

#

A meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals was held on **November 23, 2015** at 5:30 p.m. in the City Hall council chambers, 1911 Boundary Street. In attendance were Chairman Brad Hill, board members Don Starkey, Tim Wood, Eric Powell and Joe Noll and Libby Anderson, planning director.

In accordance with the South Carolina Code of Laws, 1976, Section 30-4-80(d) as amended, all local media were duly notified of the time, date, place, and agenda of this meeting.

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Hill called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. He read the notice of compliance with the Freedom of Information Act requirements.

Mr. Powell made a motion, second by Mr. Starkey, to approve the minutes of the October 26, 2015 meetings as submitted. The motion passed unanimously.

REVIEW OF PROJECTS

804 Washington Street, Identified as District R120, Map 4, Parcel 414

Special Exception

Applicant: Jeffrey and Courtney Mullins (ZB15-24)

The applicants are requesting a special exception in order to operate a short-term rental.

Mr. Powell made a motion, second by Mr. Noll, to table the application until the February ZBOA meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

2400 Wilson Drive, Identified as District R120, Map 2, Parcel 6

Special Exception

Applicant: Beaufort Rentals for Gary Geboy & Teresa Bruce (ZB15-26)

The applicants are requesting a special exception in order to operate a short-term rental.

Ms. Anderson said there needed to be a motion to take this application off the table.

Mr. Powell made a motion to take this application off the table, second by Mr. Starkey. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Anderson said this property is on the Beaufort River in the Pigeon Point neighborhood. A single-family dwelling is located there, and the board was provided with photos of it. The owners want to rent it on a short-term basis; they have recently moved out of town and have hired Beaufort Rentals to manage the property. The rental agreement specifies a three-night stay, which is longer than the ordinance requires, and limits the number of guests to four and vehicles to two. It has adequate onsite parking.

This application was tabled at the October meeting, Ms. Anderson said, which is when most of the public notice was made, including notice to the neighborhood association

#

#

president. Several emails have been received: about Wilson Drive short-term rentals and short-term rentals in general.

To approve a special exception application, Ms. Anderson said the board must determine that there will be no significant negative impact. She presented staff's opinions on the criteria that the board must use to determine if this application receives a special exception:

1. **Proposed use is compatible with existing uses in the surrounding area:** The property is in Pigeon Point neighborhood on the Beaufort River and is within an easy bike ride of the downtown core, walking distance to the Pigeon Point boat ramp and Pigeon Point Park, Ms. Anderson said.
2. **Proposed changes are harmonious with the character of area:** No changes are proposed to this property as part of its use.
3. **Impact on public infrastructure:** Ms. Anderson said the proposed use would have no greater impact on public infrastructure than a long-term rental.
4. **Compatible with Comprehensive Plan and the Civic Master Plan:** Staff feels a short-term rental at this location is consistent with those plans.
5. **Impact on public health and safety:** The use is likely to have little impact because a professional management company will manage it, Ms. Anderson said.
6. **Potential creation of nuisances:** There is little potential for this if a monitored fire alarm is installed and because of the professional management firm.

Staff recommends approval of the application if a monitored fire alarm is installed, Ms. Anderson said.

JC Cuppia, Beaufort Rentals, read a letter from one of the owners, **Teresa Bruce**. The house has been in her extended family for many years. She has taken a position out of Beaufort that will last two to four years, but she and her husband consider this their permanent residence, and they will spend vacations in Beaufort and telecommute from there when possible. The owners are leaving many of their possessions there, so they do not want to sell it or make it a long-term rental. Their neighbors support their request, Ms. Bruce said.

Mr. Starkey asked about the photo of the driveway. Mr. Cuppia said the cars would be able to park side-by-side. Mr. Wood asked about how long Ms. Bruce's assignment was, and Mr. Cuppia said two to four years, and they will move back when the assignment is over.

Charlie Calvert lives in Pigeon Point, and he said if this short-term rental application were approved, there would be a couple of VRBOs in their neighborhood that are on the water. As a neighbor, he supports the application. Mr. Calvert called Pigeon Point a "great mixed neighborhood" demographically, and he hoped the board would support this application.

#

#

Mr. Wood said the fact that the applicants are long-term, permanent residents of Beaufort who only want to do this for a few years is unique to the short-term rental applications the ZBOA has seen, and this will help them out while Ms. Bruce is assigned elsewhere.

