

#

A meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals was held on **July 25, 2016 at 5:30 p.m.** in the City Hall council chambers, 1911 Boundary Street. In attendance were Vice Chairman Joe Noll, board members Tim Wood, Jody Caron, Nigel Stroud, and Libby Anderson, planning director. Chairman Josh Gibson was absent.

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

Vice Chairman Noll 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, the criteria for obtaining a variance, and the procedure for a ZBOA meeting.

MINUTES

Mr. Stroud made a motion, second by Mr. Caron, to approve the minutes of the June 27, 2016 meeting as submitted. The motion passed unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

707 Church Street, Identified as District R120, Map 4, Parcel 495, Variance

Applicant: Saltline construction for Labi Kryeziu (ZB16-13)

The applicant is requesting to subdivide property into two lots that are smaller square footage than is allowed, and for a new, single-family house.

This property is in the Northwest Quadrant and is zoned General Residential, Ms. Anderson said. This lot exceeds the minimum lot size for the district. A single-family dwelling is located on the property. The property's address is Church Street, she said, but it faces Duke Street. It's in the Historic District, but it's not listed on the county's Historic Sites Survey.

The owners would like to subdivide the property into two lots; each parcel would be 2480 square feet, which is 38% less than the minimum lot size requirement for this district. Two variances would be required, Ms. Anderson said.

Questions for the applicant, Ms. Anderson said, include how parking will be handled for the new lot. On-site parking is not required because the house faces Duke Street, which has formalized on-street parking. If the applicant wants on-site parking, though, how will that be accommodated? Ms. Anderson said the applicant would need an encroachment permit from SCDOT in order to create or modify a driveway. If a shared driveway with the 707 Church Street lot is required, an access easement should be shown on the plat. The question of parking for the Duke Street plat should be addressed before final approval is given, Ms. Anderson said.

#

#

Staff comments

The existing dwelling on the lot has some elements that are in poor repair (e.g., some siding is missing, it needs to be painted, etc.). Though it has a Church Street address, the front door and front porch face Duke Street, Ms. Anderson said, which is an issue, and if the variances are approved, the front of the existing house would face the rear of the new Duke Street house, which is not appropriate siting. If the existing dwelling were renovated to remove the porch and reestablish the front entrance on Church Street, both lots could have appropriate siting, she said.

The applicant's conceptual plan for the proposed Duke Street lot was presented to the Historic District Review Board (HDRB), Ms. Anderson said. The HDRB granted conceptual approval for a new house on the proposed lot; the Board also informally discussed the improvements desired for the existing structure.

A satellite dish on the front of the property on Duke Street needs to be moved out of the front/street yard, unless it can't be located anywhere else, Ms. Anderson said. There needs to be an enclosure to screen the roll carts. Also, the plat should be revised to label the subdivided lot into lots A and B or lots 1 and 2.

Public notice was made in May; one public comment was received, Ms. Anderson said, and it was included with the application in the Board's packets.

Ms. Anderson enumerated the six findings the Board needs to make to approve this application for a variance:

1. **Extraordinary and exceptional conditions:** Ms. Anderson said this finding could be made because the property has a 2500 square foot side yard located on Duke Street, and it's vacant. Most corner lots have a house anchoring the corner and accessory structures in the back.
2. **Conditions as applied to other properties in the vicinity:** Most developed lots in the neighborhood have the primary building on the corner, Ms. Anderson said, so this finding could be made.
3. **Conditions are not the result of the applicant's own actions:** The applicant did not build the existing structure on the lot, she said.
4. **Granting the variance would not conflict with Comprehensive Plan:** The Civic Master Plan and the Comprehensive Plan encourage compatible infill development, and staff feels this subdivision – which would create a new lot with a structure on it – would be compatible with the character of the surrounding neighborhood, Ms. Anderson said.
5. **Unreasonable restriction on utilization of the property:** Staff feels that the siting on the lot is not typical or appropriate for the neighborhood, and construction of a house on the corner of Church and Duke Streets would improve the neighborhood's urban design character. As outlined in the HDRB staff report, Ms. Anderson said, there are at least four other lots in the neighborhood that are similar in size to these proposed lots, so staff feels it

#

#

might be unreasonable to prevent the subdivision and the construction of a building on the corner of Duke and Church Streets.

