

Town of Warner
Zoning Board of Adjustment



DRAFT Meeting Minutes

May 8, 2019

7:00 PM Warner Town Hall Lower Level

1. OPEN MEETING and ROLL CALL

Present:

Elizabeth Labbe (Alternate) Harry Seidel (Alternate) Sam Bower
Janice Loz (Chair) Howard Kirchner (Vice Chair) Beverley Howe

Absent:

Barbara Marty (excused)

Janice appointed Elizabeth to vote in Barb's absence.

Sam and Howard have been appointed by the Selectmen to a new 3-year term and have taken their oath of office.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES of April 10, 2019

Janice read Barbara Marty's email with suggested correction for the minutes into the record. She suggested "people **are** most likely" on page 2.

Howard explained that we are discussing ex parte communication> And I was saying that members are most likely to discuss with family. But it is a community issue.

"5000 fine" is there a decimal missing? Sam explained that he was exaggerating to make a point.

Motion made by Beverley to accept the minutes of April 10, 2019 as edited. Second by Howard Kirchner. Approved, 5-0

3. NEW BUSINESS:

VARIANCE APPLICATION – Case: ZBA 2019-01

APPLICANT: Chris McMahon

PROPERTY OWNER: Eaton W. Tarbel

MAP 7 LOT 6 ZONING DISTRICT: R-2

PROPERTY LOCATION: 201 ROUTE 103 East

DESCRIPTION: Request for Variance to the terms of: Article XII , Section B. 3 of the Zoning Ordinance of Warner for size of the new sign (recently installed), at Braeside Apartments, which is larger than the previous sign.

Janice: Asked the land use secretary if all fees have been collected, meeting noticed to the public, have the abutters been noticed.

Diane: Confirmed all.

A. Accept/Deny the Application

Janice: The board will review the application for completeness and accept or reject the application as submitted. We are not deliberating specific portions of the case, we are determining the completeness of the application.

Sam: The application looked complete to me.

Sam made a motion to accept the application as complete. The motion was seconded by Beverley. Application accepted: 5 - 0

B. Public Hearing

Janice closed the Board meeting and opened the public hearing. There was one applicant and no abutters, present. She asked the applicant to read the application into the record.

Chris McMahon: I am a manager for Keystone. (The applicant read the five written responses to conditions outlined in the Variance application.)

1. The enhanced size of the new sign will increase the ability for passers-by to see the property. In return, increasing the safety of all local residents.
2. It is our intention to make the property more visually appealing. The new sign is just one property improvement.
3. Granting this variance will not negatively affect any neighbors. The character of the neighborhood remains intact.
4. The Sign in question is more attractive, easier to read and an improvement in comparison to the sign used prior.
5. A. Braeside Apartments is the only residential apartment building in the direct area. Granting this exception will not effect any neighbors. Therefore, these conditions only apply to Braeside Apartments.

Chris McMahon: The signs were 5x5, white and black, and they looked awful on the side of the building. We are doing many things to neaten the property. The owner, ordered the sign, and got a 4 x 8. They are maroon in color. There was a question about the lights. We used everything that was there. We are trying to improve the way the location looks. We wanted to do something that matched the building. They are maroon, but are on white.

Howard: The ordinances go by square feet. 5 x 5 is 25 square feet. Do you know if these signs were in existence before zoning ordinance was written?

Chris: I don't know.

Howard: The Town Administrator says there is no record of a sign permit. If there was no ordinance, a permit may not have been required.

Chris: I don't know and the previous owner passed away.

Howard: These may be grandfathered. What is the threshold for grandfathering?

Chris: We don't need to go back.

Howard: It may be to your advantage.

Janice: We could find out for ourselves or ask the applicant to research it. The burden of proof is on the applicant.

Beverley: We should now for how long it has been an apartment building?

Harry: My question is for Chris. Are you the owner?

Chris: No. I am the manager.

Harry: Did you read the ordinance or the sign ordinance for the town of Warner before you made the sign.

Chris: Yes. I had put up a sign at 115 Kearsarge Mtn Rd, without reading the ordinance, and then had to do the permit thing with the sign.

Harry: Did you know that the first step in the sign process is to go to the Planning Board. Is that new? Before the sign was made, did you go before the Planning Board?

Chris: No. We put up new signs and then discovered that we needed new signs to fit the ordinance.

Harry: Before the sign was made, did you go to the Planning Board? Because that is what our process says. You did not read the ordinance?