Mr. Noll agreed and said short-term rental seems better for this situation than a long-term rental would be. Mr. Powell said he agrees, with the six-month trial period attached to reassure the neighboring property owners who had some concerns with short-term rentals. Chairman Hill said there was one email against the application, and one from a person who was not specifically opposed to this short-term rental. Four people had come out in favor of the application, including Mr. Calvert.

Mr. Starkey said city council needs to address those who have concerns about short-term rentals' proliferation. Chairman Hill said he feels that the majority of people who had written to the city or had come to present to the ZBOA are in favor of this application, so he is in favor of it. **Mr. Noll made a motion to grant a special exception for a short-term rental, with the stipulation of the six-month trial period, and the installation of a monitored fire alarm. Mr. Powell seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

705 Washington Street, Identified as District R121, Map 4, Parcel 319 and 317

Variance

Applicant: Mark & Alison Guilloud (ZB15-28)

The applicant is requesting a variance in order to make a lot line adjustment.

Ms. Anderson said this variance application is for a property at 705 Washington Street that has frontage on Carteret and Scott Streets. It is in the Old Commons neighborhood. There is a historic structure on the property. It's zoned Traditional Beaufort Residential District – Old Commons. The previous owner had also owned the property to the rear of this one: 708 Greene Street. A carport, which Ms. Anderson described and showed a photo of, was constructed on that property to serve the Washington Street residence. The car port is enclosed on three sides with lattice.

The applicants have submitted a lot recombination application to adjust the property lines, Ms. Anderson said, so the car port becomes a part of the Washington Street lot. She quoted the section of the ordinance that applies to side and rears setbacks for accessory structures. The applicants have requested a variance for a lot line adjustment.

Staff would like the applicant to address the issue of maintenance, Ms. Anderson said: how would it be maintained without going into the adjoining property owners' property? Also, was there a permit issued for the car port? No record could be found of such a permit being issued as far back as 1983 on either lot, but there was an extensive

#

#

renovation and repair permit issued in 1996; that may have included the car port's construction.

Staff had discussed this with a building official, Ms. Anderson said. The building code has setback requirements, which she showed the board. If the structure is not one-hour fire rated, it must be at least 5' from the side and rear property lines. The requirements might not have been as stringent at the time this car port was constructed, she said, but the eaves still would need to be fire-rated.

In regard to public notice, all of the usual notice was made, and no public comments were received.

Ms. Anderson enumerated the findings the board needs to make to approve this application for a variance. The board must find all six to grant a variance.

1. **Extraordinary and exceptional conditions:** Staff feels this finding might be made because an owner who owned both lots built the structure on the Greene Street lot. Additionally, Historic Beaufort Foundation holds an easement on the Washington Street property.
2. **Conditions as applied to other properties in the vicinity:** This is a "pretty unique situation," Ms. Anderson said.
3. **Conditions are not the result of the applicant's own actions:** This applicant bought the property, but a previous owner did all of this.
4. **Granting the variance would not conflict with the Comprehensive Plan:** Staff feels this finding may be able to be made, "other things being equal," Ms. Anderson said.
5. **Unreasonable restriction on utilization of the property:** There appears to be no physical reason (trees, wetlands, etc.) these lot lines could not be adjusted from the current 2' from the carport to the 5' setback, as is required by the ordinance.
6. **Not a detriment to adjacent property and the public good:** Staff feels granting this variance could be a detriment to adjacent properties because the walls of the car port are not fire-rated, and the current building code requires an unrated structure to be set back at least 5' from any property line. The previous building code, under which staff believes this car port was built, "required the 3' setback, but also the setback from the eave overhangs, which in this case (is) 2'," Ms. Anderson said.

Staff recommends denial of the application, because it appears all of the findings to recommend the variance cannot be met, Ms. Anderson said. If the board finds otherwise, however, staff recommends a 1' variance, so that "the new lot line would be 2' from the roof overhang, and 4' from the walls of the carport, which . . . would be consistent with the code that was in place at the time the car port was constructed," Ms. Anderson said.

#

#

Mr. Starkey said he reads it “as they want to be at that drip line . . . so there would be zero clearance all around the car port.” Ms. Anderson said it depends on where you measure it from; in the city’s ordinance, for zoning, it’s measured from the wall/façade. Mr. Starkey said, “The only clearance of the wall, then, would be the difference between the wall and the overhang,” and Ms. Anderson said that’s correct; that would be 2’.

