

TOWN OF AMHERST
Zoning Board of Adjustment

December 15, 2020

APPROVED-Amended

In attendance: Doug Kirkwood – Chair, Robert Rowe – Vice Chair, Jamie Ramsay – Secretary/Treasurer, Charlie Vars, Danielle Pray, and Tim Kachmar (Alternate).
Staff present: Nic Strong – Community Development Director, Natasha Kypfer, Town Planner, and Kristan Patenaude, Recording Secretary.

Doug Kirkwood called the meeting to order at 7:04 pm., with the following statement. As Chair of the Amherst Zoning Board of Adjustment, I find that due to the State of Emergency declared by the Governor as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic and in accordance with the Governor's Emergency Order #12 pursuant to Executive Order 2020-04, as extended by various executive orders, this public body is authorized to meet electronically.

Please note that there is no physical location to observe and listen contemporaneously to this meeting, which was authorized pursuant to the Governor's Emergency Order.

However, in accordance with the Emergency Order, I am confirming that we are:

Providing public access to the meeting by telephone, with additional access possibilities by video or other electronic means:

We are utilizing Zoom for this electronic meeting.

All members of the Board have the ability to communicate contemporaneously during this meeting through this platform, and the public has access to contemporaneously listen and, if necessary, participate in this meeting through dialing the following phone #312-626-6799 and password 878 1463 1947, or by clicking on the following website address: <https://zoom.us/j/87814631947> that was included in the public notice of this meeting.

Providing public notice of the necessary information for accessing the meeting:

We previously gave notice to the public of the necessary information for accessing the meeting, including how to access the meeting using Zoom or telephonically. Instructions have also been provided on the website of the Zoning Board of Adjustment at:

www.amherstnh.gov.

Providing a mechanism for the public to alert the public body during the meeting if there are problems with access: If anybody has a problem, please call 603-440-8248.

Adjourning the meeting if the public is unable to access the meeting:

In the event the public is unable to access the meeting, the meeting will be adjourned and rescheduled.

Please note that all votes that are taken during this meeting shall be done by roll call vote.

Let's start the meeting by taking a roll call attendance. When each member states their presence, please also state whether there is anyone in the room with you during this meeting, which is required under the Right-to- Know law.

Roll call attendance: Doug Kirkwood, Jamie Ramsay, Danielle Pray, Charlie Vars, Robert Rowe, and Tim Kachmar – all present and alone.

TOWN OF AMHERST
Zoning Board of Adjustment

December 15, 2020

APPROVED-Amended

Doug Kirkwood explained that each case will be opened and then the applicant will have a chance to speak to it. The ZBA will then carry out its business for each case, including asking questions, hearing from the public and abutters, going into private deliberations, and potentially voting.

Tim Kachmar exited the meeting at the approval of the Chair.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. CASE #: PZ13440-120220 - VARIANCE

Keith E. Healey, as Trustee of the Keith E. Healey Revocable Trust of 2014 (Owner & Applicant), 307 Route 101, PIN #: 008-074-000 – Request for relief from Article IV, Section 4.3, Paragraph A to continue to use the property for residential purposes and for the purpose of operating tree service/cordwood business. *Zoned Residential Rural.*

Jamie Ramsay read and opened the case.

Tom Quinn, Esq., stated that he is an attorney representing Keith Healey. He noted that Tom Carr, CWS, Meridian Land Services, was separately on Zoom, and the applicant Keith Healey, along with John Cochran and Dennis Wheeler were in attendance for the meeting at his office. The property in question is approximately 7 acres with a current residence and pole barn on it, located at 307 Route 101. This property is one tax map but contains two parcels. Lot 74 Map 8 has approximately 250ft of frontage and is located in the Residential Rural zone. He explained that the applicant purchased the land in 2016 with the intention to use it as a residence and as the base of operations for his tree service/cord wood business. The applicant previously owned a lot on Border Street that was used for the same purposes.

