

**CITY OF CONCORD, NH
ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
JUNE 14, 2023,
MEETING MINUTES**

Attendees: Chairman Christopher Carley, Nicholas Wallner, Laura Spector-Morgan, Tedd Evans and Brenda Perkins.

Absent: James Monahan, Andrew Winters

Staff: Tracey Hutton, Zoning Administrator
Rose Fife, Clerk of the Board

Meeting commenced at 6:00 pm.

- 1) Call meeting to order
- 2) Chairperson's comments
- 3) Public Hearings
- 4) Any other business that may legally come before the Board

PUBLIC HEARINGS

0052-2023 75 W Parish Road; RO – Open Space Residential District; Hooper Family Trust of 2020, Owner:
Owner seeks an Equitable Waiver for a swimming pool and associated improvements that do not meet the standards of Article 28-4-1(d), Dimensional Standards and seeks the following:

1. A rear lot setback of 0 feet where 50 feet is required.
2. A side lot setback of 25 feet where 40 feet is required.

The Board for this case consisted of Chair Carley, Ms. Perkins, Mr. Wallner and Mr. Evans. Ms. Spector-Morgan recused herself due to a conflict. The Hooper's are willing to be heard by a 4 member board.

Testified: Michael Hooper. The pool, where it is has existed for more than 10 years and the City has not notified him of any of the issues.

Mr. Wallner asked if the pool was built in 2001 and they moved there in 2013 and there was no indication by the selling agent that it did not meet the criteria. Mr. Hooper explained that there was not any indication and there was nothing in the disclosure. Ms. Perkins asked if he knew who the previous owner might be. Mr. Hooper answered that Ms. Dunn; a previous owner had installed the pool. He further stated that it has not been an issue with his neighbors. He is looking to sell his house in the near future and wanted to be sure it was not an issue for the new owner.

Mr. Evans asked if a Building Permit had ever been issued for the installation of the pool. Mr. Hooper answered that there was a permit issued in 2001 and it was closed in 2005.

In favor: Randy Dow, 105 Carter Hill Road. He was the previous owner of 75 W. Parish Road. They bought the property in 2001 and he doesn't believe the pool was over the boundary at the time. He bought the property behind 75 West Parish Road. The pool fence is 4 inches over the boundary. It is not an issue to him.

Ron Christie, 80 W Parish Road. He lives diagonal across the street from this property. He is in support of the request.

In opposition: none.

Comments from Code: Zoning Administrator Hutton noted that this was not a result from enforcement action being taken.

DECISION:

Mr. Evans believes it meets the requirements of an equitable waiver. It was not noticed until well after the time frame it was completed. It was a good faith error. It has not been a nuisance based on testimony. He moved approval.

Ms. Perkins also moved approval as well. She had a vague memory of the property from 20 years ago.

Mr. Wallner agrees.

Chair Carley agrees.

Motion was made by Mr. Evans, seconded by Mr. Wallner and passed by a 4-0 vote.

0053-2023 90 Sanborn Road; RO – Open Space Residential District; Jason Cross, Owner:

Owner seeks a Variance to Article 28-4-1(d), Dimensional Standards, for a side yard setback of 10 feet from the property line where 40 feet is required.

The Board for this case consisted of Acting Chair Wallner, Ms. Perkins, Mr. Wallner, Ms. Spector-Morgan and Mr. Evans. Chair Carley recused himself as he had a conflict.

Testified: Jason Cross. He submitted plans, which were shown on the overhead screen. They would like to attach a 3 car garage to the existing garage. They park their vehicles now where the new garage would go. It is a 10 foot setback in the front, but as you go back to the rear it increases the distance. He showed a photograph of the property. Even with the new garage, they will have additional room to get around to the back of their property. They have conservation land behind them. He has spoken with his neighbors. The new garage would add value to their property and add to their neighbor's property value as well. It would look nicer than seeing 3 cars parked in the driveway.