Chris: We replaced the signs that were there. We bought the place, took down the signs, and put up new signs.

Harry: You did not read the sign permit process before you put up the sign?

Janice: When they were first going to come to us, in March, we received a letter from the Town Administrator, it says, "It has been brought to our attention that a sign with external lighting has been mounted on the side of the barn at the referenced locations. The Town of Warner has no record of a Sign Permit being issued. Because the property is multi-family you will need to contact the Landuse Office." They received the letter and went to the Planning Board who told them that they needed to go before the Zoning Board to get a variance. Which part of the process do you not understand, Harry?

Harry: I understand all of that. I am trying to understand how the applicant came to this process. We are reviewing something that is in our ordinance which has come to us after someone has come to us who was unaware of the ordinance and proceeded to make a sign. He had a sign that was non-conforming, and he made a bigger non-conforming sign.

Janice: He was never allowed to make a bigger sign. With or without the existence of the previous sign this sign is larger and non-conforming.

Harry: I was just curious to know if the applicant was aware of the process before he made the sign.

Chris: My experience for signs was with the Kearsarge Mtn Rd sign, and that was a new sign. This time we were just replacing a sign. I did not know it was going to be larger.

Janice: We need to figure out if it was grandfathered.

Howard: If it is grandfathered in, then it is legal and non-conforming. But it cannot be replaced with a larger non-conforming sign.

Harry: I am trying to understand the process. He is a property manager, putting up a non-conforming sign without going through the process.

Sam: Who purchased the sign?

Chris: My office.

Beverley: If it was non-conforming, and still is non-conforming, if it was grandfathered, does it make a difference?

Howard: From the Planning Board notes, Ben Frost indicated that if he wanted to get a larger sign, you need to go before the Zoning Board for a variance.

Sam: If we can determine that this was a non-conforming, but accepted grandfathered sign, is there a huge financial burden to go back to the 5x5 format?

Howard: You could shrink it down to 25 sq.ft.

Chris: They were expensive. They were \$1,100 each.

Sam: That is my question, he does not need a variance if he shrinks the sign.

Howard: It would appear that way. And that would be the most expedient solution.

Sam: Would there be any harm if the application were to be denied, then what happens to the grandfathered piece of it? Now is he allowed to revert to the grandfathered sign?

Janice: We would have to find out if it was grandfathered.

Beverley: How do you find that out?

Janice: You would have to find out when it was first used as an apartment building, and when the sign ordinance was written. We don't know when the sign ordinance was written.

Harry: If it existed for a period of time, more than a few years, I think it would be grandfathered. I think the gentleman has a grandfathered right for a 25 sq.ft. sign. But he does not necessarily have a right for a larger size.

Janice Loz: He can ask for the variance.

Howard: An approved variance would allow him to keep the sign he has. A variance denied he would be required to shrink the size of the sign to the required square feet.

Janice Loz: We can deny it and he could potentially put up the old size sign.

Harry: May I ask a question about the district? It is an R2. So, it is 4 sq.ft. for a sign.

Janice Loz: It can only be 4 sq. ft, but if you read the ordinance it states that one sign can be posted for every residence. Therefore, technically, he can have potentially eight, 4 x 4 signs.

Beverley: Isn't there something about where they face? They don't even face the road. They are on the side of the building. I remember the big to-do about the MadgeTech sign. It is a business.

Janice: Article XII, 8. Reads in part, one sign shall be allowed on a premise for each residence. Each sign shall be 4 sq.ft.

Harry: Isn't that referring to a house?

Janice: It says residence. You would have to define residence. You cannot just make it up.

Howard: We do not have a definition for residence.

The applicant noted that there are 11 residences in the Braeside Apartments.

Beverly: So, they could have 11 signs. So, one sign does not seem so bad.

Janice: So now one sign does not seem so bad.

Elizabeth: In the ordinance it talks about having one additional sign if it is a home occupation. I see how you are viewing a residence, but I don't think you can have 44 sq.ft. just because there are 11 residence there, or 12 at the apartment building at the other apartment building.

Janice Loz: It is just a fault of how the ordinance is written.

Sam Bower: I don't think that is a big concern right now.

Janice Loz: In the literal interpretation of the ordinance, 11 signs would be terribly chaotic, and one sign would not. Do you know the dimensions of the side of the building that the sign is on?