Mr. Starkey asked if it is known when the lot was split into two lots. If this was done when the lots were contiguous, he said, there would have been no requirement for this garage. Ms. Anderson said she can’t say if they were two separate tax parcels at the time it was built – they might have been – but even under one owner, if it were two separate tax parcels, today they would still need to meet the setbacks. She cannot explain how this happened, she said.

Mr. Wood said there are two different property owners, one for each property at 705 Washington Street and 708 Greene Street. He asked Ms. Anderson if, when the property sale was finalized with the Greene Street owners, they thought the car port was on their property. Ms. Anderson said there is “probably a history” about this, but the applicant can speak to it better than she can.

Alice Guilloud, 705 Washington Street, said the two properties were built with an easement, and when the Greene Street owners refinanced, “much legal wrangling” began. The way to solve the problem is to purchase the car port “to the drip line,” so the Guillouds can have the car port, which was built to go with their property at 705 Washington Street. A contractor has said that it can be maintained only to the drip line, Ms. Guilloud said. The Historic Beaufort Foundation has an easement, so the Guillouds cannot build another car port on their property, and this one was intended to go with it.

Mr. Noll asked if they can use the car port now, and Ms. Guilloud said yes, a judge had ruled that they could. Mr. Noll said the car port seems to serve the Greene Street property better than the Guillouds’. It was clearly marked as being their property, not that Greene Street owner’s, she said.

Mr. Starkey asked her to describe the easement. Ms. Guilloud indicated where it is on the overhead projection and said it was found to have a legal error in it; the Guillouds and the owner of 708 Greene Street have debated it for 2.5 years. They are in mediation, and this is a compromise that they all feel they could agree to. The owner of 708 Greene Street will want to go to court, she said, if the Zoning Board of Appeals says the lot line adjustment has to be for 3’ or 5’.

Chairman Hill asked why the easement is not recorded on the official plat. Ms. Guilloud said she doesn’t know. **Edward Dukes**, the Guillouds’ attorney, said the easement was on both properties but only covers the car port on the other property, because previously one owner had owned both properties. That owner “gave himself an

#

#

easement” on this property, but “it was poorly written.” Mr. Dukes called this “the solution (to) a long-term problem.”

Mr. Wood asked what the court case was about. Ms. Guilloud said both parties believe the easement belongs to them. This is the compromise that has arisen from mediation. Mr. Wood said a note from the other property owner saying this is agreeable would have been helpful.

Chairman Hill said if he read the ordinance properly, they could go to 2’ if there were firewalls. Mr. Noll said they have been through what’s required; the Greene Street owners have said they’re willing to adjust to the drip line, and the city has said 5’ is required. Ms. Guilloud said Mr. Noll was correct about the Greene Street owners’ stipulation, and that is all they are willing to offer. There are emails to that effect, but she didn’t bring them.

Ms. Guilloud said she is the one paying taxes on this car port, in reply to Chairman Hill. He asked how much of the dialogue is between her and Mr. Guilloud and the other owners, as opposed to the lawyers. Communication on the matter has “become just (between) attorneys now,” she replied.

Mr. Wood asked if “AC” stands for air conditioning, and if there is a well house next to the car port. Chairman Hill said that is not what “AC” designates. **Mark Guilloud** said the well house is mismarked on the survey. It is not a well house; it’s a small tin shed with rotten wood in it that belongs to “the neighbors now.”

Mr. Guilloud said he and his wife “don’t really care what the setback is,” but the 708 Greene Street owners do. The Guillouds are not asking the Zoning Board of Appeals to give them anything more than what the other owners want. They “could tear the roof off” of the car port “and bring it back 10’.” If they went to court and they won, Mr. Guilloud said, it would “go back to being an easement.” The Greene Street owners know that they do not own the car port. The Guillouds thought that they had bought a property with a car port when they bought the Washington Street property. The other owners took the pine trees out, which had once blocked their access to it.

Mr. Guilloud reiterated that they are trying to settle a lawsuit with the Greene Street property owners. The Guillouds are willing to put up a firewall, but if this variance isn’t granted, the hardship will be another one to two years of court proceedings in order to settle this in one party’s favor, which is why they’re asking for the variance.