Mr. Wallner asked if they already had a garage. Mr. Cross explained that they already have an existing garage, but it is used for storage and it is very narrow so they can't park anything in there. The existing garage is 3 bays, but one will be eliminated by adding on this garage. Mr. Wallner asked if that would bring them to having a 5 bay garage. Mr. Cross explained that they will end with a 3 bay garage as 2 bays will be storage. Ms. Spector-Morgan asked why it could not be located elsewhere. Mr. Cross explained that their property has ledge to work around and they have a deck and patio area. Structurally, it would not tie together properly as they would have to take the roof off and redo it. His well is also in the way. Mr. Evans asked about the roof pitch of the garage as it exists now. Mr. Cross explained that they will have someone draft plans. Mr. Wallner asked about the proposed garage size. Mr. Cross answered that it would be a 36' x 30'. That would be plenty of room to park and have a work bench. The existing garage is 20' x 35'. Ms. Spector-Morgan asked if their vehicles were too large for that size garage. Mr. Cross answered they were. Mr. Evans asked if they did any engineering study about possibly rotating the garage 90 degrees and therefore not have any setback issues. He asked if the ledge had been studied and is it an obstacle. Mr. Evans asked if they had any studies done to see if it was feasible for an alternative placement of the garage. Mr. Cross answered that they had not. They had an architect/engineer at the property and this is the only location for the garage that is feasible. Ms. Spector-Morgan asked if he had been before the Board a few years ago. Mr. Cross answered he had been before the Board for the driveway setback. Ms. Perkins asked for the aerial photo to be zoomed in. She further asked if it was finished space above the garage or if it was storage space. Mr. Cross answered that they would like to finish that space. Ms. Perkins asked if they thought of putting a dormer on the garage? Mr. Cross answered that it would create issues with the foundation. They would need to take off the roof and walls and it would not be cost effective and not solve the problem on the width. They may make the old garage living space in the future. There is ledge in the back yard. There was much discussion regarding design possibilities. Mr. Cross explained that they have lived there 11 years and would like to stay there. They park outside now and they would like to put a roof over their vehicles. The garage will not harm anyone.

In favor: Jean Richards, 110 Hoit Road. Their property abuts Mr. Cross in the rear. They have no issue with the request. Most of the area where he would encroach has trees. Mr. Cross is as concerned as they are about the conservation land.

In opposition: none.

Comments from Code: Zoning Administrator Hutton turned the contour map layers on for the Board to see on the overhead maps. According the April 12, 2023 Conservation Commission Meeting Minutes, the commission was concerned about this garage because of the previous activities that encroached upon the conservation land.

Rebuttal: Mr. Cross saw the memo from the Conservation Commission. The photo was from 2019. He had filled in a few spots with loam and had a landscape trailer that was over the property line by a few feet. He has corrected that and has

not encroached since. Nothing has, or ever will be, over that line again. Mr. Wallner asked if he put up a fence. Mr. Cross answered that he had not because he was allowed to mow and maintain up to 50 feet. The fence was to prevent any further encroachment.

DECISION:

Ms. Spector-Morgan felt that the garage was not necessary as there is already an existing 3 car garage there. But it does meet the variance criteria. It is not contrary to the public interest, it is within keeping with the spirit of the ordinance, it is consistent with the neighborhood, it will result in substantial justice, it will not diminish surrounding property values; the property is unique due to the contours of the land and the of the house, it is a large property. The purpose of the setbacks are met. A garage is a reasonable use. A **motion** to grant the request.

Mr. Evans agrees and seconded the motion.

Ms. Perkins agrees, but the future use would be a concern as well as the encroachment to the conservation land.

Mr. Wallner agrees.

The **motion** was to approve the request by Ms. Spector-Morgan, seconded by Mr. Evans and passed by a unanimous vote.

0054-2023 13 Washington Street; RD – Downtown Residential District; Jeffrey Trovato & Gabrielle Drenzo, Owners:

Owners wish to create a dwelling unit in the existing garage on the property alongside the existing two-family dwelling. Variances are requested to:

1. Article 28-2-4(h), Multiple Principal Uses on a Single Lot.
2. Article 28-4-1(h), Table of Dimensional Regulations, to allow the reconstruction of a non-conforming building within one foot of the side setback where 10 feet is required and one foot of the rear setback where 20 feet is required.
3. Article 28-4-1(h), Table of Dimensional Regulations, to allow expansion of use of a lot with insufficient street frontage. The lot has 69 +/- feet of frontage where 75 feet is required.

The Board from this point forward consisted of Chair Carley, Mr. Evans, Ms. Spector-Morgan, Mr. Wallner, and Ms. Perkins.

