ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
BELMONT, NH
Meeting Minutes of May 28, 2025
Belmont Mill & Zoom

Members Present: Chairman Peter Harris; Vice Chairman John Froumy; Liz Stewart; Dana Silcock and Mark Mastenbrook
Alternates Present: Susan Bouthiette, Thomas Ceniglio
Staff Present: Karen Santoro, Town Planner and Susan Austin, Land Use Assistant.
Zoom: Ron Ouellette, Christine Johnson, Allison Lewis

6:00 Public Meeting
Chairman Harris opened the meeting at 6:00 pm and welcomed those in attendance and announced that as Chairman of the Belmont Zoning Board of Adjustment, this public body is authorized to meet using Zoom. He announced that any party experiencing any difficulty in accessing the meeting through Zoom at any point, should call 603-267-8300 x 101, and the meeting will be recessed until access can be restored for all parties.

Abutter's Hearings – Bonnie Moulton: Request for a variance of Article 5, Table 2 of the Zoning Ordinance (Dimensional Regulations) to place an 8'x10' porch closer (10.8') to the front setback than is allowed (50'). Property is located at 12 Leisure Lane, Tax Lot 121-090-000-000, in the Residential Multi Family Zone. ZBA Case # 07-25Z.

Bonnie Moulton was present to discuss her case. She stated that she is proposing to place a shed, front porch and a covered walkway on her lot. She stated that she needs a place to store items, but more urgently, she needs a covered walkway that will be safer for her to walk on with her cane, and possibly a wheelchair later on. The property currently does not have a front porch, so adding one would allow them to use their front entrance.

History:
11/2009 – DES Letter re: oil discharge
3/1996 – Building permit (bedroom addition)
9/1980 – Building permit (deck)
9/1980 – Building permit (garage addition)
3/1978 – Mobile home permit

Current Considerations:
- This application meets the criteria for granting a variance.
- Property is within the Aquifer Protection District.
- This proposal does not have a potential regional impact.

Development of Regional Impact
Chairman Harris stated that in order to provide timely notice, provide opportunities for input and consider the interests of other municipalities the Board shall act to determine if the development has a potential regional impact as defined by RSA 36:55. Impacts may include, but are not limited to: Relative size or number of dwelling units as compared with existing stock; Proximity to the borders of a neighboring community; Transportation networks; Anticipated emissions such as light, noise, smoke, odors, or particles; Proximity to aquifers or surface waters which transcend municipal boundaries; Shared facilities such as schools and solid waste disposal facilities.

MOTION: P. Harris moved that the proposal does not have a potential regional impact.
Second: M. Mastenbrook
Vote: 5/0

Departmental Responses:
Fire: ..... No concerns at this time.
Police: ..... No concerns.
Public Works/Water/Sewer: ..... No issues or concerns at this time.
Town Administrator: ..... No concerns.
Building/Code Enforcement Officer: ..... No concerns.
Conservation Commission ..... No concerns
Assessing: ..... No concerns.
Land Use Technician: ..... See staff comments:

Staff Comments:
Applicant is proposing to add an 8'x10' front porch closer to the front setback than allowed (10.8' where 50' is required).

M. Mastenbrook asked if the proposed covered walkway would be totally enclosed? B. Moulton stated that it won't be totally enclosed, just enough to keep out the elements. She is proposing to build it at the proposed size in order to have enough room to walk with a cane. In the future, she plans to convert it into an ADA compliant ramp.

MOTION: D. Silcock moved to grant a variance of Article 5, Table 2 of the Zoning Ordinance (Dimensional Regulations) to place an 8'x10' porch closer (10.8') to the front setback than is allowed (50'). Property is located at 12 Leisure Lane, Tax Lot 121-090-000-000, in the Residential Multi Family Zone. ZBA Case # 07-25Z, based on the following criteria:

1. The variance will not be contrary to the public interest because: The proposed does not conflict with the implicit or explicit purpose of the ordinance and doesn't alter the essential character of the neighborhood or threaten public health, safety or welfare, or otherwise injure public rights.

2. The spirit of the ordinance is observed because: The proposed does not conflict with the implicit or explicit purpose of the ordinance and doesn't alter the essential character of the neighborhood or threaten public health, safety or welfare, or otherwise injure public rights.