Mr. Wood said that the Guillouds would pay for the car port, “and the easement would disappear.” Mr. Guilloud explained which part of the property belongs to the owners of 708 Greene Street. Chairman Hill said they would both need a firewall if the other property owners build a car port in the space to the left of the Guillouds’ car port. Mr. Guilloud said if they get the variance, with the requirement to do the firewall, they

#

#

would be willing to make it fire-rated. The 708 Greene Street owners “will not give anything more” than 2’, according to a letter from them. Mr. Guilloud said it is costing “a lot” per square foot, but they feel this car port is important to the house he purchased. The former owners had nice cars, and they wanted to park them there to keep off the debris from a huge live oak.

Mr. Starkey asked, if they did this, if it was possible to get permission from the Greene Street owners to have access to the land to maintain the outside wall. Mr. Guilloud said they had asked if they could come on the other owners’ property twice a year to do maintenance: paint the walls, blow leaves, etc., but the other owners had refused permission. Alan Patterson has told him, though, that it’s possible to maintain the roof while standing on it, and most car ports don’t need maintenance other than that. The other owners will be seeing the side that they won’t allow the Guillouds to maintain.

There was no public comment. Mr. Powell asked if Historic Beaufort Foundation had to look at the firewall. Ms. Anderson said **Maxine Lutz**, the executive director of Historic Beaufort Foundation, was present and could speak to that, but there would need to be a design review by the Historic District Review Board or, more probably, by staff.

Ms. Anderson said, “If the walls were one-hour fire rated, the underside of the roof projections would need to be as well.” Mr. Guilloud indicated for the board where there is a brick wall, and where the easement runs: its 25’ and runs from a corner out to Scott Street. Mr. Wood asked if there had ever been an offer by the owners of 708 Greene Street to buy the easement. Mr. Guilloud said those owners hadn’t occupied the car port until the Guillouds “started the purchase process.” He described the configuration of the latticework under the Pollacks, the former owners of his house. The Guillouds had closed the area that had been open between 705 Washington Street and 708 Greene Street and moved the latticework, which is what started the lawsuit.

Mr. Guilloud said it’s been very complicated, and they want to end this litigation by doing something, so as not be “in court indefinitely.” He said he’s aware this is a variance from the rules; he is trying to appeal to common sense in the situation. He supports the fire-rated wall because the owners of 708 Greene Street could build a car port next to this one, and a fire could jump from one structure to the other.

Chairman Hill said, technically, they would have to be 2’ out from the drip line to have a fire wall. He feels if they grant this variance, and the structure is at the property line, neighbors could see this as precedent. Mr. Wood said that’s been a concern of his, too. He added that he would have presumed the car port was on his property if he were the 708 Greene Street owner.

Mr. Guilloud said there are other plats that clearly mark the easement, which Chairman Hill and Mr. Wood said wasn’t shown on the one displayed on the overhead. Mr. Wood said he doesn’t understand why the easement wasn’t resolved in the sale of the

#

#

property. He said he knows that's not the board's job, but it might apply "as an accommodation that sets precedent." If the owner of 708 Greene Street wants to build a car port next door, they will be subject to setbacks, so they can't utilize that corner of their property as the Guillouds have.

Ms. Anderson said if the wall of the car port is fire-rated, it could be less than 5' from the property line. It could be 2' if the walls and underside of the eaves are fire-rated. Mr. Wood said unobtrusively fire-rating the walls would not be difficult for the Guillouds to do. Ms. Anderson said if that were done, that would be acceptable under the building code, but the board would need to grant "the variance that would allow the waiver from the zoning." If they have the fire-rating, it addresses the building code. Ms. Anderson said if the underside of the projections is fire-rated, then the minimum wall separation would be between 2' and 5'.

Mr. Starkey said there are no buildings near this one at the present time. The house is 28' from the end of the car port, and it's been that way since 1996. Mr. Powell asked if there has been any correspondence from the Greene Street owners, and Ms. Anderson said no. She has had contact with their lawyer, but just about when meetings are taking place; there's been no comment from them.

Chairman Hill said on the plat, 2' of projections are right on the property line. They are measuring from the walls, Ms. Anderson said. This is the zoning with which the board needs to be concerned. The building code provisions she had brought up would apply if they were to build this structure today, but the building is an existing structure. The neighbors would have to meet this code if they were to build, Chairman Hill said, and Ms. Anderson said that was correct.