Testified: Jeffrey Trovato and Gabrielle Drenzo. Mr. Trovato explained that it is an existing barn and is a characteristic building for the neighborhood. Consideration has been given to the character of the neighborhood and the spirit of the ordinance as well as the neighbor's opinions. They would like to turn it into a dwelling to improve the property and add a living unit to the City's roster. Mr. Trovato works for a building design company. He has done feasibility studies. It is a creative way to generate more housing.

Chair Carley asked about the hardship. Mr. Trovato answered that they are burdened by the fact that this building was constructed before the ordinance was written. It is detached from the house. If it had been attached to house, they wouldn't require a variance at all. Multi-family is a permitted use in this zone. They are trying to preserve an existing building. By the fact that it is existing, close to the property line, and is detached, all that creates the hardship. There is no financial incentive to improve this building without rental income.

Ms. Perkins asked what the lot size was. Mr. Trovato answered that it is .19 acres. Ms. Spector-Morgan noted that it was 8,276 s.f., 11,250 s.f. would be required and 25,000 sf. would be required for 3 units, per staff memo. Ms. Perkins noted that there are 6 parking space requirements as well. Do they have that ability? Mr. Trovato answered that they do have the ability.

In favor: none.

In opposition: none.

Comments from Code: none.

DECISION: Carley reviewed the testimony as given.

Mr. Wallner noted that this lot is larger than most other lots in the neighborhood. There are many multi-family dwellings in the neighborhood. It would fit with the characteristic of the neighborhood.

Chair Carley stopped the deliberation at this point to read the letters and emails received in favor and in opposition into the record. He summarized.

John Chorlian, 80 School St. Letter received. He has the First Congregational Church campus across the street under agreement. He is planning to develop it into multi-family dwellings. This request would be a benefit to the neighborhood. As a resident he feels it is an important project to address the lack of housing. The proposed new zoning ordinance encourages infill projects such as this.

Email received from Nancy Hendrix, in support. She has lived there for 35 years. The renovations are in keeping with the character of the neighborhood.

Email received from Ryan Devisto who is a neighbor in support.

Chair Carley went back to deliberations.

Mr. Wallner stands with his comments he made prior to the reading of the letters and emails.

Ms. Perkins questioned what was the hardship?

Ms. Spector-Morgan had no issues with the reconstruction of the nonconforming building or frontage. She has issues with the frontage for a separate single family home on the same lot. There is nothing about the lot that makes it burdened more than any other lot that is in that area. She is inclined to grant variances request #2 and #3, but she is not inclined to grant variance request #1.

Mr. Evans agrees with Ms. Spector-Morgan. The hardship is the configuration of building which is more restrictive and creates the hardship.

Chair Carley agrees with Mr. Evans and Mr. Wallner. The configuration of the lot and building, and that it predates the ordinance, makes the lot peculiar or unique and creates a hardship that wouldn't exist if there were a connection between the two building. He would be inclined to support the requests.

A **motion** to approve all 3 requests was made by Mr. Evans, seconded by Mr. Wallner and passed by a 4-1 vote with Ms. Spector Morgan in favor of request #2 and #3, but not #1.

0060-2023 10 Drew Street; RS – Single Family Residential District; Georgia Karathanasis, Owner:

The owner wishes to convert a portion of a single-family dwelling to a studio apartment creating two-family dwelling. The applicant seeks the following variances to:

1. Article 28-2-4, Table of Principal Uses, to allow Use A2, Two-family Dwelling.
2. Article 28-5-2, Duplex or Two-Family Dwellings, to allow a Two-family dwelling with 125 feet of frontage where 150 feet are required and 12,500 square feet of lot area where 18,750 square feet are required.
3. Article 28-7-2(e), Table of Off-Street Parking Requirements, to allow two spaces where four are required.

Zoning Administrator Hutton explained to the Board that a new plan arrived in the Code Administration office today. This application was noticed as a variance for a 2nd dwelling unit. Based on the new plan, it should have been noticed as a special exception. The drawing presented today was with assistance from the Assessing Department. Chair Carley asked if with the drawing that was submitted, they do not need a variance, but they do need a Special Exception. Ms. Spector-Morgan asked if it was the Board's practice to proceed with a special exception even though it was noticed for a variance. Zoning Administrator Hutton answered no. They would have to apply for a special exception and be noticed properly.