Chris: It is 10 to 12 feet high, and 70 feet long.

Janice: It seems we would want a sign that is proportionally correct for the size of the building.

Beverley: When I drove by I thought, "that little sign?"

Harry: I had a completely different reaction. I drove by at night, and was surprised by the amount of glare. I felt it was a large glaring sign. I thought it was unusual. That is why the town has written a sign ordinance.

Janice Loz: What, specifically, bothered you, Harry?

Harry: I found it to be, I am sensitive to glare, when there is something shining at me that makes glare, it is difficult for me to see what is in front me. I see it as a safety issue. Lighting and signage can be nice, they don't have to be large. Our town has written an ordinance for signs. Why? To maintain a certain feeling, and maintain safety.

Janice Loz: What specifically in the ordinance addresses that?

Harry: The size.

Janice Loz: I would like you to point to a specific ordinance that addresses your concern. Not just because you have sensitive to glare, or you are worried about safety.

Beverley: I think it started with McDonald's.

Harry: #10 (in Article XII), signs or lighting of signs shall not be placed in such a position to endanger vehicular or pedestrian traffic by interfering with vision by obscuring or by clear view or by confusion with official street signs or signals.

Chris: It is not a lighted sign.

Janice: We do not have anything in the ordinance that says you cannot externally illuminate a sign. It cannot be internally lit, flash or have motion.

Harry shows a lighted sign on his phone.

Janice told Harry that if he shows a zoning member a picture on his cell phone a printed copy of the picture must be submitted into the record. If he could forward a copy of the picture to the Landuse Secretary, it will be filed into the record.

Harry: This is a photograph taken by me after the last meeting.

All zoning members viewed the picture on Harry's phone.

Sam: How many occupants?

Chris: 11 apartment units.

Sam: And the parking is right there?

Chris: Yes.

Elizabeth: Has an abutter complained?

Chris: No neighbors have complained. We can move the lights, we just utilized what was there.

Janice: Do you have neighbors directly across the street, and have they complained?

Chris: There are neighbors across the street and they have not complained. We have never even met them. There were no lights previously, just wires hanging out. If we can move the lights, we can move them.

Janice Loz: I don't personally think it is a problem. It is remote. If you are looking for the place it makes it easier to find. If you live there, it makes it easier to see.

Chris: I have pictures if you want to see them. The police and fire departments know where to go.

Janice directed the applicant to submit a printed copy of the cell phone picture of the sign to the Landuse Secretary for inclusion in the record.

Chris showed his cell phone to the zoning board members pictures of the signs, and will submit a digital picture to the Land Use Office.

Sam: Do they stay on all night?

Chris: Yes, they do.

Sam: In reference to number 13 in the sign ordinance, we are not certain if a sign permit was issued. Am I reading that correctly? You can replace the sign with the same size sign. If it had been a permitted sign, it could have been done without a permit. If you have a sign out there, and want to take it down, and replace it, you don't need a permit to replace his sign. If he had gotten the same size sign, this would not be an issue.

Note: Article XII, 13. Reads in part "*if a sign has been issued to a particular business, a new sign construction permit will not be required if the sign . . . is the same size*".

Janice: Is this the actual sign? It is a rectangle with a circle placed in the center.

Howard: It is hard to get the accurate square footage on a sign of that shape. I don't think it is much more than the 25 sq. ft. If it is 47 inches at its widest point, then you take out a lot of square footage.

Janice Loz: We are talking the difference between the previous sign which was 25 sq.ft. and the current sign which is 32 sq.ft. It is not a huge difference.

Sam: It is going to be a little closer if you measured it out exactly.

The board agrees to read and review the five conditions for a variance

Five Conditions of a Variance (discussion)

Janice: Granting the variance will not be contrary to the public interest. I think that the sign not be internally lit, flashing or having motion, which is outlined as a prohibitive sign in Warner, and in this district, I think that speaks to the public interest.

Howard: I cannot see a reason to say it is contrary to public interest, to grant a slightly larger sign, on a very large barn.

Janice Loz: Proportionally it seems to be adequately sized to the building, and not oversized.

Harry: When I review something like this, the first thing I do is go to the very beginning of the ordinance and I look at the purpose. If you go to the sign regulations, it says “, The purpose of this article is to provide standards for the size and treatment of signs within the various zoning districts to protect against detrimental impact on the visual character of the community and on transportation safety. Signs should be consistent with the goals of Master Plan.” We don’t have the master plan in front of us. The goals I remember from the Master Plan is that people want small town charm, not a lot of bright lights, they didn’t want the golden arches. That is how I interpret the feeling of the Master Plan. Am I wrong?