Tom Quinn, Esq., stated that, prior to the applicant's purchase, this lot was owned for 50-60 years by a woman who used it as a residence and for various commercial uses. To speak to this prior use, as the applicant began clearing the site to get it ready for its intended purpose, he found metal salvage, bricks, and other debris. The applicant has constructed a fairly substantial concrete pad to facilitate the cutting and splitting of cord wood for his business. This structure is not part of the variance request because it will be removed, but it is shown on the plan. At some point, Scott Tenney, Building Official, visited the property to investigate possible wetland buffer and setback issues.

Tom Quinn, Esq., explained that Scott Tenney discovered the zoning ordinance violation and an encroachment issue. Some of the filling and regrading already completed by the applicant encroaches on the wetland and wetland buffers. In September 2019, the Town sent a cease-and-desist letter to the applicant regarding the violation of the zoning ordinance and the encroachment issues. DES also notified the applicant that approximately 1,000 s.f. of wetland and wetland buffer area was disturbed without the proper permit. The applicant has been working to fix all of these issues. In October, the applicant contacted Scott Tenney who issued a new letter of violation and withdrew the cease-and-desist letter, due to the fact that the applicant

TOWN OF AMHERST
Zoning Board of Adjustment

December 15, 2020

APPROVED-Amended

was working to bring the property into compliance in conjunction with himself and Tom Carr, of Meridian Land Services. The plan from Meridian Land Services regarding restoration of the wetlands has been approved by NHDES. The applicant intends to apply for a State Alteration of Terrain (AoT) permit, but the State would like to see that the property will be able to be legally used first before moving forward.

Tom Quinn, Esq., stated that the property will be used as a family residence, and a base for the applicant's tree service/wood chipping business. The business has three employees.

Tom Quinn, Esq., reviewed the variance criteria:

1&2) Granting the variance will not change the essential character of the neighborhood. Prior to the applicant's purchase, this lot was used for residential and commercial purposes for a number of years. These commercial ventures include selling bark mulch, bricks, and landscaping materials; a salvaging business which included bringing demolished structure materials onto the site; and a gravel/excavating business. There were large trucks coming and going from the property for approximately 40 years. The property is adjacent to a garden nursery business and a church. It is also only a street or two removed from the Limited Commercial zone and Salzburg Square and Liberty Park. There is no retail business expected on the property.

Granting the variance also does not threaten the public health, safety, and welfare. There will be no dangerous materials on site. The proposed use will not create any additional traffic, because the site has been used this way since 2016 by this applicant, and before that by the prior owners.

3) This test looks to see if the loss to the individual in not granting the variance is outweighed by the benefit to the public. This property is located within the Residential Rural zone and is intended to be used as a family residence and a commercial business. The neighborhood surrounding the property is already a mixed-use area. The property is located along a busy road and has been operating in this place since 2016 without any complaints. Denying this variance would create a significant loss to the applicant without a substantial benefit to the public.

4) This property has been used in similar ways for so long that the proposed use is already reflected in the property values of the area. In speaking to a real estate broker, the person agreed that the proposed use would have no adverse effect on property values. In addition, the applicant has received letters from all of the direct abutters, save one, who support the use of the property. The abutters would likely not support this proposal if they felt that their property values were going to take a hit.

5a) Denying this variance would create an unnecessary hardship for the applicant. This property is located near the Limited Commercial zone and near other local businesses. The prior owners used this property as a residence and commercial business. There is no

TOWN OF AMHERST
Zoning Board of Adjustment

December 15, 2020

APPROVED-Amended

fair, substantial relationship between the purpose of the ordinance and this property. This property has always been used in the way the applicant is proposing to use it, or, quite possibly, in a more aggressive way than the applicant is proposing.

Tom Quinn, Esq., stated that the property has always been used in this way, and that the proposed use is consistent with the immediate area. The proposed use will not add any traffic to the area. The proposed use does not include retail use. The neighbors are in support of the project.