Testified: Ms. Karathanasis. She obtained relief for a salon in the front of her home a few years ago. This was at the beginning of Covid. Things took a turn for the worse and she lost clients. She had to close her salon. She wanted to rent it out, but that didn't work out for her. Her current job is to serve the elderly, which doesn't pay a lot. There will be no

changes on the outside, just the inside of her home. The unit will need a kitchenette and a bathtub. It will need 1 parking space as it would be a studio apartment. It will not generate a lot of traffic. There will be no change in the number of people living there. The apartments in Concord are scarce and unreasonably priced. This relief would help her keep her home. She has a coworker that also serves the elderly who is interested in renting.

Ms. Spector-Morgan asked Ms. Karathanasis what her reason was to proceed with a variance vs. a special exception. Ms. Karathanasis answered that she had already paid for this application so she thought she would come in. Ms. Perkins asked to see the neighborhood.

In favor: none.

In opposition: none.

Comments from Code: none.

Ms. Spector-Morgan asked if it was an ADU by special exception, would they still need 4 parking spaces. Zoning Administrator Hutton answered yes.

DECISION:

Ms. Spector-Morgan: There is no unnecessary hardship as they can construct an ADU that would be entitled to a Special Exception. She is inclined to say no to Variance #1 and #2. As far as the parking request, she doesn't know why there couldn't be 4 parking spaces on the lot. She is inclined to deny all the requests.

Ms. Karathanasis asked to speak to the parking. The Board allowed it. Her parking is very narrow. She would have to widen her driveway.

Ms. Perkins asked if they said no to the variance, could she come back in for a special exception. Chair Carley answered yes. Ms. Perkins asked if she would submit the same thing. Chair Carley explained that the criteria for granting a special exception are different from those for a variance. Ms. Perkins is inclined to approve, not put her through the process again.

Mr. Wallner agreed that Ms. Perkins had a point. It is already a multi-use building before. Zoning Administrator Hutton reminded them that it was with the Board's approval. A studio apartment is less intense and he has looked at the Special Exception criteria. Do we want her to go through the process again?

Chair Carley asked Zoning Administrator Hutton if the parking issue goes away with a special exception for an ADU. Zoning Administrator Hutton answered that they still need parking for the units. She wanted to remind the Board that a variance runs with the land. ADU's have different restrictions that don't exist for a variance. Chair Carley's reaction is that he is reluctant to vote for variances when they are not needed. This was not noticed as a Special Exception, but as a Variance and he doesn't see the variance issues being resolved; except the parking. He understands inconvenience and expense, but it is not an issue that the Board can remedy. His inclination is to vote in favor of the parking variance.

Zoning Administrator Hutton explained that if she created an addition space, she only needs 3 spaces for the ADU, not 4 spaces as previously mentioned.

Chair Carley suggested that the Board could Table item #3 (the parking variance) and that would give the appellant the option to revisit it in the context of an ADU appeal. Mr. Carley suggested that the Board act on the first 2 requests.

Ms. Spector-Morgan agreed.

Mr. Evans agrees with Chair Carley about granting the minimum, not the maximum. Mr. Evans made a **motion** to deny request #1 and request #2, which was then seconded by Ms. Spector-Morgan. **Motion** to deny was passed by a 4-1 vote with Ms. Perkins in the Minority. The Board found no hardship.

A **motion** to Table request #3 was made by Ms. Spector-Morgan, seconded by Mr. Evans and passed by a unanimous vote. Request was Tabled to the regular July meeting.

0061-2023 61 Borough Road, Penacook; RM – Medium Density Residential District; Kalapa Realty Trust, Owner:

Owner wishes to construct 20 two-story dwelling units within 30-feet of the property line where Article 28-4-5(d)(5) requires 50-feet of perimeter buffer.

Testified: Eric Jones. He is a representative for owner. He plans to build the project. The previously approved plans from 2018 was for single story buildings. In keeping with that aesthetic, they designed and submitted a plan with 2 story buildings with the second story being under cover. The setback requirement for a two story building of 50 feet is unclear to him. They tried to stay within the parameter of the original plan approval. The maximum height of a 1 story structure is 35 feet and they are at 27 feet. Originally, when the property was clear cut there was less of a vegetation buffer. It has since grown up substantially and they can maintain that buffer. Density wise, it is 21 units total. There will be 18 new units and 3 existing units. They would be allowed 67 units in this zone. The shape of the lot is unique.

