5.1.3 Front Setback Area and Table 2 Dimensional Regulations for the construction of a 5,888 square foot Single Family home with walk-out basement, deck and garage. The property is located at 8 Varney Point Road, Left on Tax Map & Lot #223-420.000 in the Single Family Residential (SFR) Zone and the Island and Shore Frontage District. *Tabled from the May 25, 2021.*

Motion made by A. Howe, seconded by B. Knightly, to take the application off the table. Motion carried with all in favor.

Jon Rokeh of Rokeh Engineering, representing the applicant, said he had new information to present but was told by the board he could not. The board said that they would not be accepting any new information.

A. Howe wanted to know if there was any additional information from the last meeting. William Fidler, applicant, stated that there were plans submitted by Carl Johnson showing the sewer lines.

A. Howe said that at the last meeting an abutter said that the plans weren’t correct. He asked if the new plans show the shoreline information accurately. He said both plans have a blue line as the shoreline and he doesn’t see anything on the south described by the abutter with regard to the inlet. W. Fidler said that there wasn’t an inlet.

A. Howe said the board had asked for a more updated plan and asked the applicant to elaborate on the new plans submitted. W. Fidler replied that the current plans show the utilities and the setbacks. J. Rokeh stated that he looked at the existing driveway and what they are proposing to do is lower the walkout about 10 feet and fit the house into the grade. He said they will be doing a little bit of a retaining wall along the side and adding rain gardens.

A. Howe asked if they are designed to slow the water. J. Rokeh replied, yes the rain gardens are designed to do that.

L. Routhier asked to confirm that this is 28 feet from the shoreline. J. Rokeh said that the structure is 28 feet and that’s matching up to where the existing dwelling is located. L. Routhier said except that it is a new structure. J. Rokeh said that it will be more compliant than what is there currently. J. Rokeh said there isn’t much that can be built there.

Attorney Philip Hastings of Cleveland, Waters and Bass, P. A., representing the applicant, said they could rebuild on the existing footprint. He said the board needs to determine if what is being proposed is reasonable in the context. He said he believes this proposal would be considered reasonable.

A. Howe asked what the bold dashed line was on the plan. J. Rokeh stated that Carl Johnson was showing that as a limited disturbance line.

A. Antonopoulos asked about the lot coverage. W. Fidler replied that the coverage is less because we are making just about everything permeable, such as one driveway will be removed, which is actually shown on the plan.

A. Howe asked if they did anything about the roofline. Peter Stewart said that the rooflines have not changed. The height of the building from the first floor to the top is the same. He said they could have raised the foundation higher and it would be 2 feet higher, but they didn’t do that. W. Fidler said that they didn’t go excessive with regard to their ceiling heights, which will be 8 foot and 9 foot high ceilings. He said there will be two peaks. He added that one thing they looked at was the Fay property, which is across the street, and tried to have less of an impact for them looking down. Also, there are many birch trees along the side of the property which they will reduce down to shrubbery which will make the view better. He said that currently the garage is higher than the house.

J. Rokeh said the structure is larger than what is there, but when you take away the pavement and the patio below it is not as big. He said this is done all the time, adding rain gardens and using pervious pavers to reduce stormwater runoff. B. Knightly said that he believes that the NHDES Wetland Bureau has done that for a few years now.

A. Howe asked if they would reconsider the roofline. W. Fidler said they could maybe go down about a foot. He said that he lives down the road and there are many walkers on the street, and that they will be opening up that area to improve lake views. P. Hastings said that the Gilford zoning ordinance doesn’t have a view easement requirement. A. Howe said that his point is well taken, but he said it is the board’s job to be respectful of the neighbors and based on the applicant’s application, that’s one of the applicant’s objectives as well.

P. Stewart said that the proposal is way down on the hill. A. Antonopoulos agreed but said it is double the size. B. Knightly said that he feels like the abutters have concerns and the applicant said he wanted to be a better neighbor, so maybe he could go down a bit in size. W. Fidler said that they’ve mitigated as much as they could. W. Fidler said that he could lower one ceiling on one floor to bring the ridge down a foot. P. Stewart stated that they could come down about one and a half feet.

K. Hayes that it’s much bigger than what it looks like on the sketch. He said he appreciates what the applicant has done here, but he said the house goes from the front all the way to the back and this is a side view.