In response to a question from Bob Rowe, Tom Quinn, Esq., stated that he is not arguing that this proposal is a non-conforming use because, although it's still a commercial use, it is different than previous commercial uses of this property.

Bob Rowe noted that the applicant already cleared 2.5 acres of the property for his business. Tom Quinn, Esq., stated that the lot was only lightly wooded prior to being cleared.

In response to a question from Bob Rowe regarding the lot being unique for the purpose being requested, Tom Quinn, Esq., stated that there is no longer a requirement that the property be considered unique for the proposed purpose. The test now looks at the special circumstances of the property. The test also no longer looks at other reasonable uses being available for the property under the ordinance. There is no issue between the express purpose of the ordinance and its application to this lot because the proposed use is as it was. The history of this site is what makes it special, as it has always been used in a similar way. Tom Quinn, Esq., stated that he believes the proposed use is a reasonable one, which is what the test looks at. In looking at the list of permitted uses for this property, none of them are really applicable. The lot is too small, and with the included wetlands, it is not a reasonable property for a Planned Residential Development or for workforce housing.

In response to a question from Bob Rowe, Tom Quinn, Esq., stated that the applicant knew of the zoning ordinance when he purchased the property, but also didn't know, in a way. The proposed use has historically taken place on the property. The applicant never tried to hide his intentions and immediately opened his business after purchasing the property. The applicant believed the proposed use was a permitted one because of historic use on the property and also because of his past commercial business on Border Street.

In response to a question from Bob Rowe, Tom Quinn, Esq., stated that the applicant's cord wood business processes no more than 100 truckloads of wood per year. The applicant delivers this wood only; no one comes to the site to pick up the wood.

Charlie Vars stated that he has done some previous work with Meridian Land Services and the applicant. He does not believe there is a conflict of interest and doesn't believe he needs to recuse himself. There was no comment to this.

TOWN OF AMHERST
Zoning Board of Adjustment

December 15, 2020

APPROVED-Amended

Danielle Pray noted that she understood using the property as a base of operations and that the tree cutting business entailed the applicant going from his site to other places and cutting trees. She noted that the variance request was also for the wood chipping and cord wood parts of the business. She asked what kind of machinery was onsite for this and how the wood came to the property. Tom Quinn, Esq., stated that there is a wood processor on site that cuts and splits wood into a fireplace length size. The source of this wood is from the tree trimming service portion of the company. Tom Quinn, Esq., noted that, while he included wood chipping in his correspondence to the Board as a portion of the business, there isn't really any of that actually happening on site.

In response to a question from Danielle Pray, Tom Quinn, Esq., explained that, in connection with the tree service, usable wood is brought back to the site. This wood is not processed daily or even weekly. Once there is a significant amount of wood stacked, processing will happen for about a month and then stop. Cutting and splitting only really occurs in January and February.

Danielle Pray asked if the machinery used for this operation was noisy. Tom Quinn, Esq., stated that there is equipment and machinery used for the business that generates noise. It is generally located on the furthest reaches of the seven acre property. In this location, it shouldn't impact neighbors or abutters. The noise hasn't seemed to bother the abutters, as there haven't been any complaints and most of the abutters wrote letters in support of the application.

Doug Kirkwood noted that the Board is in receipt of four abutter letters, all in favor of the proposal. Tom Quinn, Esq., mentioned that there should also be a letter from EAM Amherst Holdings, LLC, which Doug Kirkwood then located. Tom Quinn, Esq., also mentioned that, while there is no letter of support from the church, because the pastor doesn't own the lot, the church has never complained about the business.