6. **Not a detriment to adjacent property and the public good:** An appropriately sized and sited single-family dwelling could be built on this lot, Ms. Anderson said, and the HDRB has approved that. The proposed lot has advantages over the other, similarly sized lots in the neighborhood, she said, in that no on-site parking is required, so the whole lot can be used for the buildings and yards.

Staff recommends approval with the following conditions, Ms. Anderson said: Before final approval of the subdivision plan is granted, the existing structure should be renovated to remove the north-facing porch and establish a new entrance on its Church Street side; the satellite dish should be removed and an enclosure for the roll carts constructed as part of this renovation. Staff would not recommend approval with the current, Duke Street-facing entrance and porch, she said.

Mr. Stroud asked about the need for a variance for a stoop encroachment into the interior side setback, which would be required in the Northwest Quadrant. Ms. Anderson said it is not scaled on the plat, but it looks like it meets the 6' requirement. Staff's recommendation is not to give final approval to the plat until the front porch and door are redesigned.

Vice Chairman Noll asked if Historic Beaufort Foundation (HBF) "cares about" the front of one building "facing the back of the (other) building," or if that was "just staff's concern." Ms. Anderson said the HDRB had looked at the conceptual plan; HBF is not concerned with these matters. The HDRB endorsed the front door change. The application for design review was just for the new house, she said, but she doesn't believe that the HDRB had looked at the floor plan of the existing house.

Tom Michaels, the architect for the project, said the intent for the existing house was to renovate it and relocate the front door to the Church Street side, but they have not done much renovation yet because he and his client first wanted to see if they obtained the variance. They will bring plans for *both* houses to the HDRB next time they go before it, he said.

Mr. Stroud asked about how Mr. Michaels planned to "resolve the parking situation." Mr. Michaels said the existing house would have shared access. He had discussed with the HDRB the possibility of "siting the house a little bit forward," to allow for parking in the back, but the discussions about this are "ongoing." Mr. Stroud asked if each house would then have a designated parking spot. Mr. Michaels said yes. Mr. Stroud said he presumed that Mr. Michaels and the applicant had looked at removing the existing house and had decided to keep it. Mr. Michaels said yes, but it would be better to renovate the existing structure than to take it out.

#

#

Jay Weidner said he lives about 6 blocks from this site. He thinks “the city’s drive for infill on empty lots” in the Northwest Quadrant is “a good and healthy development” that he “fully supports.” He feels it’s “an oversight to present a plat that does not show the tree coverage.” There is an enormous live oak on the northwest side of the existing house that would prevent the on-site parking that’s proposed from being “functional.” Mr. Weidner would not like to see the same thing happen to that tree that has happened to other trees on Craven Street. There are other trees on this site, too, which he described, and he recommended that the board members look at the lot and its trees, which would have to “come down to accommodate any new construction.” The “space for parking for the existing house is 6’ wide, between the bottom of the live oak and the new property line,” Mr. Weidner said, which can be easily seen when visiting the site.

Mr. Weidner said when the survey was made 20 years ago, houses in the Northwest Quadrant were in such poor condition that they were not considered contributing or worth saving. However, this house is definitely “the same house that was on the 1912 Sanborn Insurance Maps,” he said. It’s had an addition on the back, and the front porch has been changed, though there was a porch in that location at one time, he said. The piers offer evidence of the house’s age, and the frame is very old with old nails in it. If the tin siding were removed, clapboard put back on it, and 6/6 windows restored, it would appear as it did “when it was built,” Mr. Weidner said; it would be “a historic, contributing house” to this neighborhood, so he thinks “it should be considered that way.”

Mr. Weidner said in Beaufort, there are “plenty of examples” of the front door facing the back of another house, and Charleston is full of them in its historic neighborhoods. There is no room for a front porch on the Church Street side; “the wing projects 5’ from the house, and it’s right at the setback line,” he said. The house “would lose (its) historic character,” he feels, and neither house on the subdivided lot would have an outdoor living space. The front yard is very little and is appropriate, Mr. Weidner said. It’s 5’ lower than the house. It was historically appropriate to build a house on the lot’s highest part, he said. He feels it’s an interesting feature of Beaufort’s historic neighborhoods when all the houses on a street are not “lined up the same,” and lot sizes vary, which is seen in the “more prestigious historic areas.”