Janice Loz: I would say that is a portion of the Master Plan.

Sam: There is also economic development and safety of the citizens that live in town.

Harry: In terms of visual impact that is what we are talking about. When I look at each of these, that is my metric to measure. The answer from the applicant, “the enhanced size of the new sign will increase the ability for passers by to see the property, and in return increasing the safety of all resident. ...” I don’t know if that is addressing the ordinance. My reading of the ordinance is to affect small signs. That is why they have 4 sq. ft. We should be measuring against if it is in the spirit of the ordinance.

Janice: I think that it is commercial entity, and it is a residence. It is commercial entity so they have the right to promote their business. I think that it fits with the character of the district.

Sam: We may not be talking about reverting back to a 4 sf sign, we may be talking about reverting back to a 25 sf sign. Do you get that much difference in the character of the district? I don’t know if that is going to make the biggest difference.

Janice: I also don’t think it is objectionable or unattractive for rural character.

Harry: You like the sign. We have to decide if you like the sign, it is pretty, if we should allow a new precedence for signs because someone comes in with a pretty sign that is in violation of the ordinance.

Janice: You just said it was objectionable; and I said it was not objectionable.

Harry: I do like the sign. It is a well-done sign. But it does not meet the criteria of the town.

Janice Loz: We are not measuring this against the Master Plan. We are measuring it against the ordinances.

Harry: In my view, we should be reviewing if this applicant and this sign warrants a variance. If an argument is not made that it is in the spirit of the ordinance, and substantial justice is done, and it will not diminish the values of surrounding properties, and then #5 literal enforcement and it is long so I won’t read all that. If it does not meet those criteria, those are the criteria we should be using. Not if we like the sign.

Sam: If the sign had just been replaced with the same dimensions, we would not have to be here. I am still thinking about the last sign. If there had been any complaints about the last sign fitting in. I also think it is the manager’s responsibility to fix his place. The one thing that does visually change is the lighting. But if this sign were, I don’t know how this sign, if you measure it out exactly, I don’t know that if increasing the sign by 5 or 7 sq.ft, I don’t know that it would cause havoc in the district.

Elizabeth: My understanding is that this is a variance, and they should be very difficult to get. Regardless if it is four square feet or not, it should be challenging, And the burden should be to sway us.

Beverley: If this room were filled with people, it would be different. But there is nobody here. This is a business, and we do want to encourage a bit more business in town.

Sam: It is part of the Master Plan.

Janice: I also want to mention that we gave the Buffalo Farm a much larger sign in the same area. This is just an observation. We have never heard that the buffalo farm sign is an issue for the neighborhood.

Elizabeth: The lighting at the Buffalo Farm is on one side then the other. If you are sleeping near the Braeside farm, it would be very bright. Everything in the ordinance we have about lighting is internal lighting.

Janice: The ordinance states that as long as it is not impeding on an intersection or interfering with traffic signals.

Harry: Are you saying that the Planning Board agreed with the lighting?

Chris: They said they were not internally lit.

Harry: They are lit from the outside. Some people are saying that the light on the sign creates glare. We can decide that a smaller bulb should be used. But that is not our thing.

Janice: I believe the Planning Board would deal with the lighting.

Sam: You do need to have lighting. If I owned an apartment, I would want to be sure that residents can find their door, get out of their car, and safely get into their residence. We have not heard any complaints. And even the letter sent to the Town Administrators, there was not a complaint, only that there was no sign permit issued. So, to me, it all goes back to if we denied this variance, how much would the sign shrink? And if we granted the variance, would we be causing something that is detrimental. I don't know how much of a difference we would be making.

Beverley: I think it is 6 inches all the way around the sign.

Harry: I don't think so. This sign is 4 x 8.

Sam: The 4 x 8 is peak to peak. If you are to take out the section of missing wood, then that is the square footage. So, 4 x 8 is 32 sq. ft., minus the missing portions.

Janice: It is not a pure rectangle.

Sam: That is where I find myself right now. If I am thinking about it, I think a business has a right to advertise itself. And sometimes you have to come before the board and say, "I am running a business in a residential area" a smaller sign would be harder to read. And the Buffalo Farm is interesting because they came before us and were granted a variance.

