

**Town of Wolfeboro
Zoning Board of Adjustment
October 2, 2023
DRAFT Minutes**

Members Present: Audrey Cline, Chair, Suzanne Ryan, Vice-Chair, Luke Freudenberg, BOS Representative, Sarah Silk, Clerk, Member, Nancy (Sabet) Stroman, Catherine McMahon, Alternates.

Members Absent (excused): Chuck Sumner, Member

Staff Present: Tavis Austin, Director of Planning & Development.

I. Roll Call

Suzanne Ryan called the meeting to order at the Great Hall at 7:05 PM. A quorum was present. Suzanne Ryan appointed Sabet Stroman, Alternate, and Cate McMahon, alternate to sit in for Chuck Sumner, Member, and Audrey Cline, Member, as Audrey Cline has recused herself.

II. Public Hearings:

- a. **Derrick L. Brown** – 16 Libby Street, Unit B – Tax Map # Lot # 217-013 – Case # 07-AAD-23 – Public Hearing for an Appeal of Administrative Decision under Chapter 175, Section 89 of the planning and Zoning Ordinance for Dimensional Controls –***Public Hearing continued from 09/25/2023.***

Suzanne Ryan stated that the ZBA took jurisdiction at the last hearing per NH RSA 676:5-I and NH RSA 674:33-I.

Suzanne Ryan opens continued hearing for appeal filed 8/23/23 and invites Mr. Brown to come forward and speak on any new information he may have regarding his appeal.

Mr. Brown stated that he spoke with Mr. Walker, the attorney for Mr. Beckwith, and was shown proposed plans for drainage improvements. Mr. Brown noted that there was no engineering stamp on the plans and was told that there had not been time to get a stamp, or time for the calculations for the drainage. Mr. Brown stated he asked what happens if the storm drain cannot handle the amount of water runoff, and it was stated to him that it would be a town problem. Would like to point out that his property is the last property at the bottom of the hill, where the last storm water drain is, and if that reaches capacity it will back up onto his property. Mr. Brown stated that Mr. Walker had asked him to approve this plan and drop the appeal, which he declined. Mr. Brown stated he would like someone other than Mr. Austin to look at this plan and say that it is okay. Mr. Brown stated he would like to remind everyone of things that have been happening over the past year. During the winter Mr. Beckwith's basement would flood, so he would pump the water live on the street, which is a hazard. Mr. Brown posed a question to the board about the site visits on 7/11 & 9/11, and Mr. Beckwith's absence from subsequent meetings, asking one would think he would want to be there. Mr. Brown continues that Mr. Beckwith's neighborly behavior is that of total disregard for his neighbors, parking wherever he feels, pumping water into the street, making public

statements that the back yard will not be changing, and Zillow retraction out of nowhere. Suzanne Ryan stated that Mr. Brown needed to stay with relevant information as to what his application has provided. Mr. Brown stated that he hired a survey company, and received the results regarding the Right of Way that was stated to be Mr. Beckwith's. The results showed that the Right of Way is in fact public Right of Way for 30, 24, 20 and 16 Libby St. Suzanne Ryan asked for a copy of the results to be forwarded to ZBA.

Luke Freudenberg asked Mr. Brown what he believes should happen here tonight. Mr. Brown replied that the drainage should be addressed before the project can continue, and that he believes it should go back to being a garage with storage.

Luke Freudenberg asked Mr. Brown if he had been counseled by Audrey Cline for this application. Mr. Brown answered that he approached her, not knowing who she was and that's when he found out that she was represented Mr. Kent.

Sarah Silk asked for confirmation on who lives at the 4 addresses Mr. Brown stated. Mr. Brown listed: 16 – Beckwith's, 20 – Mr. & Mrs. Hart, 24 – Mr. & Mrs. Fernald, and 30 – Mr. & Mrs. Brown. Mr. Brown stated that his property was originally owned by Grange Hall and has no easement on it. The easement starts at the highline of his property and goes up to the church parking lot. It is 14 feet wide and on the abutters side, not the churches.

Sabet Stroman asked Mr. Brown for clarification on an earlier statement regarding Mr. Walker asking him to drop the case with the proposed plan and him stating he would like someone other than Mr. Austin to look at the plan. Is this hypothetical or are you stating Tavis Austin had actually reviewed the drainage plan presented to you? Mr. Brown responded that he understood that Tavis had been given a copy of the plan and said it looked good, however there should be an engineering firm looking at this.