Tom Quinn, Esq., explained that he reviewed the minutes of the February Board meeting, at which the EAM Amherst Holdings, LLC, application was heard. This property is located next to the applicant's property. There were some Board members at that meeting concerned about a potential traffic impact along Route 101. He noted that this proposal, unlike the proposal from EAM Amherst Holdings, LLC, will not have any significant increase of traffic. He also contacted DOT regarding their 10-year plan and whether there were any problems with the road in this location. The traffic count on Route 101 is 20,000 - 21,000 vehicles per day with slightly fewer at the Bedford line and slightly more by the Meeting Place and the same volume going east to Manchester. There has been a 2% increase per year historically. Tom Quinn, Esq., stated that he was told that there are no plans to do anything along this stretch of Route 101 in the immediate future, and certainly nothing like the recent improvements to Route 101 in Bedford. He noted that the State is more concerned with the bypass west of Route 13 towards Wilton.

In response to a question from Danielle Pray, Tom Quinn, Esq., stated that the proposed business includes three trucks that could leave the site everyday.

TOWN OF AMHERST
Zoning Board of Adjustment

December 15, 2020

APPROVED-Amended

Danielle Pray noted that Article 3.1 of the ordinance addresses noise and states that any use may be prohibited if the noise coming from it is considered injurious or obnoxious. She stated that she was concerned with the wood processing portion of the application and the noise aspects.

Tom Quinn, Esq., stated that the area where wood is being cut is approximately 1,000ft from the road. There have been no neighbor complaints in regard to offensive noise. The applicant usually cuts wood in January/February; at that time of the year there are few people outside to hear any of the noise that might be heard.

Tom Quinn, Esq., noted that he doesn't believe the noise issue can be used as grounds to deny the application. If the application has met the test criteria, then circular reasoning cannot be used to reject it. Any use of the property, and of any property in Town, is still subject to nuisance laws. The applicant is comfortable moving forward with his proposal because he has been cutting wood in the winter months for the past four years without complaint.

Danielle Pray noted that noise issues could also fall under the public health, safety, and welfare section of the tests. Tom Quinn, Esq., stated that this was not grounds to deny the application if the variance criteria are met. He stated that the proposal would not change the character of the neighborhood or affect public health, safety or welfare. He stated that any use of the property would be subject to the nuisance provision in the Zoning Ordinance.

Bob Rowe stated that he believes the applicant is making the argument that an owner of any large tract of land can use the land any way s/he wants to, even if contrary to the zoning ordinance, if the use is hidden in the back of the property.

Tom Quinn, Esq., stated that the applicant is not making that assertion. The applicant does believe that concerns about this use are mitigated based on where the work is located on the property. The proposed use will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood or diminish nearby property values because it is out of view. This itself does not entitle the applicant to a variance, but it does factor highly into the variance criteria. He also noted that the wood processing equipment is much less noisy than a chainsaw.

Jamie Ramsay noted that he is familiar with the property in question and noticed the demolition and scrap metal business that was there for decades. While the proposed use is not a permitted one, it is a historic use of this property. It is not an expansion of the historic use. He is also familiar with the wood cutting process and believes that the machines are not very noisy. If located approximately 1,000ft from the road, the equipment will hardly ever be heard.

Tom Quinn, Esq., noted that, although the applicant did cut about 2 acres of trees on the property, the perimeter of the property is still fairly wooded. The perimeter and existing tree stands on the property will also help to mitigate the noise.

Doug Kirkwood asked for public comment. As there was none, he closed the public hearing portion of the meeting.

December 15, 2020

APPROVED-Amended

Jamie Ramsay moved to enter deliberations. Danielle Pray seconded.

Roll Call: Bob Rowe – aye; Jamie Ramsay – aye; Charlie Vars – aye; Danielle Pray – aye; and Doug Kirkwood - aye. Motion carried unanimously.

CASE #: PZ13440-120220:

Bob Rowe moved no regional impact. Charlie Vars seconded.

Roll Call: Bob Rowe – aye; Jamie Ramsay – aye; Charlie Vars – aye; Danielle Pray – aye; and Doug Kirkwood - aye. Motion carried unanimously.