B. Knightly asked about the shore land permit. W. Fidler said that it was sent back for additional information regarding the materials being used.

Public Input

Ralph Federspiel an abutter at 12 Varney Point Road Left said he’s not so concerned about the building itself, but rather the property line between their properties. He said there has been surveying done, but they have not put any markers out on the property and he would like to have a marker and a line drawn down to the lake so they can keep the digging and interruption as minimum as possible around those roots from all the trees they will be removing. He said digging up the roots will cause a problem. R. Federspiel also said that their sewer lines are really close and he doesn’t want anything to happen to them. He asked how long blasting will take place, adding that they had to deal with the Nickerson’s blasting for six weeks last year.

R. Federspiel said they are requesting that the pins be put in place and a line drawn down the property line. He said there was a survey done for the Town of Gilford for the road, but no one can find it. He said if you research the deeds, you will see that nothing on the road agrees with the deeds. He said they have had several surveys done and they all seem to be different, so neither surveyor agrees with the previous. K. Hayes said that sometimes they don’t put pins in until after construction so that they don’t get disturbed.

L. Routhier asked if the sewer line gets damaged, who would be responsible. D. Tousignant responded that if the sewer line is damaged the town DPW would be contacted and the responsibility would go to the contractor or whoever caused the damage. D. Tousignant said that the excavators will only move what they need to move. Doris Federspiel, also of 12 Varney Point Road Left, said that it would still affect their trees.

D. Tousignant suggested that maybe as a neighbor/neighborhood there could be an agreement made.

S. Davis said that you should have the surveyor put the pins in so that there is an accurate side property line. W. Fidler said that there was a survey done in 2008 by DMC Surveying, and their surveyor was able to match up to that survey.

S. Davis said that the tax map and the survey plan show different acreages. K. Hayes said that if the tax map is incorrect we could have it corrected when we get the new survey.

Beth Fay, an abutter at 5 Varney Point Road Left, said that as an abutter and she’s concerned about losing her view and that she’s just finished preserving her 1938 cottage across the street at 11 Varney Point Road Left. She said she is worried about the percentage of lot coverage.

P. Hastings said that currently this is a non-conforming structure and they are planning to reduce the non-conformity from the existing conditions.

Merrill Fay, an abutter at 5 Varney Point Road Left, said that he has the original maps that were done many years ago by Pearly. He said he is happy with all the pins, and he knows right where they are. He said that he counted about 11 good size trees and he wanted to know if they were going to cut down all the trees. S. Davis said that it looked like they were cutting about 50% of them. M. Fay said he thought that they would be restricted by the state on that. M. Fay said that the road is very narrow and the traffic is crazy. He said during construction it’ll be worse. M. Fay asked where they would be parking. He said there is a flat area on the property, are they going to park there? He said it will be close to the side neighbor. M. Fay said there are “no parking” signs all the way down the road. It looks like they will have one parking space in the driveway and one parking space in the garage. He asked what happens if they park on the side of the road and people can’t get by. B. Knightly said that someone could call the police.

M. Fay asked for an explanation of the rain gardens. J. Routhier explained that rain gardens add stormwater retention in case there is a heavy rain.

D. Federspiel said that sometimes the water flows down like a river and a small child could actually drown. It washes out everything. She said there is no place for the rain to go on that road and explained that it comes down off Heights Road. It causes an issue when it is plowed as well. There is a lot of run off.

W. Fidler said that the pin is not a real issue, but we will definitely have it surveyed again. In terms of the waterfront, there is only one tree in the waterfront, which he is not removing. He is going to remove the thin little birch trees because the garden will go there. Discussion ensued. W. Fidler said that they are trying to work with everyone on this. M. Fay said that it’s just an enormous house on a small lot.

W. Fidler said that they will agree to disagree. He said they will reduce the roofline and there will be a wide-open view of open water. W. Fidler said that when it’s done everyone will be happier. He said they have spent an enormous amount of money to get the best people involved to make this work.