Ms. Anderson said the Greene Street property owners' attorney is present if the board has questions. **Demetri Koutrakos** said the deal has been accurately depicted to the ZBOA. Chairman Hill asked if Mr. Koutrakos' client had "any wiggle room." Mr. Koutrakos said, when his clients bought the property, they thought they were getting a car port. They are very reluctant to settle, but they will, to end the litigation. "Even going a couple of feet into their backyard" would not be acceptable to them, he said. They had come up with the drip line idea as a compromise. It is along the edge of the roof, and they think this is a solution. His clients are out of town, and they have different legal arguments than the Guillouds do, but Mr. Koutrakos said he knows the board isn't interested in those. This is the potential settlement that has been reached.

Mr. Powell made a motion to approve the variance as written, with the stipulation that the existing structure will be modified to comply with the requirements of the fire code. Mr. Wood seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

#

#

2611 Southside Boulevard, Identified as District R120, Map 8, Parcel 419

Special Exception

Applicant: Clay M. Dalon (ZB15-29)

The applicants are requesting a special exception in order to operate a home occupation with one outside employee.

Ms. Anderson said this is an application for a special exception. The property is in Mossy Oaks, and it is a single-family dwelling. There is an accessory structure in the back, as well as a garage. Photos of the property were provided.

Ms. Anderson said **Clay Dalon**, the applicant, is a professional engineer who would like to open a home office. The staff approves these, unless it's a "Type 2" home occupation, which permits up to two employees from outside the dwelling to work in the home office, and requires a special exception. Mr. Dalon wishes to employ an outside employee to work there.

Questions for the applicant, Ms. Anderson said, should include: Will the home office be located in the accessory structure? Are any changes to the site proposed? Are any changes to the interior or exterior proposed? Public notice was made, and two comments were received.

Ms. Anderson presented staff's opinions on the criteria that the board must use to determine if this application receives a special exception:

1. **Proposed use is compatible with existing uses in the surrounding area:** This is a collector street, Ms. Anderson said, and a sidewalk is on this side of the road. The property is across from Southside Park. There is a daycare center nearby, and Spanish Trace Apartments. A large parking area serves the property.
2. **Proposed changes are harmonious with the character of area:** There are probably not proposed changes, but the lot is over half an acre, which is well over the minimum zoning requirement. There appears to be adequate parking onsite for the accessory unit and the residence, Ms. Anderson said.
3. **Impact on public infrastructure:** Impact on infrastructure, staff feels, is negligible.
4. **Compatible with Comprehensive Plan and the Civic Master Plan:** The use is compatible with the plans, Ms. Anderson said.
5. **Impact on public health and safety:** Impact on public health and safety will be negligible with a few conditions to be found in staff's recommendation.
6. **Potential creation of nuisances:** There is little potential for nuisances because it's an engineering firm, she said.

Staff recommends approval, Ms. Anderson said, with the following conditions: only one outside employee; no outside work, fabrication or storage or equipment related to the home office; any vehicles associated with the residence or home office are to park in the driveway, not in the street or the front yard.

#

#

Mr. Starkey asked if there are any codes that apply to home businesses. Ms. Anderson said they have to have a business license, but no inspections are required, even with a Type 2 home occupation.

Mr. Dolan said he is a mechanical engineer and decided to start his own firm. It's gone well, he's busy, and he's asking for the special exception because he needs to hire help. All of his work is done on a computer. As far as producing noise from his business, he only uses the computer and a phone. Mr. Dolan said he has been working on some home improvement projects on the weekends, which is probably what a comment about noise in relation to the application was referring to.

Mr. Powell made a motion to approve the application, with the provisions of only one outside employee, no outdoor work or outdoor storage related to the business, and parking in the driveway, not in the street; Mr. Starkey seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

2304 Wilson Drive, Identified as District R120, Map 2, Parcel 8

Special Exception

Applicant: Michael A. McFee (ZB15-30)

The applicants are requesting a special exception in order to operate a short-term rental.

This property is on the Beaufort River, Ms. Anderson said, and is near the intersection of Wilson and Pigeon Point Drives. It is a single-family dwelling. The applicant desires to manage the dwelling as a short-term rental. The applicant lives immediately adjacent to this property. The rental agreement limits the number of guests to eight and the number of vehicles to four, which can be done if they're "stacked." There's a minimum two-night stay, Ms. Anderson said.

Staff wants to know who will manage the unit when the applicant is out of town, Ms. Anderson said. As with the previous short-term rental application, the same public notice was made; several public comments have been received about this application and about short-term rentals on Wilson Drive.