Discussion:

Jamie Ramsay noted that tree services are currently getting a lot of business. He wondered if it would be prudent for the Town to ensure that this tree service operation, if the variance is approved, not expand substantially beyond what it currently is.

Danielle Pray agreed that, if the business were to expand, there may be complaints from neighbors/abutters. An expanded use would affect consideration of the variance tests for her.

Scott Tenney, Building Official, joined the Board.

In response to a question from Doug Kirkwood, Scott Tenney stated that his discussions with the applicant were about the current use and noted that he did not recall the applicant's remediation plan mentioning any sort of expanded business plan.

Jamie Ramsay explained that, if the Town would like to mitigate the amount of expansion of this business it would first need to establish a baseline by which to measure future expansion.

Bob Rowe mentioned that, if the variance is granted, the applicant has the right by law to expand use of his business as it exists.

In response to a question from Doug Kirkwood, Bob Rowe stated that the applicant may need to come back before the Town if an expansion of the business was substantial, but how would the Town make a determination of the definition of "substantial."

In response to a question from Doug Kirkwood, Tom Quinn, Esq., stated that the applicant will need to go before the Planning Board for a Non-Residential Site Plan Review.

1. The Variance will not be contrary to the public interest.

- C. Vars – true, the proposal is consistent with the spirit of the ordinance. The previous owner had a much more intensive commercial use on this property. He believes it is in the public's best interest to approve the variance.

December 15, 2020

APPROVED-Amended

- J. Ramsay— true, the proposal is in the spirit of the ordinance. He does not see that the proposal will have a negative impact on what the ordinance states.
- R. Rowe – not true. While this proposal may be relatively unnoticed from the street, it changes the character of the back wooded area of the property. He believes this request is more in the interest of the applicant than the public, and thus it is contrary to the public interest.
- D. Pray— true. While she has no problems with certain aspects of the application, such as the property being the home base for the commercial operation and a residence and does not believe these items will change the essential character of the neighborhood, or disrupt the public health, safety, or welfare, she does believe that the noise aspect is an issue. She will look for conditions of approval so that the applicant is mindful of the noise section of the ordinance.
- D. Kirkwood – true.

4 True, 1 Not True

2. The Variance is consistent with the spirit and the intent of the Ordinance

- C. Vars – true, the proposal does not affect the character of the neighborhood and similar commercial businesses have been on the property for about 40-50 years. He believes the proposal meets the criteria and that this property is an excellent place for the proposed use.
- J. Ramsay – true, this property is a very out-of-the-way place for this business. He is unsure if there is anywhere else for the business in Town that would draw less attention.
- R. Rowe – not true. He explained that the prior commercial uses on this property were well before the current zoning ordinance. The entrance into Amherst along this corridor is supposed to be non-commercial and rural. He believes this proposal is not in the spirit of the ordinance.
- D. Pray – true, she believes using this property as a base of operations for the business will not affect the essential character of the neighborhood. She does still have the same concern under this test about the potential noise affecting the public health, safety, and welfare.
- D. Kirkwood – true, there are more contemporary commercial uses of this property, other than just wood processing. He did not hear any complaints from the past or currently existing about this business. He stated that he believes the spirit of the ordinance is being observed because of that fact that this business was previously being operated with no issues.

4 True, 1 Not True

3. Substantial justice is done.

- D. Pray – true, this is a balance between the applicant and the general public. She believes that, as the applicant has been running this business on the property since 2016 without complaints, she is leaning in the applicant's favor.