Janice: And sometimes people will use a previous case as an example of precedence to support their case. The other things I want to mention is, "granting the variance, substantial justice is done." I started thinking that in the business district a 50 sq.ft. sign is allowable, in commercial district it is a 60 sq.ft. sign. This sign is roughly 32 sq.ft. which is half of what is allowed in the commercial district. This is a R-2 district and the sign is 18 sq.ft. less than the business district, that seems proportionally allowable to me.

Harry: It does not make sense to me. You are talking about something in a business district.

Sam: Harry, what do you think would be appropriate if it was a 25 sq.ft. sign. Or is it a 4 sq.ft. sign?

Harry: I think that 25 sq.ft. because it is grandfathered. It is very bright. We don't discuss lighting, that is a Planning Board issue. This sign has the character that is affected by the lighting on it. It is much larger than what would be allowed here.

Beverley: You probably have a light in your driveway.

Harry: If I lived here, and was trying to sleep, I would have a hard time sleeping.

Howard: I have driven by this. It seems that the sign which is in the entrance to the apartments, it seems that the one near the road is less bright, and maybe that is so that it does not bother the residence.

Sam: I think I agree with Harry that what would have been ideal if that 25 sq.ft. sign came down, and a 25 sq.ft. sign went up. Residents should know that the ordinance should be followed in that manner. But it is hard to find anything in here, there are sign regulations but very little about grandfathered. Then you read the ordinance, and it says that if it goes back up in relatively the same material and same size. I think the applicant made a mistake. But I don't see this as such an egregious mistake. I think it should be shown in the record, that we recognize that a mistake was made, and the applicant recognizes that. But in this case, where the difference is so small, a difference of 7 sq.ft. at a maximum, on the side of a barn, with no complaints from neighbors. I personally feel that this is something we can move forward on, and I don't think the town is going to be any worse off for it. And I think we are still abiding by the ordinance.

Janice read Barb Marty's statement into the record, she was unable to attend this evening. Her statement was received before the deadline for responses which is the day of the ZBA meeting at 12:00 noon.

Case ZBA 2019-01

The applicant violated two of the ordinances under 2. Sign Permit Process:

2.b. "A Sign Permit Application must be completed, submitted to the Board of Selectmen's Office, and approved prior to erecting, altering, or relocating a sign",

11. "Non-conforming signs shall not be expanded.

I would like to point out that under Article XII A. "Signs should be consistent with the goals of the Master Plan."

Again and again the Master Plan reinforces the goal of maintaining the rural character of the districts. These two, oversized and floodlight-illuminated, signs are definitely not in keeping with the residential character of an R-2 district.

The applicant gives only personal opinion and no evidence to support the five conditions necessary to meet the threshold for a variance. I find none of the written statements compelling and disagree that the new signs are an improvement visually or to public safety. The signs violate the spirit of the ordinance and are in conflict with the goals of the Master Plan.

For these reasons I believe application ZBA 2019-01 should be denied.

The Public Hearing was closed at 8:15 pm.

C. Board Deliberations

Janice: Is there any further discussion?

Howard: My thought is that would it be appropriate, assuming that this variance is granted, would it be appropriate to send them back to the Planning Board about their lighting of the signs? I think it would be appropriate to not leave it hanging. They never said anything about where it goes beyond that they need a variance.

Beverley: I agree, seeing it is a matter of concern.

Sam asked to read Barb's letter.

Janice: She discusses the lighting which we can address by sending him to the Planning Board. She does not say anything about the size, but we know that is why the applicant is here for a variance.

Elizabeth: I would like to see a bit more of the history.

Janice: That is something we can add to a checklist, requesting the applicant to research history of a pertinent subject and to attach it to the application.

Sam: We encourage you to submit as much information as possible to help the board make a decision.

Elizabeth: The burden of proof is with the applicant. If we decide to do research, then we are doing that above and beyond what a typical board would do, or what is required?

Harry: Something that I find troubling is when an issue comes to us after the fact. There is an ordinance and it is printed. Professionals who are in the business, know what is going on. Someone that does not go through the proper channels, the Planning Board did not even get brought in, a larger sign than what is allowed in the district, and now we are in a position of making it harder for us. The sign is already there. We are even thinking that if this person has to take it down and rebuild it, and we are thinking about how much it will cost the applicant. That should not be our concern. We don't make a decision because it is cheaper or more expensive for an applicant. We should be making a decision on the criteria of the questions. I am troubled by the process that this came through. I am not convinced by the arguments that were made.