Suzanne Ryan stated that they did a site visit prior to tonight's meeting, and Sarah Silk, Clerk, took notes which will be part of the record. In the interim between the last meeting and this meeting, Mr. Brown sent pictures to Mr. Austin, of Zillow, and drainage issues. This will be put into the file. Suzanne Ryan asked Luke Freudenberg if he had a chance to discuss any of this with the towns. Luke Freudenberg replied that he can confirm that the town, as Mr. Brown submitted, did some work to attempt to alleviate some of the drainage problems, and that the town has done work like this in the past to alleviate drainage issues on private property.

Suzanne Ryan asks Austin Tavis, Director of Planning & Development, to stand at the podium for questions from the board.

Suzanne Ryan stated building permit application from 7/26/23 for Duplex, signed off by Jason has numbers 1-4, and a bunch of required inspections. She asked Tavis Austin when there is an X, does that mean it is applicable or not applicable. Tavis Austin answered in this case X means applicable. Suzanne Ryan stated the building permit lists required inspections for erosion, sediment control, foot piers, foundation, under slab, electrical services, and plumbing. Asked if the Code Officer looked at these already. Tavis Austin answered as related to the duplex, yes. Suzanne Ryan asked with it being

signed off on, does that mean he felt it was in compliance. Tavis Austin answered that he was not sure, that it did not mean the inspections were completed because the permit was issued. Suzanne Ryan asked what it means when the permit is signed. Tavis Austin answered it means the criteria was met to have a permit issued, and it was issued with those criteria. Suzanne Ryan asked if an occupancy permit had been issued. Tavis Austin answered yes for garage with storage. Suzanne Ryan asked if criteria was met for occupancy, then. Tavis Austin answered not if it is the permit for the duplex.

Luke Freudenberg asked Tavis Austin why he feels the duplex meets 175. Tavis Austin replied 175-55 is non-conforming lots. It's a legal non-conforming lot. 175-55 clearly states grandfathered lots, or legal existing non-conforming frontage and lot area do not have to comply. Luke Freudenberg asked if this was what the permit of the duplex was based on. Tavis Austin answered that this clause is relied upon for every lot that does not meet the standards.

Sabet Stroman stated that the town attorney stated since this can be interpreted in many different ways, that there needs to be evidence of administrative gloss, that undersized lots in the area have been built on in the past. Stated that this is something that Mr. Walker argued, stating there were a number of lots that have been built upon in the past, but that the ZBA does not have any specifics. Asks Tavis Austin if he has specifics of evidence of administrative gloss. Tavis Austin replied that he estimates 90% of building permits rely upon this clause. There are very few lots, created prior to 1987, that comply with today's regulations. Every lot created prior to zoning would be subject to that clause, a majority of downtown Wolfeboro. Sabet Stroman asked if these were built upon without variances. Tavis Austin replied yes built on without variances. An example would be last month's Hart location, there wasn't anything about lot size, but they had to seek a variance for setbacks. Sarah Silk asked Tavis Austin if he is insinuating this administrative gloss is recent or just something that happened in the 1940s. Tavis Austin answered there wasn't any zoning in the 1940s. Sarah Silk stated most of downtown had been built upon long before 1987, before zoning was around, therefore it wouldn't be administrative gloss, because there was no zoning. Tavis Austin replied asking if Downtown Grille was there in 1987, apartments above Avery building, or the expansion of residential units. No specifics because wasn't asked by the board prior to the meeting.

Suzanne Ryan asks Mr. Walker, the attorney for Mr. Beckwith, to come forward with any testimony or comments.

Mr. Walker stated he would like to touch base on a few previous comments made. First being the ice in the road. Stated that the house above Mr. Beckwith's pipes had burst, causing Mr. Beckwith's basement to flood, and went downhill. Second, the Right of Way is irrelevant, but Mr. Beckwith's deed does state Right of Way. Third, to Sabet's comment – Mr. Beckwith's property is grandfathered, the ordinance cannot be any clearer, 175-55 means it is exempt from frontage and area requirements. Suzanne Ryan stated that the planning board should have picked up on 175-55 and notified the Zoning Board. Asked Mr. Walker if he knew about this at the last meeting, why didn't he bring it up then. Mr. Walker answered that he had only recently found it. Mr. Walker handed out a copy of the ordinance he had to the board members. Suzanne Ryan stated that