Robert Kendall, attorney with McLane Middleton representing the Fays, said that he had a couple of concerns and they submitted a letter yesterday addressing those concerns. He said their main concerns were not addressed last time, regarding the height. He said looking at where the current garage sits and where the new house and garage are proposed, there is no way that their view will not be affected. He said if the Board grants the variance one could ask if the value will be diminished. He said he thinks in this case if they lose their view then it is diminished. R. Kendall said another point is with regard to traffic. He said the applicant is seeking a variance from the front setback. He said to be so close to the street they are limited in where they can park and they can fit maybe three vehicles. This application proposes a one-car driveway and a 4-bedroom house and a garage. He said the road is only 17 feet wide and there is not much room to park on the road. R. Kendall said they can’t see that justice is done with regard to this.

A. Antonopoulos pointed out that the plans show a different lot coverage. K. Hayes said that it might be because they included the garage on one. A. Antonopoulos said that she’s confused with the numbers shown on the plans and then the front and the lake side setbacks not being met.

S. Davis introduced the next application.

 **1.2** **Stones Throw Realty, LLC**

 **Application #2021000355** - A Variance is being requested from Article 5. Dimensional Regulations, Article 7. Off-Street Parking, Article 17. Architectural Design Standards, 5.2 Special District Standards, 5.2.1 Island and Shore Frontage District (a) Section 5.3 Building Standards, 5.3.1 Building Heights to construct a new building. The property is located at 40 Weirs Road, on Tax Map & Lot #223-539.000 in the Resort Commercial (RC) Zone.

Presentation

Christopher Drescher of Cronin Bisson & Zalinsky P.C. is representing the applicants Ron Allen and Kalley Cutler

C. Drescher gave a brief background of the property. He said the original plan was to construct a new building, but they got pushback from NH DES and in taking the advice of DES, they are seeking relief from the height, parking and architectural design requirements with this new proposal. He said they are asking to allow a 56-foot high structure where 25-feet is allowed. The 56-feet would be needed for the elevator shaft, which goes up to the roof deck. He said for the most part, the building itself is 42-feet, and they are aware why the town has those setbacks and height restrictions. He said it is because they are behind a municipal airport, next door to a shopping area, and across the street from the lake. The building next door is Shep Browns and that building is 38.9 feet in height measured from the ground.

L. Routhier said that the Airport District in the Zoning Ordinance has a height restriction, but won’t the FAA need prior notification? C. Drescher said that they were given a preliminary approval that the height would not be an issue. He then went over Article 7 for the parking.

C. Drescher said that they have an agreement with the folks next door at Sports & Marine Parafunalia with regard to parking. He said this would work out because after they close then the restaurant can utilize those other parking spaces, and that will be 88 parking spaces. But he said that is still not enough to meet the parking requirements. He said they anticipate that a certain percentage of customers will be walk-in traffic. He said there was a petition that was signed by many people from the marinas and condominium association in the area stating that they would walk to the restaurant.

C. Drescher went over the variance criteria.

*1. Granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest because:* The grant of the requested variances will not be contrary to the public interest. More specifically, the requested variances will not unduly conflict with the basic purposes of the relevant zoning provisions as they will neither alter the essential character of the area nor threaten the public health, safety, or welfare. The property is located in a commercial area with a wide variety of uses including boat slips, restaurants, strip malls and a landmark water sports store. The construction of the restaurant, as proposed, will not substantially alter the essential character of the neighborhood.

*2. The spirit of the ordinance is observed because:* The spirit of the ordinance element is related to the public interest element as a matter of law. For the reasons that the grant of the variance is not contrary to the public interest, it also does not violate the spirit of the ordinance.

*3. Substantial justice is done because:* The loss to the applicant, in the event that a variance is denied, outweighs any gain to the general public. Accordingly, substantial justice would be done by granting the requested variance.

As suggested above, the applicant has been bearing the carrying cost relative to the property. Denial of relief here will not serve the public in any meaningful way. Given the circumstances, the applicant will be denied any reasonable economic use of the property without there being any true corresponding interest to the public.

*4. The values of surrounding properties will not be diminished because:* The property is located within the resort commercial district and there will be no negative impact to the sight lines, views, or abutters. The RC district is intended for tourism, supporting services and residential use. The airport is located to the rear of the property and there is no issue with flight patterns or interference with airport operation. The abutting building, used as a boat dealer and for auto storage, is tall and the height of the proposed building will be similar.