Ms. Spector-Morgan noted that the PSNH easement takes a chunk out of the lot as well. Mr. Jones answered that was correct. Ms. Spector-Morgan asked what they were proposing to build. Zoning Administrator Hutton showed on the overhead projection what the lot looked like with the structures. Ms. Spector-Morgan asked if it was higher than the one story building? Mr. Jones couldn't really scale it. Ms. Spector-Morgan asked how tall. Mr. Jones answered 27 feet. Chair asked how tall to what. Mr. Jones answered to the ridge. Ms. Perkins asked how tall the vegetation was in the buffer now. Mr. Jones was not sure. Ms. Perkins asked if the backside of the building facing the neighboring street had a lot of windows. Mr. Jones answered it had a double window and slider and windows in the dormer.

In favor: none.

In opposition: Anthony Puntin, 86 Primrose Lane. He's an engineer. He is representing a few abutters. They looked at the plans. They abut the property on the south, western property line. There is a distinct line between vegetation and what is growing back. It was clear cut to the property line a few years back. The growth is chest high right now. He understands there is a 30 foot setback. On the east side is common land and the south side the same. It is never going to be developed. They would like to keep 50 feet on the west side. There is two 24 foot roadways separated with an island between and storm water treatment between. It does seem like they could adjust that. The two 4 units are not shown in the elevation view, they show a slider and railing; they are assuming that there is a patio. The plans do not show the patio and railing. Is that in the buffer and is it allowed to be? There is a landscape plan/erosion plan in there that he asked about. Will there be a lawn all the way back to the property line? They should know, at this stage, how high the buildings would be. He didn't hear one thing about a hardship.

Michael Wright, 78 Primrose Lane. There is an easement for underground utilities. They were told there would be a 50 foot setback.

Jason Lane, 70 Primrose Lane. He is the last abutting property on the corner. He has lived there 24 years and has made improvements on his property. He is a public education. He supports shortening setback on other side.

Jennifer Chase, 73 Borough Road. She is happy to know it is a 55 and over community. She is requesting to keep the 50 foot buffer to keep the privacy. She likes the quiet neighborhood. She'd like to keep their lighting low.

Debbie McLaughlin, 74 Primrose Lane. She has owned there for 25 years. She was under the same impression that it was a 50 foot setback. She doesn't feel there is an unnecessary hardship. The property line that does have the growth is maintained and not removed.

Jeff Lorden, 47 Borough Road. He is on the east side of this property. In the fall when the leaves are off the trees, he can see over to Primrose Lane. He is concerned with the setback as well. He is concerned with more traffic on Borough Road. It is a very dangerous corner to the east of this. A senior community will want to walk and use that road. He thinks the City needs to add walkways to that section of road. Whittaker Place is down the road on the west hand side and the elderly walk on that road from there as well. He wondered if they had done a traffic study. Chair Carley explained that the Planning Board will address that.

Amy Miller. 66 Primrose Lane. She purchased her home 4 years ago and never knew about this project. Now there will be 20 houses in her back yard. She is concerned with noise. They took their kids out of the City and brought them here for a quiet neighborhood. They will have to listen to noise for 2 years while this is constructed.

Comments from Code: Zoning Administrator Hutton explained that this was an approved project by the Planning Board, but it has since expired. It was approved with 30 foot buffers. Ms. Perkins asked how many years ago. Zoning Administrator Hutton answered more than 2 years ago. They have already had approval by ADR. On the 24 foot road, it is a requirement of the ordinance, so they cannot reduce it without an additional variance. Ms. Spector-Morgan asked if it were public roads or private roads. Zoning Administrator Hutton answered public roads. They still need Planning Board approval.

Chair Carley asked if it is considered a 2 story structure due to the addition of the dormer. Zoning Administrator Hutton answered yes. Ms. Perkins asked if it were originally approval for 1 story. Zoning Administrator Hutton answered yes. The elevation was very similar. Enforcement of Planning Board conditions comes through the Code Administration office. If it is paver patios, it cannot be in the buffer. Steps would be allowed. Ms. Perkins reiterated no decks, no patios. Zoning Administrator Hutton answered that was correct because the structure needs to meet the buffer requirement.