Mr. Weidner also feels it’s inappropriate to say that there are other lots in this neighborhood that are as “tiny as what’s proposed”; there are very few, and those might have been “mistakes that were made in the past,” he said. In his opinion, these lots are “entirely too small to have a nice place to live on,” and it’s also “a significant loss of green space.” On Duke Street, the houses are lined up and close to the street, he said, but “when you come up to Church Street, it’s very interesting that there’s a green opening there, on both sides of the street.”

#

#

Mr. Weidner feels “the tree loss would be a shame.” He doesn’t see how there could be parking for the existing house, “other than to put the car out in the street,” because “the right-of-way along Church Street is very narrow,” and while it could be graveled, “there’s very little space there.”

Mr. Weidner said he doesn’t feel the present lot arrangement “presents any hardship to anybody.” To reduce the lot from 4,000 square feet to 2,480 square feet – 38% less – misses “the zoning there for the lots by a lot,” he said. On the 1912 Sanborn Map, “all the lots in the neighborhood were the size that this one is presently platted.”

Andy Roberts said he lives 1½ blocks to the west of this lot. The owner of 707 Church Street has cleaned up a lot of vegetation around the lot. Mr. Roberts is looking forward to improvements to the existing house, but he agrees with Mr. Weidner’s comments, especially about the trees. Mr. Roberts is concerned that parking might be less available for everyone in the area if the lot becomes two lots, with two houses there. Even though there is parking on Duke Street, it’s not always available because of use for “the housing across the street” and the police substation. Mr. Roberts is also concerned about the lack of open space and the percentage of pervious versus impervious surface that would result from trying to build “a practical house within such a small space.”

Also, the existing house is currently unoccupied, Mr. Roberts said, and it has been “for several months.” He said he looks forward to the existing house’s restoration and its “adding to the character of the neighborhood.”

Mr. Michaels said his client has talked to **Liza Hill**, the city’s arborist, about the trees on the lot, and she “had no problem” with removing any of them. The lot is above the flood zone, he said, and they could build a slab on grade house there and not raise it up. Vice Chairman Noll asked if there has been any finding that the live oak there is not salvageable. Mr. Michaels said he doesn’t know if there has been or not. He stated again that his client has spoken to Ms. Hill.

If the city arborist would not give them permission to remove the live oak, Mr. Stroud asked, how would the applicant solve the siting problem and the parking issue? Mr. Michaels said he could solve it; “that’s my job.” His clients have discussed other siting, so he thinks the siting and parking issues could be solved.

Moon Longo said he lives a ½-block from this lot. He lives on a ½-lot, and the lack of outdoor space is definitely a reason he would leave downtown; “you can only walk around the house, and that’s it,” he said. Looking at the trash cans, they have to consider that they are bigger now, and there’s nowhere to put them. These will be “practical . . . issues” that “everyone’s overlooking now,” Mr. Longo said. “This just seems semi-unrealistic.” The infill in this area is slowly happening, and they will end up with parking issues eventually, he said. The public housing might be removed, and “if it’s

#

#

all rebuilt for people with two cars per house,” then there will be problems, Mr. Longo said.

Maxine Lutz said she lives in the Historic District. While HBF supports infill, the organization’s position is that dividing the lot to make two small lots would not be the best use of the property. However, HBF agreed with Mr. Michaels’ presentation of his position to the ZBOA, and if the Board approves Mr. Michaels’s variance request, she said the organization hopes when Mr. Michaels goes back before the HDRB, he’ll take into consideration issues like the lack of parking and preservation of specimen trees.

Ms. Lutz said, as a private citizen, she is “shocked” that the city would allow a live oak to be taken down, and she wants more information about that before it is approved. The other trees on the site aren’t protected, but she would like them not to be cut down, either. She also agrees with Mr. Weidner that the house’s orientation shouldn’t be changed to have the entrance on Church Street. “It is a historic house,” Ms. Lutz said, built in 1912, with “the same footprint” as it has now, so she doesn’t feel like it should be changed to make it “friendlier to the street.”

Ms. Lutz said the lot, as history shows, was low, and that’s likely to be the reason why “the house was built at the back” of it. It “could be a charming, restored house with a lovely landscape in front,” she said, and while the ZBOA is not to consider economics in its decision-making, the owner could “recover his investment” in it “if he chose to sell it as a restored historic cottage with appropriate landscaping.”