The variances will permit the construction of a restaurant, which is an allowed use in the zone. The parking issues currently exist and the parking area will generally remain the same. An important factor that makes the parking reasonable is an agreement with the abutter that will allow nearly the number of required spaces and allow some extra protection to the river in the existing parking lot as commented upon during the site walk.

*5. Literal enforcement of the provisions of the ordinance would result in an unnecessary hardship because:* The property, which has been used for a restaurant for many years, has several non-conformities that are vested and will be improved upon to make the property more nearly conforming. The property is unique in its configuration and proximity to the Gunstock River. The applicant seeks to return the property to productive use and stabilize the value for tax purposes.

The property is more than sufficient in size to accommodate such a use. Without relief the applicant cannot make the restaurant work. If the variance requests are denied, it will be difficult to make any economic use of the property. The proposed use is reasonable.

The applicants have a very successful restaurant bar and the applicant understands how to make this work. He said they need to have capacity in order to have the restaurant survive here. If anything, it will have a positive impact. C. Drescher said he would contend that this restaurant will be a major asset and they’ve summited evidence to support that.

S. Davis said that given the fact that you’re anticipating such a high volume, can’t we drop the elevator shaft so that it’ll just be two floors. C. Drescher said that the kitchen is on the first floor and the elevator will be made ADA compliant.

K. Hayes asked how the food gets from the kitchen to the second floor. K. Cutler said there are three sets of stairs and dumb waiters. B. Knightly said that there was a site visit for a prior proposal and the NH DES shot that idea down. K. Cutler said that they have an agreement with Sports and Marine Parafunalia and they will be taking down the trees between the two areas.

Ronald Allen of Stones Thrown Realty said that they will work with Bart Jeffreys next door and they will take the trees down in between the two businesses and he needs parking there in daytime and they will need the parking at night. He said they will have to line the parking spaces.

A. Howe asked about buffers between commercial lots. C. Drescher said that they weren’t going to merge lots, but they are sharing the two lots and they will take down trees.

A. Antonopoulos said that if they have to go through another application process through the FAA, would the ZBA approval be conditional on that. C. Drescher said the Board could approve it conditionally with that condition. A. Antonopoulos said if we wait for that, could we wait for a better architectural visual as well. C. Drescher said we can get the architect to draw up whatever you want.

S. Davis said that there was some correspondence from Marv Everson, Airport Manager, and in the letter, it said that he didn’t foresee that the FAA would have any issues with it. S. Davis said they would need to get a formal approval from them. He said that that process is part of the site plan review process.

L. Routhier said that he had no objection as to the restaurant, but that he does have an objection to the height, and he respects the town ordinance and we did make the ordinance for a reason. He said he anticipates that it will be easily visible, it would stand out, and the applicant wants that. C. Drescher agreed with that, but said that the lot is unique, but in order to build, they have to build up.

A. Howe asked about the Gilford Fire Department and will the height affect them with regard to fighting a fire on the 4th floor. S. Davis said that they would call the mutual aid to help, and that would be the engine out of Weirs Beach. This plan/proposal will have to go through the Planning Board process as well. K. Cutler said that it would be 3-feet taller than our abutter and the top is wide open, it’s just the elevator that will be taller.

Public Input

S. Davis asked if any members of the public wished to speak.

Susan Leach said that she’s opposed to the height and she’s been watching those planes for years. She said there was an accident there recently. She has a daughter that lives back there and she has to keep her trees at a certain height. She’s surprised there hasn’t been a major accident because the planes go right over the tops of the trees. S. Davis said that he understands, but M. Everson did send in a letter saying the FAA would not likely object to the height. S. Leach said that the other thing she was wondering was if there had been any discussion about if people will be able to leave their cars there and walk up to see the concerts.

S. Davis closed the public hearing and introduced the last application.

 **1.3** **Colleen Chausse**

 **Application #2021000356** - Applicant is seeking a Variance from Article 5. Dimensional Regulations, Section 5.1.3 Front Setback, Section 5.1.4 Side Setback and 5.1.5 Rear Setback area to replace an existing non-conforming mobile home with a new 14’x 66’ mobile home. The property is located at 14 Hollow Lane, on Tax Map & Lot #242- 383.000 in the Resort Commercial (RC) Zone.