Janice: Are you going to deny because you don't like the process?

Harry: I make my decision based on the criteria. If someone can make that argument to me, then they should be allowed some grace because there is some benefit to them, and no harm to the public, and if someone can make that argument, then it makes it easier for the zoning board member. I will allow you that because the public loss is not great. It is not such that it should not be allowed. Lighting is an issue. The glare I see off the building. It is never easy to make these decisions. Lighting is a major element in most cases. When I look at my picture, what I see is glare off the white building.

Beverly: Did you read the Planning Board minutes and see what they said about the lighting? That the lights were pre-existing?

Harry: But they weren't.

Beverly: Yes, they were.

Chris: There were wires there.

Beverly: They have signs on both sides of the barn in the same place as the original ones. And they also said that it is lit all the way around. It is lit. The whole barn is lit so that people don't get hurt. The lights were not put there for signs, they were put all around the barn for safety. The lights go all around the building so that people can walk around and dispose of their trash. If you go around the back side, there are five lights that are not to light sign, but to light the property. And they are all bell shaped. I really do not understand what you are doing.

Harry: My concern is that there is a lot of glare created by the illumination of the sign. When I drove by, I took a photo because I was startled by it. It created a glare. It is not that it is internally lit, but it is a reflection off the building. All of it all together, and the sign, I found to be glaring.

Beverly: But that is not our business, the lights. We cannot tell him he cannot have lights.

Howard: If the sign was not there, and the lights were on, you would get glare from the side of the barn.

Sam: Correct.

Harry: But we are here to talk about the sign.

Sam: I am thinking that because we have not been able to find a permit history for this location, I am thinking we have an obligation to get something on the books. We should not assume it is grandfathered. Seeing that there is such a small difference between the old existing sign and the new one that is there now. With no complaints ever coming forward with the old signs, and nobody here today complaining about the current signs. I think we have an opportunity to get something on the books. I think by accepting this application, I think by doing that, we can maintain what historically has been adequate.

Howard: I would like to have one more pass at the Planning Board, and they may send you to the select board for a permit. And passing the variance would approve the slightly expanded square footage of the sign.

Janice made a motion. ***The ZBA grants a variance in accordance with article XII.B. for two signs, each 4 feet by 8 feet with an area of 32 square feet, to be mounted in two locations on the building dba Braeside Apartments located on the property at 201 Route 103E, Map 7, Lot 6.***

Howard seconded the motion.

Harry: Is that without a condition? It hought it was a condition to be reviewed by the planning board but not mentioned in your motion.

Janice: I am thinking to we have an amendment or second motion?

Beverly: It is a second motion.

Harry: You are making a motion which don't intend to be the final to amend later?

Sam: That is incorrect. She is making a motion to accept the variance.

Voice vote on the motion:

Beverley: Yes

Howard: Yes

Janice: Yes

Sam: Yes

Elizabeth: No

The Variance is granted 4 - 1.

Janice Loz: Any aggrieved party has the right to appeal a decision made by the Zoning Board of Adjustment. The appeal must be made within 30 days of the decision. The appeal will be granted if you can show that the decision was indeed made in error.

Janice: Does someone want to make another motion?

Harry: I don't know why. You just granted it.

Sam: It is for the lighting. It is to send the applicant back to the planning board to be sure there is no confusion about the lighting on the signs. I want to make a recommendation and not sure if we have to make an amendment.

Sam makes a recommendation to the applicant to go back to the Planning Board to be sure there is no confusion about the lighting on the sign.

The ZBA Chair will reach out to Ben Frost to see if the Planning Board wants to see him.

4. OLD BUSINESS:

None.

5. COMMUNICATIONS:

Howard: I have one comment on communications. Is it not that the Chair of the board is supposed to vote last. In the rules of the procedure, the Chair is supposed to vote last.

Janice agreed that is the procedure. She thanked Howard and will work to follow that procedure in the future.

Motion to adjourn, Seconded and Unanimous Vote – ADJOURNED at 8:35 pm.

*ZBA meetings will end at 10:00 P.M. Items remaining on the agenda will be heard first at the next scheduled monthly meeting.

All interested parties are invited to attend. Correspondence must be received by Noon, Wed, May 8, 2019.
(Agenda is posted when received)