Julie Rhodes said she wanted to advocate for the residents of the public housing across the street from this lot. If this property is built on, in addition to the existing house, heavy rains will “create a huge problem” for the public housing residents, she said, who already have issues with flooding.

Ms. Rhodes asked if “it matter(s) where the public parking is, with respect to the lots,” because to get an on-street parking spot for *this* lot, she said, “you actually have to move to the *next* lot.” The homeowners would not be able to park on the street in front of their door. Also, if this lot split is allowed, other currently vacant lots could be split, too, and each could have two cars, which Ms. Rhodes is concerned will “snowball in the wrong direction.”

Mr. Weidner said “the very attractive plants . . . that were presented” as planned for the new cottage “are for a three-bedroom house,” which typically means children would live there, but if they did, they would have no outdoor space to play in.

Mr. Stroud said there are other lots of similar size in the area. He “can’t imagine the city would give permission” to cut the live oak down, so “the architect may have to re-site the house,” but “that’s going to happen outside of our . . . purview.” They will have to do a stormwater drainage plan in order to get their building permit, Mr. Stroud said, so

#

#

he's not concerned about that, either, only about whether this request meets the variance criteria.

Mr. Caron said the lot being 38% smaller than the minimum lot requirement is a concern for him. In regard to the porch relocation to Church Street, there is not space for a porch, only a stoop. He also has an issue with "even the thought of cutting down that (live oak) tree." Because of the way the tree lies, he said, "it . . . reaches over to where that new house would be built." He is also concerned about parking.

Vice Chairman Noll said the tree issue will be resolved one way or another. There "are run-off objections," but other than that, he doesn't have an objection to splitting the property.

Mr. Wood said many objections have been raised about the appearance of the existing structure. He wishes the homeowners could renovate/restore that house, and then those issues would be addressed: the front door could face Church Street, the porch size could be reduced, and parking could be addressed, "because that house has to have parking. It doesn't have the street parking." If this were his house, Mr. Wood said, he would have restored it, *then* would have addressed the issues that would require subdividing the lot. If they do the subdividing now, he said, they "make a lot of hassle for the client down the road," and it makes it hard for the Board to make a decision, because they don't have answers to a lot of their questions.

The matter of the live oak isn't known, either, at this time, Mr. Wood said. If they had an arborist's report after the house had been restored, that would also help the Board decide. He suggested that if the applicant could restore the existing house first, then they could "show how the lot could be free and clear of all these controversies."

Mr. Stroud said economics probably drives this, and that's why the applicant has done things this way. The Board has to have faith that the city will do due diligence, he said. Mr. Wood said that the Board would to make exceptions to approve the front porch/door.

Ms. Anderson said if the board wanted to table this application and get more information, they could ask the applicant to get conceptual approval for the house's restoration from the HDRB, and, for example, ask the applicant to then come back to the ZBOA and show the subdivision of the lot with the tree survey. The Board could also request a certified arborist's report, say the applicant could not have a driveway at the new house but only one that would serve the existing house, etc. Ms. Anderson said the Board could request that the applicant come back in August or September with whatever information they felt they needed.

Mr. Michaels said his client "would go with that," but they are concerned about getting the variance to subdivide the lot. Those issues need to be addressed before the

#

#

applicant can go forward. The ZBOA wants it clarified, he said, though the applicant will be going to the HDRB again.

Mr. Wood asked Mr. Michaels if the restoration wouldn't happen if the subdividing doesn't happen. Mr. Michaels said it would not happen "unless we get the subdivision." Mr. Stroud said the Board is looking for more information. The ZBOA members would like to see what the houses will look like, and see how the applicants will solve the tree and parking issues, so they can make their decision on the variance.

Mr. Michaels said he's concerned that another board handles such design issues, as does staff, so the applicant will have to address these issues with those two entities.

Mr. Wood stressed again that, if the property were his, he would "restore the (existing) house with the idea of subdividing" the lot. **Mr. Stroud made a motion to table this application for 90 days, so the applicant could get the information that has been requested (e.g., what the existing house would look like). Mr. Caron seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.** Mr. Michaels said what the house looks like is not within the purview of this Board for the granting of a variance; "it's the jurisdiction of the HDRB and the city."