Presentation

Colleen Chausse was on GoToMeeting. She stated that she and her sister own this mobile home and another one that is on the abutting lot. She said her sister was able to replace hers in 2004, but she wasn’t able to replace this one at that time. C. Chausse said she renovated hers on the inside, but the person that did the plumbing didn’t add a drain so the water had collected underneath for 12 years and there’s just mold and mildew and rot.

C. Chausse explained that she currently rents and that her lease goes out in August of where she currently lives now and that she put a deposit down to hold a mobile home unit at Camelot. She said she wants to make this mobile home as compliant as possible. She explained that the lot will be leveled off, with landscaping and they will add a slab. The property value will be improved in that area. She said the existing structure is already a non-conforming structure and she’s asking for 6 feet. C. Chausse said she has a deposit down and there is a home available and she will lose her deposit if this doesn’t get approved.

B. Knightly said that your sister is the one on the deed. C. Chausse explained that they bought them together at the same time, but that her sister’s name is first so that’s why it’s the only one that shows up.

L. Routhier asked if everything is non-coming in that area. Yes, everything is non-conforming over there replied D. Tousignant.

A. Howe said that it appears that is this is a non-conforming lot. Yes, that is correct replied D. Tousignant. Anything smaller would be a special order asked B. Knightly. Yes, that is correct replied C. Chausse.

A. Howe asked if there was a cement pad there currently. No, not yet replied said D. Tousignant.

S. Davis said that the septic and well are shared between the two lots. How many bedrooms are there combined?

Cheryl Favreau, sister of and co-owner with the applicant, said that there are four, but there were four before and it will remain four. She said they are set up for year-round use, but they don’t go up there in the winter.

C. Chausse went over the variance criteria:

*1. Granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest because:* The existing home was already non-compliant to the lot. The lot is intended for a mobile home.

*2. The spirit of the ordinance is observed because:* I want to make it as compliant with the zoning ordinance as allowed by the size of the lot compared to the size of the unit.

*3. Substantial justice is done because:* I removed a rundown, dilapidated, abandoned mobile home and will replace it with a new, more compliant mobile home.

*4. The values of surrounding properties will not be diminished because:* This will be upgrading the property values by more than 100%.

*5. Literal enforcement of the provisions of the ordinance would result in an unnecessary because:*

*(A)* The existing structure was already a non-conforming structure to today’s ordinances. The lot is very small and cannot fit a modern mobile home and still meet setbacks. The existing mobile home encroaches over the property line and this change would eliminate that encroachment.

*(i) No fair and substantial relationship exists between the general purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property.* The existing mobile home is encroaching into the front and side setbacks. Allowing the variance will allow the new mobile home to be more compliant with setbacks. Denying the variance would deny reasonable use of the property.

Or

(B) The lot is very small (approx. 55 feet wide and 100 feet long) and cannot accommodate a newer mobile home because they are not made that small any longer. Only a mobile home can go on the lot because it is in a mobile home park. Denying the variance would be an unnecessary hardship because the mobile home could never be replaced with another mobile home

Public Input

S. Davis asked if any members of the public wished to speak. Hearing none he closed the public hearing.

DELIBERATIONS:

**1.1** **William J. Fidler 2020 Family Tr.**

 **Application #2021000276**

K. Hayes said he is not happy with this proposal because it takes up so much of the lot.

D. Tousignant pointed out that a neighbor brought up the issue with the side setback.

K. Hayes said that he would like to see the shoreland permit and he would like it if they had a survey done.

B. Knightly made a motion to table the application to the July 27, 2021 meeting so that the Board could see the shoreland approval and the survey. Seconded by A. Howe.

L. Routhier said that he agrees and he sympathizes with the neighbors but he knows that the view can’t be impacted by the variance.

B. Knightly said that they could get a nice building that’s smaller. He said the ordinance is there for a reason and he has a real problem with the hardship on this application.

S. Davis said maybe the Board should consider asking them to come back with a smaller impact.

A. Antonopoulos said she will not be at the next meeting.

Motion carried with all in favor.