Ms. Anderson presented staff's opinions on the criteria that the board must use to determine if this application receives a special exception:

1. **Proposed use is compatible with existing uses in the surrounding area:** The property is in the Pigeon Point neighborhood on the Beaufort River and is within an easy bike ride of the downtown core, and within walking distance of the Pigeon Point boat ramp and Pigeon Point Park.
2. **Proposed changes are harmonious with the character of area:** No changes are proposed to the property.
3. **Impact on public infrastructure:** Staff feels the proposed use is not likely to have any greater impact than a long-term rental would have, Ms. Anderson said.

#

#

4. **Compatible with Comprehensive Plan and the Civic Master Plan:** It is in conformity with the Civic Master Plan and the Comp Plan, staff feels.
5. **Impact on public health and safety:** Staff feels there will be little impact, Ms. Anderson said, since the property manager lives immediately adjacent to the property and can provide continuous onsite management.
6. **Potential creation of nuisances:** There is little potential to create nuisances, provided a monitored fire alarm is installed.

Mr. McFee said he is the adjacent property owner and “the godchild of (the owners of) this house.” The intention is for the extended family to use this house sometimes, too, and making this a short-term rental will allow the family to retain this property, which has been in the family since 1955. Because he lives next door, Mr. McFee said he is “constantly on tap to watch this house,” and if he is out of town, he has eleven professional realtors on staff who can look out for the short-term rental. In regard to an e-mail that had been received that commented about multiple properties renting for \$80 a night, Mr. McFee said, “We have a very set standard for what we intend to use this property for.” The house has many family heirlooms and furnishings in it, so they will “be pretty particular about who will be in there,” and they will not be renting it for \$80 a night. Also, Mr. McFee added, the minimum stay will now be three nights, not two; he and the owners have changed their minds about that since they submitted the application.

Martin Pinckney said he and his sister would soon own this house, which is in probate. He grew up in it, and said his mother wanted it to remain in the family. Making it a short-term rental will be “a vehicle” for that, as the income will allow them to maintain it as a family gathering place, as it has been for decades. They would like to establish an owners’ suite, too, so they can stay there, even when it’s rented. If they rented it long-term, they would not be able to stay there, Mr. Pinckney said.

Mr. Calvert said since this property faces the river, there would be less noise for the neighbors. In Pigeon Point, there are houses that range in value from \$40,000 to several million dollars, and there is also an abandoned home. The neighborhood is “in transition,” and Mr. Calvert thinks this is a great use for properties there; it allows closer scrutiny of such properties than is possible with long-term rentals.

Mr. Starkey asked Mr. Calvert if there was a Pigeon Point homeowners’ association. Mr. McFee replied that there’s a neighborhood watch group that is “very organized.” Mr. Starkey said it would help in these applications to have a “nod” from a member of such a group that represents the neighborhood.

Chairman Hill said there was only one public comment against the application, and the majority were in favor; Ms. McGraw’s comment was neither for nor against, but she questioned at what point there was short-term rental “saturation.” Chairman Hill knows council will be taking this matter up soon to determine how many short-term rentals are

#

#

too many. **Mr. Noll made a motion to approve the special exception request with installation of a monitored fire alarm. Mr. Wood seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

Ms. Anderson said city council will consider the short-term rentals at a work session, probably on December 8, and she will keep the board apprised of the date when it is certain, should they like to attend.

Also, the technical review committee for the form-based code had had its kick-off meeting that day, Ms. Anderson said. The chairs of the boards are the representatives, but because of time issues for Chairman Hill, for the Zoning Board of Appeals, Mr. Starkey is the representative. **Lauren Kelly** is the project manager, Ms. Anderson said, and she has devised “a tight schedule” for the process, which she will keep everyone to. Ms. Anderson and Mr. Starkey will keep the board apprised of what the committee does.

The December Zoning Board of Appeals meeting has been moved to December 23.

Mr. Starkey said he had been reading a 278-page document from the National Association of Realtors, “Residential Rentals,” which someone who had commented on short-term rentals had sent. He said it goes into all the questions the Zoning Board of Appeals has had regarding short-term rentals, and he would like Ms. Anderson to forward it to each of the city council members and to city staff. If someone could draft a one-page summary of it, that would be good, he said. It covers all of the issues the board has had presented to it, and he thinks it would be good for council to read before council makes a decision on short-term rentals.

There being no further business to come before the board, the meeting was adjourned at 7:11 p.m.

#