3. Substantial justice will be done because: Any loss to the individual that is not outweighed by a gain to the general public is an injustice. The injustice must be capable of relief by the granting of a variance that meets the other qualifications.

4. The variance would not diminish the value of surrounding properties because: The expert testimony on the question is not conclusive but cannot be ignored. The Board may also consider other evidence of the effects on property values, including personal knowledge of the members themselves.
5. Owing to special conditions of the property, that distinguish it from other properties in the area, denial of the variance would result in unnecessary hardship because of the following:

    a) no fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purpose of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property because:

    and

b) the proposed use is a reasonable one because: The applicant must establish that the property is burdened by zoning restrictions in a manner that is distinct from other similarly situated property.

Additional conditions:

A. All representations made by the applicant during the public hearing are incorporated as a condition of this approval.
B. The applicant and owner are solely responsible to comply with the approved plan and conditions of approval. Contractors should be sufficiently warned regarding same.
C. Approval expires on 5/28/27 if use is not substantially acted on and if an extension is not granted. Approval also expires if use ceases for more than two years.
D. The deck be ADA compliant.

Second. J. Froumy
Vote: All in favor, motion carried. (5-0)

Abutters' Hearing – Amy Goober Rev. Trust: Request for a Variance of Article 4 Table 1 of the Wetlands Ordinance (Principal Structure: Setback from Public Waters) to construct an addition closer (33.9') to the side setback than allowed (50'). Property is located at 18 Lakeside Drive, Tax Lot 112-005-000-000, in the Residential Single Zone. ZBA Case # 08-25Z.

Christopher Boldt, Esq. from DTC Lawyers was present to speak for the applicants. He stated that the applicant's property is approximately .45 acres in the Residential Single-Family zone. The existing house foundation is located 35' at it's closest point to the lake and the overhang at that spot is 33.9 from the lake. The applicant is proposing to add a two-story section to the existing house, with a portion of the second floor being roofed and overlooking the Lake. This property has already received the necessary shoreland permit from NH DES. The total addition will be 633 sq. feet.

D. Silcock asked if they would be altering the retaining wall. C. Boldt stated that the retaining wall on the lakefront received a separate wetlands permit. That wall is being redone in place.

J. Froumy asked for clarification that the alterations are either within the existing foot print or no closer to the lake setback than the existing. C. Boldt stated that he was correct.

P. Harris asked if this was located in the flood zone? C. Boldt stated that it's not in the flood zone. There is a fairly substantial wall, and the property is perched above the lake.

History
12/2010 – Mechanical permit (tank set)
3/2008 - Building permit (demo 2 sheds; add garage)
4/1990 – Wetland permit (denied); LOMA
4/1988 – Wetland permit (retaining wall)
6/1987 – Building permit (raise house; install foundation)
1/1983- Sewer permit application

Current Considerations:
Property is within the Aquifer Protection District.

Development of Regional Impact
Chairman Harris stated that in order to provide timely notice, provide opportunities for input and consider the interests of other municipalities the Board shall act to determine if the development has a potential regional impact as defined by RSA 36:55. Impacts may include, but are not limited to: Relative size or number of dwelling units as compared with existing stock; Proximity to the borders of a neighboring community; Transportation networks; Anticipated emissions such as light, noise, smoke, odors, or particles; Proximity to aquifers or surface waters which transcend municipal boundaries; Shared facilities such as schools and solid waste disposal facilities.

MOTION: P. Harris moved that the proposal does not have a potential regional impact.
Second: D. Silcock
Vote: All in favor, motion carried (5/0)

Chairman Harris opened the public comment. There was no public comment.

Departmental Responses:
Fire: .....No concerns.
Police:.....No concerns.
Public Works/Water/Sewer: ..... No issues or concerns at this time.
Town Administrator: .....No response.
Building/Code Enforcement Officer:…….Does this Property Fall within the flood Zone?
Conservation Commission.....No concerns
Assessing:.....No concerns.
Land Use Technician: ……See staff comments

Staff Comments:
Applicant is proposing an addition to an existing single-family home. A portion of the proposed addition is located within the 50' setback (33.9' where 50' required) from Lake Winnisquam. Proposed addition meets all other setback requirements (front and side setbacks)

MOTION: M. Mastenbrook moved to grant a Variance of Article 4 Table 1 of the Wetlands Ordinance (Principal Structure: Setback from Public Waters) to construct an addition closer (33.9') to the side setback than allowed (50'). Property is located at 18 Lakeside Drive, Tax Lot 112-005-000-000, in the Residential Single Zone. ZBA Case # 08-25Z, based on the following criteria:

1. The variance will not be contrary to the public interest because: It does not conflict with the implicit or explicit purpose of the ordinance, and it does not alter the essential character of the neighborhood, and does not threaten public health, safety or welfare.