REVIEW OF PROJECTS

2008 North Street, Identified as District R120, Map 3, Parcel 249, Variance

Applicant: Joel Newman, Thomas and Denzinger Architects (ZB16-18)

The applicant is requesting a variance in order to construct a garage.

Ms. Anderson said this property is at the corner of North and Glebe Streets in the Dixon Village neighborhood. The minimum lot area in this R-2 District is 9,000 square feet, and this lot is over 11,000 square feet. It's undergone a nice restoration, Ms. Anderson said. A single-family dwelling is on the property. The applicant is proposing renovations and additions to that structure, she said, including a two-car garage facing Glebe Street. The ordinance specifies that when garage doors face the street, the garage must be set back a minimum of 20' from the street side property line, and in this case, the garage is proposed to be 10.8' from the Glebe Street property line, so the applicant is requesting a 9.2' (46%) variance to permit the garage to be sited as proposed.

Ms. Anderson showed the existing house and the additions to the two-car garage. The dimensions will be a little over 10' from the Glebe Street property line. Most standards vehicles are 14' to 17' long, so when they are parked outside the garage, if it is sited as proposed, 3' to 6' of the vehicle would be in the street right-of-way.

In the street-regulating plan of the draft Beaufort Code, Ms. Anderson said, Glebe Street is designated a "low-impact development road." These roads have on-street parking and a sidewalk on one side of the street. While there are no plans for the city to improve

#

#

Glebe Street, is it acceptable to create a condition where vehicles parked in driveways are encroaching in the street right-of-way? Ms. Anderson asked.

Other questions:

- Could the garage be moved back on the site to avoid or minimize the variance?
- Could the garage be shallower than the proposed 26' deep?
- Does the applicant plan for the upstairs space in the garage to be habitable?

Public notice was made, Ms. Anderson said, and one public comment was received about the application; it was included in the packet.

Ms. Anderson enumerated the six findings the Board needs to make to approve this application for a variance:

1. **Extraordinary and exceptional conditions:** Ms. Anderson said the lot is bigger than is required, but that is not to the advantage of the applicant in the granting of this variance.
2. **Conditions as applied to other properties in the vicinity:** The Board must find that this situation is unique, Ms. Anderson said.
3. **Conditions are not the result of the applicant's own actions:** Ms. Anderson did not address this criteria from staff's perspective.
4. **Granting the variance would not conflict with Comprehensive Plan:** This finding could be made, staff feels.
5. **Unreasonable restriction on utilization of the property:** Ms. Anderson did not address this criteria from staff's perspective.
6. **Not a detriment to adjacent property and the public good:** Ms. Anderson did not address this criteria from staff's perspective.

If these six findings can be made, Ms. Anderson said staff recommends that a condition of approval should be that vehicles are not to park outside the garage. Though she acknowledged that this could be difficult to enforce, a memorandum of understanding with the applicant might suffice, as this is the only problem with the application, she said (i.e., there's not a problem with the garage's siting if the cars are parked inside it and are not sticking out in the right-of-way).

Ms. Anderson said this provision is so specific because it was enacted for a reason three or four years ago: There was a situation further east on North Street where there was "a very narrow right-of-way," and parking vehicles outside that garage presented "a safety hazard."

Joel Newman, architect, said **Jim and Lori Kesten** are the owners of this house, which has been restored and is their full-time residence. Mr. Newman said he had done a site evaluation and a master plan. He showed a current site plan. There's a building in the backyard that they want to remove; it's not even a story high, he said. When the Kestens originally looked at the property, a two-story building was part of the original

#

#

parcel, "until they went to buy it," he said, when someone else bought the other structure.

The woman who objected to the variance for these applicants has a garage that is causing her to do the very thing that is of concern to the city in this application, Mr. Newman said.

The Kestens are "rethinking the character of the house," Mr. Newman said. They had been parking on North Street; the project started with Mr. Newman when they wanted to build the garage. Mr. Newman had looked at the original alignment of the property and at the patterns all over the neighborhood to see where others' garages are. Most were very close to the street, or are close enough for only a parking pad to be put in, he said. This property has room for a 20' pad.