December 15, 2020

APPROVED-Amended

- R. Rowe – not true, the applicant purchased this property knowing that he wanted to have a wood processing business on the property. The applicant also clear cut the back area of the property without noticing the Town and thus, creating an issue with the wetlands there and possibly adding to the pollution of the Church property nearby.
- J. Ramsay – true, he questioned how a previous Board decided to recognize this as a non-permitted use. The proposed use allows the applicant to enjoy his property without being unreasonably offensive to the neighbors.
- C. Vars – true, denying this variance would put the applicant out of business. Looking at how the site was used in the past; one can see how he might not have thought a variance was needed for the proposed use. The abutters' letters also show no complaints for the proposal.
- D. Kirkwood – not true. He shares Bob Rowe's concerns. As this is a new use of the property, it was incumbent on the applicant to make sure that there was no conflict with Town ordinances. This did not happen until after the fact. However, the owner has shown willingness to cooperate with the Town and correct the damage done as much as possible; this deserves consideration.

3 True, 2 Not True

4. The values of the surrounding properties will not be diminished.

- J. Ramsay – true, he believes the letter from Jim Spellman speaks to this issue.
- C. Vars– true, the proposed use is already built into the tax structure of the area. Two nearby abutters purchased their properties since the tree service business started on this property.
- D. Pray – true, the applicant has met the burden of this test.
- R. Rowe – not true, he did not read the Spellman letter as being about value. He said that, while there may not be any difference to the abutting properties in front of this property due to the proposed use, there is a loss to the abutting back lots due to the loss of trees after the applicant cut them down.
- D. Kirkwood – true, property values are a subjective assessment and there would have to be a very obvious difference for this to be taken into account.

4 True, 1 Not True

5. Literal enforcement of the provisions of the Ordinance would result in an unnecessary hardship.

- R. Rowe – not true, there is no uniqueness to the back area of this property than to any of the others in the area.
- J. Ramsay – true, there is limited access to the area that will be used as the workstation on the property. He can't think of a better place for this operation. While this may not be a permitted use, he believes this may be a possible oversight, based on past use on this site.
- C. Vars– true, the house is well set back on the property and the work area can't be seen easily. He believes the proposed use is a reasonable one.

TOWN OF AMHERST
Zoning Board of Adjustment

December 15, 2020

APPROVED-Amended

- D. Pray – true, the history of use on this site is what makes it unique. The proposal is also located along a very heavily traveled route. She believes the proposal is a reasonable use and consistent with other businesses in the area.
- D. Kirkwood – true. He noted that the ordinance does not contain the word “unique.”

Danielle Pray explained that she was using the word “unique” as a synonym for “special conditions.”

4 True, 1 Not True

The Chair stated that the application, as it passed all of the tests, is granted.

Danielle Pray suggested that there be conditions regarding the days and times of day in which the operation could run, such as no weekends or only at certain times of the year.

Jamie Ramsay stated that the Board would have to establish a baseline in order to create these conditions, such as decibel levels, times of operation, etc.

Bob Rowe stated that Section 4.3.8.G of the ordinance (Noise & Lighting) states that, for sports activities, 60+ decibels at a range of 10’ is prohibited from 9pm – 7:30am. He believes this section could also be used for this type of business.

Doug Kirkwood stated that it is unclear if the Zoning Board of Adjustment should refer this item to the Planning Board. He explained that, in terms of noise, the distance measured from the source will be critical, due to the inverse square law.

Jamie Ramsay explained that most businesses of this type run the same hours with most starting their equipment at 7:00 a.m. He believes that typical operation decibel levels could be used as a measure and, if the applicant would like to increase past this, he would need to come back before the Town.

Danielle Pray agreed that the days of the week and times of operation are the best the Board can do to measure a baseline at this time. She questioned who would enforce decibel levels.

Nic Strong noted that hours of operation and other technical items about the business would be handled by the Planning Board, in negotiations with the applicant, as part of the Site Plan Review.

Danielle Pray suggested that the Board send this to the Planning Board with comments regarding possible conditions for them to address.

Jamie Ramsay noted that he does not necessarily want this to rise to the level of Planning Board consideration. This is not a mega operation, but a small businessman trying to work out of his property.