2. The spirit of the ordinance is observed because: It does not conflict with the implicit or explicit purpose of the ordinance, and it does not alter the essential character of the neighborhood, and does not threaten public health, safety or welfare.

3. Substantial justice will be done because: There is a clear loss to the applicant that is not outweighed by a gain to the community if this variance application is denied.

4. The variance would not diminish the value of surrounding properties because: Any time there are any improvements done to water front properties, property values go up.

5. Owing to special conditions of the property, that distinguish it from other properties in the area, denial of the variance would result in unnecessary hardship because of the following: The special conditions of this property that create a hardship include: The shape and location of this lot is on this segment of road and on the angled shoreline of the lake create a hardship for the applicant. The fact that the property has an existing non-conforming house, deck and garage. The ability to place the expansion in a largely conforming spot on the property, and the ability to place the expansion within the lot coverage restrictions of the ordinance.

   a) no fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purpose of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property because:

      and

   b) the proposed use is a reasonable one because: In all fairness, they are placing this expansion further from the lake, and not getting any closer to the neighbors on each side.

Additional conditions:

A. All representations made by the applicant during the public hearing are incorporated as a condition of this approval.
B. The applicant and owner are solely responsible to comply with the approved plan and conditions of approval. Contractors should be sufficiently warned regarding same.
C. Approval expires on 5/28/27 if use is not substantially acted on and if an extension is not granted. Approval also expires if use ceases for more than two years.

Second: J. Froumy
Vote: all in favor, motion carried (5/0)

Abutters Hearing - Susan Condodemetraky Revocable Trust: Request to amend an existing Special Exception approval of Article 5, Table 1 of the Zoning Ordinance (Table of Permitted Uses) to allow expansion of the existing contractor's yard to include towing of motor vehicles on a flatbed truck in the Rural Zone. Property is located at 194 Gilmanton Road, Tax Lot 241-019-000-000. ZBA Case # 10-25Z

J. Froumy recused himself, S. Bouthiette was moved to full member.

Ethan Wood was present for the applicants. He distributed additional documentation to the Board.

History:
9/8/80 – Building permit to construct a solar greenhouse.
10/14/93 – Building permit to construct a two-car garage.
11/14/95 – Demolition permit to remove existing shed/garage.
5/24/99 – Demolition permit to remove a manufactured home.
8/10/01 – Building permit for addition to home office.
6/14/04 – Private burial ground established.
9/20/05 – Building permit for 52'x60' metal storage building. Residential accessory use only.
11/20/13 – Building permit for addition to storage shed for farm equipment.
12/10/18 – Mechanical permit (tanks)
3/16/20 – Dealer license denied
4/23/21 – Building permit for 30'x60' garage damaged by fire. Residential accessory use only.
6/28/21 – Building permit for 30'x60' lean-to for residential accessory use.

3/31/22 – Change of Tenant request to add motor vehicle and trailer services and operate a towing business.
4/1/22 – Staff denied the Change of Tenant request and recommended applying for two Special Exceptions – one for Motor Vehicle Sales and Repair and one for operating a Contractor's Yard.
5/4/22 – Applicant submitted one application for a Special Exception for Motor Vehicle Sales and Repair.
7/27/22 – ZBA denied without prejudice a Special Exception of Article 5 Table 1 of the Zoning Ordinance to allow motor vehicles sales and repairs in the "R" Zone.
6/28/2023 – ZBA denied a Special Exception of Article 5 Table 1 of the Zoning Ordinance to allow expansion of an existing contractor's yard in the Rural Zone.
8/23/2023 – Request for rehearing of Special Exception application granted.
9/27/2023 – ZBA granted a Special Exception of Article 5 Table 1 of the Zoning Ordinance to allow expansion of an existing contractor's yard in the Rural Zone.
2/24/2025 – Site Plan application for the expansion of the existing contractor's yard to include towing and temporary storage of repossessed or abandoned motor vehicles. – Continued (application did not address condition that was part of ZBA approval)

Current Considerations:
At least three members of Board must view site prior to meeting.
Property is not in the Aquifer Protection District.