Rebuttal: Mr. Jones. They did not contemplate putting decks there. The railings on the plans are a drafting error. Ms. Spector-Morgan asked if they could shift it all 10 feet towards conservation property. Mr. Jones doesn't believe so due to the narrow end of the long triangle being 24 feet wide. Ms. Perkins does not see the driveway lengths for each unit noted on the plan. Mr. Jones explained that it looks to be about 20 -25 feet to the curb. Ms. Spector-Morgan asked if they needed the driveways for parking? Mr. Jones answered yes. He doesn't know what type of dark sky lighting is present in the ordinance, but he always does dark sky lighting which shines the light down. Even if it is not required, he would be happy to commit to that. They are not going any higher than what was previously approved. The windows are facing backward. By moving the guest bathroom and bedroom to the second floor, you gain a garage space. Ms. Spector-Morgan asked if they needed a third parking space per unit if they have a 2 car garage. Zoning Administrator Hutton answered that you cannot back directly onto a street from a garage without an additional variance.

Mr. Jones noted that currently they have a second floor configuration; the rear facing dormer is a bedroom and the front facing is a loft, or flex space. They could look at flipping that around.

Mr. Evans asked to have the hardship issue addressed. Mr. Jones explained that the hardship is maintain the shape of the lot. They are asking for a 30 foot setback, which had already been approved. If it were not for the shape of the lot, they may not have needed that.

DECISION:

Mr. Evans: The hardship is an issue for him. It was approved for the same number of units, but for single story buildings, and for 55 and over. Now it is going to be a 2 story building and that kicks in the variance request. He doesn't see that as a hardship.

Ms. Spector-Morgan: The density is allowed, the construction is allowed. They cannot redesign the project. The developer has heard their concerns. The hardship is clear. There are wetlands, the shape of lot, and the PSNH easement. Her concern is that the lesser setback would alter the character of the neighborhood of single family homes. A lesser setback would diminish property values. What gain is there to applicant from the reduced buffer where he could have one story units of the same size vs the harm to the public in granting the variance. She felt he met the hardship standard, but not the others.

Ms. Perkins: She is familiar with 55 and over and in being familiar with it, 8 out of 10 second floor are used for company. She agrees the hardship is due to the PSNH easement. She is struggling with the second floor change.

Mr. Wallner: He is persuaded by the shape of lot being a hardship, but the other 5 criteria have not been met. They could redesign it to accommodate a 50 foot buffer. He is not inclined to support the request.

Chair Carley: He doesn't agree that to redesign the projects would enable them to have the same number of units. If they lose 40 feet of width on the lot, they have lost quite a bit. The shape of the lot can create a hardship. The intent of the ordinance had to do with massing; not whether or not you could see your neighbors. If they were single family homes, they could be 2 story and 30 feet from the property line. It is not actually any larger than an ordinary house with a dormer. The scale is no different than what was original approved. You could make an argument that this is in keeping with the spirit and intent of the ordinance. The hardship is created by the lot. However, what he doesn't see is that if they are denied extra square feet on the upper level, they are being denied the minimum variance for a reasonable use. They can build a one story use. They want to do this design to get more square footage on the land because it is a better business

proposition. He is inclined to vote against the request. The hardship does not deprive them of a reasonable use.

A **motion** to deny the request was made by Ms. Spector-Morgan as the unique characteristics of the property does not deprive reasonable use of the property. It is not consistent with purpose and spirit of the ordinance. She didn't hear any evidence that it would not diminish property values. The gain to the public by denying this request outweighs any loss to the applicant, who is still free to develop the property with the same density. The **motion** was seconded by Mr. Evans. Chair Carley does not agree that it is inconsistent with the intent, but it is immaterial for him as they haven't met all 5 criteria. **Motion** passed by a unanimous vote.

MINUTES: A **motion** to approve the Minutes from June 7, 2023 was made by Mr. Wallner, seconded by Ms. Spector-Morgan and passed by a unanimous vote.

JULY MEETING: Chair Carley will be unavailable for the July 12th meeting. Zoning Administrator Hutton polled the Board to see who is available on July 5, 2023. Mr. Evans, Mr. Wallner, Ms. Perkins, Chair Carley will all be available on July 5, 2023 as well as Zoning Administrator Hutton. It was the consensus of the Board to change the meeting date for July from July 12, 2023 to July 5, 2023.

A motion to adjourn the meeting at 7:50 pm was made by Mr. Wallner, seconded by Ms. Spector-Morgan and passed by a unanimous vote.

*Respectfully submitted,
Rose M. Fife
Zoning Board of Adjustment*