**1.2** **Stones Throw Realty, LLC**

 **Application #2021000355**

B. Knightly said that he agrees with concerns about the height and he wished that the elevator shaft wasn’t so high.

A. Howe said he thinks the elevator shaft is in direct contrast with the architectural designs. He said there are no other elevator shafts in the area, so it would not be in keeping with the character of the neighborhood to have this big square building there and to have an elevator shaft sticking out. He said he is also concerned with regard to the shared parking and whether it’s going to work. He understands that it will be under the Planning Board purview. A. Howe said he understands what they are doing. They are asking for relief from these ordinances. The parking thing bothers him and the dimensional requirements as well and that he’s leaning against granting the variances.

S. Davis supports the concern with the elevator shaft. He said he is not as concerned about the shared parking, but he said there could be issues. The parking requirement based on the number of seats is huge, but he said he could go in favor of the shared parking. He’s more concerned about the appearance.

L. Routhier agreed about comments made regarding the shared parking. L. Routhier said that he didn’t know the heights for Patrick’s Pub or the Shep Browns building. He doesn’t know what transpired and how things got granted for them. He does know that in the 2013 Zoning Ordinance it was made clear that they wanted 25-foot setback from Lake Winnipesauke. He honestly supports the area for a restaurant, but to go to a 45-foot height is just too much for him.

S. Davis said that in terms of hardship and the uniqueness of the lot, Gunstock Brook puts constraints on the lot, which is unique to buy and invest in something there. He said he understands where they are going in terms of multiple levels. He didn’t know that they needed to go three stories high. He gets the restraints of the lot and they should be taken under consideration to some degree.

B. Knightly said that in looking at Ellacoya Barn and Grille and what that looks like, he said that site is a disaster really with regard to parking so he does have a concern about the parking. He went on the site visit and saw the intended design. He said that parking on the road would be a concern and that would be a disaster, but looking at the building he can live with it. L. Routhier said there is no parking allowed on the road.

R. Allen said he actually put an elevator in the house because of what’s going on with his wife. If it’s too high they can go without the top deck. He said they are here to work with the town on this.

S. Davis asked if they would think about it and come back to us next month.

R. Allen said that the first floor is for the kitchen and the coolers. The next two floors will be restaurant. He said they talked to people from all over the area with regard to the restaurant and they told him that they would be happy to walk over.

K. Cutler said that she had the statistics for the boats and all the other condominiums in the area if the Board would like them. If there’s no parking available then people will go somewhere else, people are smart and they will have to figure it out. In order to do this, it will have need to financially pay off. She is grateful for the support and that this is a wonderful place to be.

Attorney Drescher said that they would be happy to come back with another plan if we could do something with regard to the elevator.

K. Hayes wondered if there might be another type of elevator shaft.

Attorney Drescher said that it would eliminate a few feet at the top, if we eliminated that elevator shaft or the deck.

A. Antonopoulos said that she has a young family and she is excited about this proposal.

**Motion**

Motion made by A. Howe, seconded by B. Knightly, to table the application to the July 27, 2021 meeting. Motion carried with all in favor.

**1.3** **Colleen Chausse**

 **Application #2021000356**

Motion made by L. Routhier, seconded by B. Knightly to grant the Variance for application #2021000356 under Article 12, Section 12.1 Specific Requirements and to approve the Variance request from Article 5, Sections 5.1.3, 5.1.4 and 5.1.5 to allow for a new 14’ x 66’ mobile home.

We don’t know when a new mobile home would be available, the existing structure was rundown, and a new compliant home will be going in its place. The lot is small and can’t fit a modern mobile home to meet the current standards. The prior mobile home was already encroaching into the setbacks.

S. Hart took a roll call:

A. Antonopoulos - yes

A. Howe - yes

B. Knightly - yes

L. Routhier - yes

S. Davis - yes

Motion carried with all in favor.

**MINUTES**

April 27, 2021

B. Knightly, seconded by L. Routhier, tabled the minutes of April 27, 202. Motion carried with all in favor.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

Election of officers.

Motion made by A. Howe, seconded by L. Routhier, to nominate B. Knightly to be Chairman. B. Knightly made a motion, seconded by A. Howe, to nominate L. Routhier to be vice-chair. Motions carried with all in favor.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Motion made by B. Knightly, seconded by L. Routhier, to adjourn the Zoning Board of Adjustment meeting of June 22, 2021 at 9:45 p.m. Motion carried with all in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Sandra Hart, Secretary