Development of Regional Impact
Chairman Harris stated that in order to provide timely notice, provide opportunities for input and consider the interests of other municipalities the Board shall act to determine if the development has a potential regional impact as defined by RSA 36:55. Impacts may include, but are not limited to: Relative size or number of dwelling units as compared with existing stock; Proximity to the borders of a neighboring community; Transportation networks; Anticipated emissions such as light, noise, smoke, odors, or particles; Proximity to aquifers or surface waters which transcend municipal boundaries; Shared facilities such as schools and solid waste disposal facilities.

MOTION: P. Harris moved that the proposal does not have a potential regional impact.
Second: D. Silcock
Vote: all in favor, motion carried (5/0)

Departmental Responses:
Fire:……As long as all fire and life safety regulations are followed I am good.
Police: Two concerns regarding this application:
Traffic concerns: Vehicles entering or leaving the location can cause obstruction or safety hazards.
Hours of operation: Given that many or some of these vehicles will arrive by flatbed or wrecker, it will cause undue noise and disturbance to the neighbors if it violates the noise ordinance.
Water/Sewer: ..... No response.
Public Works: ..... No response.
Town Administrator: The concern I have is the safety concern for the truck offloading the vehicles off that busy main road.
Code Enforcement Officer/Building Official: Tradz LLC is currently operating as more than a simple contractor yard. Has advertised for automobile auctions at this location, and has requested a dealer's license for this location which will include sales, and repair.

There have been numerous complaints of traffic day and night with back up alarms/lights in use all hours of the night. This has been documented by abutters. While there is one construction business in close proximity to 194 Gilmanton Rd., it is not on Gilmanton Rd, is not transporting equipment multiple times a day/night, and does not impede traffic on Gilmanton Rd.

Due to Tradz LLC currently operating as an unpermitted business it has proven to be a major traffic hinderance and safety issue. Towing vehicles are frequently stopping traffic on Gilmanton Rd. Tow vehicles frequently back out into Gilmanton Rd occupying both lanes of traffic. In some cases, back completely across the road to damage abutters lawn. Placement of driveway prevents adequate line of sight in both directions if/when the tow vehicles are occupying both lanes, are entering/exiting property, or are parked alongside of Gilmanton Rd.

There has been a significant amount of property work out of sight from Gilmanton Rd. It is an unknown what drainage or runoff impacts currently exist.

Conservation Commission .....No response.
Land Use Technician:.....See staff comments

Staff Comment

The applicant is requesting to amend a Special Exception approval of Article 5, Table 1 of the Zoning Ordinance (Table of Permitted Uses) to allow expansion of the existing contractor's yard to include towing of motor vehicles on a flatbed truck in the Rural Zone. Property is located at 194 Gilmanton Road, Tax Lot 241-019-000-000.

The original approval contained a condition that a second entrance be installed in the location of Old Route 140; the applicant is requesting an amendment to allow one driveway.

K. Santoro stated that she spoke with counsel, and it was counsel's advice that this be treated as a new application. Typically, Zoning Board approvals are not amended.

Ethan Wood, Esq., George Condodemetraky, Stephan Condodemetraky and Christopher Condodemetraky were present for this application.

E. Wood stated that they received a Special Exception for an expansion of the existing use to permit passenger vehicles to be brought to the property on flatbed trucks. There was concern that the existing driveway was inappropriate for any expanding use, and the ZBA approved the application on the condition the applicant open and use a discontinued portion of Old Route 140 as the entrance to the yard. He referenced the history of the lot, noting that it was important to this application.

Their engineer looked at the proposed driveway, and immediately noted that opening this discontinued road would be significantly more dangerous than widening the existing driveway. The applicant also reached out to NH DOT District 3, and they stated that they agreed with the engineer's opinion.

E. Wood read the Special Exception Criteria to the Board.

Article 5, Table 1 of the Belmont Zoning Ordinance permits a Contractor's Yard by special exception in the Rural Zone.