There is no sidewalk on North or Glebe Streets, Mr. Newman said. There weren't garages on North Street in the original master planning. Putting in a driveway seems like it would spoil the neighborhood, he said, and have more impact on it. Since garages are already facing Glebe Street, it seemed logical for the garage to come in from Glebe Street. The house has a front porch on North Street, but the street is very busy, Mr. Newman said, so they "would like to develop a lovely backyard and garden." The applicants would keep the front rooms as they are, add on a back porch, and open up the inside in back. That was a reason to set up the garage this way, he said: to fit it into the rest of the plan and open up a backyard garden space.

The garage has no living space in it, Mr. Newman said; the Kestens would like to tear out that little structure in the back, and while renovations are done/a master bedroom wing is built, they would move their things out of the house and into the garage. When they put the garage on the setback line, it was better than the other examples in the neighborhood, some of which he showed. A car outside this garage would not obstruct a city sidewalk, Mr. Newman said, and it is not on a public thoroughfare.

Mr. Newman said the neighbor who objected to this proposal doesn't live there, and he described why her objection is not valid. This work would take away 30% of his client's back porch and add more outdoor living space. If a car were parked there, "it would not block someone's ability to come down the street," he said, and if it's built as he is proposing, "the front of the garage is the same alignment as the neighboring building" on the corner.

Mr. Newman said he tried to use good design principles and to move the Kestens away from their original idea of a garage on North Street, especially since there is no sidewalk on their garage's side. He felt the idea of a curb cut and a garage that was "a bigger structure than the master bedroom wing" would have been "an imposition on the community."

#

#

Mr. Stroud asked Ms. Anderson if there were plans for a sidewalk on Glebe Street, and Ms. Anderson said no; it's a "low-volume street," and this would be "way down there" on the list for streets to get sidewalks. If the Board were to approve the variance, Mr. Caron asked, would Mr. Newman's client object to parking inside the garage? Mr. Caron said the Kestens could park on the grass of their lawn, so to have a rule that they couldn't park at the entry to the garage "seems patently ridiculous." Ms. Anderson said that in the original case she'd mentioned, a car parked in front of the garage door would have been "in the travel lane."

Mr. Stroud said he thinks this is "a good solution to a problem," and he feels all the criteria have been met. This is a better solution to protecting the public good than parking in the yard.

Mr. Caron asked how the Board should deal with "this new setback ordinance." If the homeowners park inside the garage, the prohibition against parking outside the garage doesn't apply to their guests. This doesn't say the homeowners' cars have to be inside their garage "all the time." He asked Ms. Anderson if it's OK if a car sits outside for awhile (e.g., after returning from the grocery store). She replied that the ZBOA could make it a condition that it could sit outside, but it could not be parked outside overnight. If the homeowners' "intent is to generally park it inside," she said, that "seems reasonable."

Mr. Caron asked Vice Chairman Noll, if the house is being renovated, and a car *can't* be parked inside because it's full of stuff, would the Kestens' intention be to park outside of the garage overnight? Mr. Newman said yes. He said he chairs the HDRB, and on that Board, he always goes back to this: Where do you draw the line? He feels "every single problem is contextual." What matters is *where* this problem is, or where that problem is. What's around it? What is the impact of any particular project? Each particular set of circumstances changes things, Mr. Newman said. If the ZBOA grants this variance, it doesn't open the Board up to having to approve every case that looks like this one. The boards always make their determinations based on each specific case and its merits, he said. Mr. Newman and his clients had looked at other low-impact streets and decided this was a good solution for this location, he added.

Vice Chairman Noll said he had "paced off some of the bumpers of the neighboring cars that were parked outside their garages," and they were all in the right-of-way, but they had sidewalks, which this property doesn't. You can't tell that this is in the right-of-way, he said, though it will be if the applicant is parked outside the garage door. He added that he appreciated the explanation of how Mr. Newman had looked at the different possibilities.

Mr. Wood said he agreed, too, and he thinks it's a great solution. He doesn't feel they have to make stipulations that are difficult to enforce, though he understands why the city requested that. He agrees that what the Board does is contextual, so he has no

#

#

problems with approving this variance. **Mr. Caron made a motion to grant the variance with no conditions. Mr. Wood seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

Ms. Anderson said there would be an August ZBOA meeting.

There being no further business to come before the board, the meeting was adjourned at 7:07 p.m.

#