TOWN OF AMHERST
Zoning Board of Adjustment

December 15, 2020

APPROVED-Amended

Bob Rowe suggested that the Board send this item to the Planning Board as a non-residential use and request the Planning Board review it with the applicant to set reasonable standards.

Charlie Vars moved to send a letter to the Planning Board, subject to Non-Residential Site Plan Review, regarding concerns about the time of operation, hours of operation, days of operation, traffic and noise level of the business, and to negotiate the concerns with the applicant. Bob Rowe seconded.

Roll Call: Bob Rowe – aye; Jamie Ramsay – aye; Charlie Vars – aye; Danielle Pray – aye; and Doug Kirkwood - aye. Motion carried unanimously.

Jamie Ramsay moved to exit deliberations. Charlie Vars seconded.

Roll Call: Bob Rowe – aye; Jamie Ramsay – aye; Charlie Vars – aye; Danielle Pray – aye; and Doug Kirkwood - aye. Motion carried unanimously.

OTHER BUSINESS:

Jamie Ramsay noted that, per the Staff Report for this application, under the permitted uses section, the Integrated Innovative Housing Ordinance (IIHO) is mentioned. He stated that the IIHO was voted out back in March 2020 and there should be no reason that remnants of it keep showing up.

Nic Strong explained that the petition from March 2020 was only to delete the IIHO, Section 4.16, itself. That petition did not remove any other references to the IIHO found throughout the ordinance. There will be an additional petition on the upcoming ballot to remove all additional references, as a housekeeping item.

Natasha Kypfer noted that certain items, such as the relevant ordinance sections to the application, are included in the Staff Report in order aid the Board, the applicant, and the public.

Doug Kirkwood stated that he is not sure it is productive to include all relevant citations and citation language within the Staff Report.

Nic Strong explained that Town Counsel advised the Town to put an article on the ballot this year to remove all other references to the IIHO.

2. Minutes: November 17, 2020

Bob Rowe moved to approve the meeting minutes of November 17, 2020, as amended [Line 436, replace “recruitments” with “requirements.”] Charlie Vars seconded.

Roll Call: Bob Rowe – aye; Jamie Ramsay – abstain; Charlie Vars – aye; Danielle Pray – aye; and Doug Kirkwood - abstain. 3-0-2; motion carried.

3. Zoning Board of Adjustment – Reorganization

TOWN OF AMHERST
Zoning Board of Adjustment

December 15, 2020

APPROVED-Amended

478

479

Bob Rowe moved to nominate Doug Kirkwood as Chair of the Zoning Board of Adjustment. Charlie Vars seconded.

480

481

Roll Call: Bob Rowe – aye; Jamie Ramsay – aye; Charlie Vars – aye; Danielle Pray – aye; and Doug Kirkwood - abstain. 4-0-1; motion carried.

482

483

484

Charlie Vars moved to nominate Danielle Pray as Vice Chair of the Zoning Board of Adjustment. Bob Rowe seconded.

485

486

Roll Call: Bob Rowe – aye; Jamie Ramsay – aye; Charlie Vars – aye; Danielle Pray – abstain; and Doug Kirkwood - abstain. 3-0-2; motion carried.

487

488

489

Bob Rowe moved to nominate Jamie Ramsay as Secretary/Treasurer of the Zoning Board of Adjustment. Danielle Pray seconded.

490

491

Roll Call: Bob Rowe – aye; Jamie Ramsay – abstain; Charlie Vars – aye; Danielle Pray – aye; and Doug Kirkwood - abstain. 4-0-1; motion carried.

492

493

494

Bob Rowe moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:22pm. Jamie Ramsay seconded.

495

Roll Call: Bob Rowe – aye; Jamie Ramsay – aye; Charlie Vars – aye; Danielle Pray – aye; and Doug Kirkwood - aye. Motion carried unanimously.

496

497

498 Respectfully submitted,

499 Kristan Patenaude

500

501 Minutes approved as amended: February 16, 2021