The proposal satisfies the applicable Special Exception criteria set forth in Article 13F. Article 13F requires that the ZBA find the application meets the following additional requirements regarding treated soils. Article 15 defines treated soils as "soils decontaminated by treatment process and certified for distribution and use as soil under NH Env- Wm 3203, having originally been contaminated with liquids not regulated by the State of NH as hazardous waste as defined under NH Env-WM 2603.01." There are no soils on the property that meet these criteria, and therefore the applicant is in compliance with the criteria set forth in Article 13F.

The proposal is not incompatible to other uses in the area through the creation of noise, fumes, dust, odor, lighting, smoke or other impacts. This is a natural and limited expansion of a pre-existing use. The towing and storage of a limited number of vehicles is not materially different than the towing and storage of construction and farm equipment that is the existing use of this site and not subject to review in this application. The towing and storage of cars on a limited basis will not create additional noise beyond any existing at the property, nor will it generate fumes, dust, odor, or smoke. The applicant will adhere to the Belmont Noise Ordinance. No additional lighting is being requested as the proposed expansion of the existing use will occur between the hours of 10 AM and 6 PM. There is not expected to be any impact to traffic on Gilmanton Road as no truck will be entering on to Gilmanton Road in reverse and the sightlines from the existing driveway are sufficient to enable minor expansion of use without impact.

The proposed location is of adequate size. There are over 60 acres of land in this parcel. The total amount used by all of the structures and the vehicle storage area do not exceed five acres. All of the activity occurring on the property is shielded from the view of the neighbors and the abutters, and is limited in scope to approximately four flatbed trucks entering and exiting the property daily. There is sufficient area on the premises to ensure that the flatbed trucks will be able to enter the property, unload the cargo, (whether it be vehicles, farm equipment or construction equipment), load cargo, and exit the property without any impact to traffic on Route 140 or any of the abutters.

The proposal does not create undue traffic congestion or unduly impair vehicular or pedestrian safety. The limited scope of this use and the hours of operation are designed to ameliorate any impact to either traffic or pedestrian safety. While the initial plan was to open the lower driveway, the safety concern with doing so make the expansion of the driveway apron and use of the existing driveway a better option. This use will not create undue traffic or impair vehicular or pedestrian safety as the use is limited in scope, and not substantially different than the existing use. The ZBA's concern with trucks backing out or stopping on the road is eliminated by expanding the apron so that these vehicles can safely pull off the road and out of traffic. In addition, the NH DOT's Rt. 140 Corridor Study from 2013 suggests that any potential increase in the number of vehicles on Rte. 140 in this area would be a negligible increase in existing traffic over the time period during which vehicles are expected to enter or exit using the premises. The sightlines from the existing driveway and the expansion of the driveway apron make this entrance and exit much safer than trying to have vehicles enter or exit using the old Route 140 as set forth in the engineer's opinion. Trucks will not be lined up on the road way and will be able to pull off onto the expanded driveway apron. There are no sidewalks in the area and pedestrian traffic in the area is low to non-existent so there is no expected impact to pedestrian safety.

The proposal does not overload any existing water, drainage, sewer, or other system, nor will there be any significant increase in stormwater runoff onto adjacent properties. The proposed expansion does not require does not require any new water, drainage, sewer or other systems. The impact, to the extent there is any, to the existing water, drainage, sewer and other systems will be negligible, as the proposal is to have vehicles towed to this location and towed from this location, which is something that currently exists with farm and construction equipment. Given the location of the proposed activity, there will be no runoff onto the adjacent properties as there are no adjacent properties near this location and the existing contours of the land are such that any runoff the does occur will be confined to the site.

The proposal does not create excessive demand for municipal services or facilities. The proposal does not envision any demand for municipal services or facilities beyond that which is required for the existing use.

The proposal does not create hazards to the health, safety, or general welfare of the public. The proposal is limited in scope and nature and is a minor expansion of the preexisting use. The towing of vehicles to and from the premises will not create any hazards to the health, safety, or general welfare of the public, especially given the limited scope of this expansion. All other activities are wholly contained within the lot and set back substantially

from the public way and abutters. There is no hazard created by the towing and storage of vehicles as this use exists for construction equipment and farm equipment.

E. Wood discussed the pictures that he distributed to the Board at the beginning of the meeting.

K. Santoro stated that the applicant has offered to pay for 3rd party review, which would allow the town to hire an engineer and produce a report that is from a 3rd party.

M. Mastenbrook asked if the original approval was based on the applicant opening up the other driveway? E. Wood stated that ultimately, that was one of the conditions of approval. K. Santoro stated that part of the approval with the last special exception was the opening of the second driveway to alleviate the safety concerns. M. Mastenbrook stated that they have allowed them to have the contractor's yard based on using a second driveway. Now they are asking for more expansion? One of the criteria for a special exception is noise. He stated that the abutters have testified to a noise issue because of trucks entering the property. Based on that, this request doesn't meet the criteria when it comes to noise. It seems to him that they have already given him an approval, but now they are asking for more, without complying with the conditions they put on that approval in the first place. He stated now they are asking to include towing and storage of repossessed and abandoned vehicles and more trucks. They have neighbors across the street that have complained about the noise. How are they improving the noise and public safety if they aren't going to use the second entrance that the first approval was based on? E. Wood stated that he thought there was a misunderstanding. They aren't asking for more expansion, just what they were approved for but without utilizing the second entrance.

P. Harris stated that the bottom line is that they have to have a better driveway. They were willing to move forward when there was to be a second driveway, but now they can't do that based on what the applicant's engineer has stated. S. Condodemetraky stated that the engineer has stated that it is not safe, and DOT agreed. They did all that they agreed to do, and now they are back asking to expand the existing driveway rather than using that road. They have DOT approval to expand the driveway.

K. Santoro stated that Staff suggests that the Board accept the applicant's offer for a 3rd party review to review the applicant's engineering report for that driveway, and continue this case until they do so.

MOTION: M. Mastenbrook moved to continue Case 10-25Z until June 25, 2025, to allow for a 3rd party review to be completed.
Second: D. Silcock
Vote: All in favor, motion carried (5/0)

The Board recessed at 7:30 PM
The Board returned at 7:36 PM

J. Froumy returned to the table.

Request for a Rehearing – Revision Energy: Consideration of a request to rehear an application to install a commercial solar farm on 6 acres of land within the lot. The applicant is requesting a Variance to Article 5 Table 1 (Zoning District Table of Permitted Uses). Property is located on Mile Hill Road, in the Rural and Residential Single-Family Zones, Tax Lot 205-037-000-000. ZBA Case # 09-25Z. **This is NOT a public hearing, there will be no public comment heard at this time.**
K. Santoro reminded the Board that this is a request to rehear a case. There is no public comment. The Board needs to decide if they made an error in procedure or if there was information provided that was substantial enough to predicate a rehearing.

J. Froumy stated that there was a substantive error in their approval. He stated that the person who wrote the request for the rehearing did a good job at it. The substantive error is that there are components to the variance, including substantial justice and hardship. Both of those were affected when the debate came up about diminishing value. J. Froumy noted that his comment was that it was 1% to 3%. The substantive error was that there is more information and when the abutter's appealed for a rehearing, they supplied numbers that went up to 10%, and it was presented objectively. He doesn't feel that they can deny the rehearing because they presented an objective opinion that contradicts what he said. They can't make a decision at this meeting if that is significant enough to change their decision, nor can they at this meeting make a decision whether or not they can maintain their decision. They can only say that new information has come in that may dispute the information that was used to come to the original decision.

M. Mastenbrook stated that he agrees with J. Froumy.

S. Bouthiette stated that the information provided was based on Massachusetts and Rhode Island. Those are very different areas than Belmont, New Hampshire. It also doesn't take into account the Eversource power lines and the cell towers. What was the value before the power lines and cell towers?

MOTION: J. Froumy moved to rehear Case # 09-25Z based on a possible error and the possible diminished property values.
Second: M. Mastenbrook
Vote: All in favor, motion carried (5/0)

Minutes of April 23, 2025

MOTION: M. Mastenbrook moved to approve the minutes of April 23, 2025.
Second: D. Silcock
Vote: All in favor, motion carried. (5-0)

Staff Report:
K. Santoro, in response to a member's question, explained how zoning ordinances are updated and the timeline.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: M. Mastenbrook moved to adjourn at 7:57 PM
L. Stewart seconded the motion.
Vote: All in favor, motion carried. (5-0)

Respectfully Submitted,

Susan M. Austin
Land Use Assistant