175-55 was amended in 2011, and 175-175 terms defined density and size was amended in 2017. Part 1 is superseded by the new requirement, making this not applicable. Mr. Walker asked which part was amended. Suzanne Ryan answered 175-55 amended in 2011. Part 1 and Part 2. Part 1 is Town Ordinance, and Part 2 is Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Walker stated he does not agree with this. If you look at the table of contents, Part 1 starts at section 175-1 and part 2 doesn't start until section 192. Suzanne Ryan stated Part 2, 175 is Zoning. 175-1 through 175-215. 175 was amended in 2017, what Mr. Walker is using is superseded by this. Mr. Walker asked for clarification as to what Suzanne Ryan was referring to as his stated amended 2011. Suzanne Ryan replied that 175-55 makes the application null and void. However, that was superseded by town vote in 2017. This is an administrative mess up and believe the board will go forward with the application. Mr. Walker stated 175-175 is just terms. Cate McMahon stated he was correct, however on the building permit for a duplex, it does not meet the definition of duplex. Tavis Austin stated that was not appealed. Suzanne Ryan stated that the confusion comes from part 1, adopted in 1939. Then part 2 came along at some point. Part 2 is for zoning and has been amended here and there. Stated she will recommend to the board this application is valid. 175-55 is not part of part 1, it is an old left-over reference. Mr. Walker stated he does not agree with this, and will stick to his position on it, but at the request to move on, reserves all rights in regard. Mr. Walker started researching deeds to Mr. Beckwith's property, from current all the way back to 1912, which would prove the property is grandfathered in. Sarah Silk asked if this was to clarify the lot existed. Mr. Walker responded to show it's a pre-existing legal non-conforming lot as defined in 175-175, exempt in 175-55. The basis to show this is so that later on it cannot be said it was proved to be a grandfathered lot. Mr. Walker continued that he handed out a plan to the board members, to Mr. Brown prior to the meeting to try and come to a resolution, and to the town planner a week prior, this plan is trying to resolve problems that arose from the previous meeting. Suzanne Ryan asked for a date when this plan was made. Mr. Walker replied to the week prior, 9/28/23. Mr. Walker stated that Mr. Brown has no standing to appeal, as he is not an abutter, not an abutter's abutter. Stated that the Hart's, who are abutters, and the Fernald's who are abutters to the abutter, did not file appeals. Would assert that Mr. Brown is not an aggrieved party. Stated that Mr. Brown's property may have water, but there is no proof that it comes directly from Mr. Beckwith's property. Mr. Brown has no evidence, no facts, no plans to show that he is an aggrieved party. Mr. Walker stated that he would like to bring up how the Zillow information has been mentioned, and believe this is inappropriate to bring up, as it is his understanding that this board cannot do research outside of the hearing because it may be bias, meaning they can only make decisions on what is brought forth during the hearing. Sabet Stroman stated she went to Zillow to get a sense of what the property looked like as she had missed the site visits. Suzanne Ryan stated that this had been presented to the board prior to this meeting, this was a moot issue and believed Mr. Walkers made his point known. Suzanne Ryan stated that it was obvious that Mr. Brown is not an abutter to Mr. Beckwith's property, however, non-abutters that are directly affected have a standing. Suzanne Ryan read from the municipal association "Standing to an appeal does not apply to all persons in the community. Standing is a factual determination of each case, such as proximity of plaintiffs, property to site for which approval is sought, type of change proposed, immediacy of the injury claim, plaintiffs' participation in

administrative hearing, land use.” Suzane Ryan stated that there is plenty of case law that shows if you have a direct affect, you have standing. Mr. Walker stated the point is there are no facts to support that. Going back to Zillow. Mr. Beckwith posted an ad on Zillow to test the rental waters, and subsequently took it down since no occupancy permit had been issued. Mr. Walker references the case Rodowski v. Rodowski, where a judge did independent research on Zillow, and it was found that this was something that cannot be done. This is the basis for which Mr. Walker believes that the board cannot do independent research outside of the hearings. Suzanne Ryan stated that the deliberations would sift out what is factual and applicable, and that Mr. Walker has made his point known.

Mr. Walker stated that the application cites 175-89 as the reasoning for the appeal, nothing else. No other section would be appropriate issues to discuss.

Sabet Stroman stated for administrative gloss that the town attorney advised in order for this to hold that Mr. Walker, on behalf of Mr. Beckwith, would have to prove that multiple over built lots have violated lot size. Asked Mr. Walker if he had any specifics of other properties that would fall under this. Mr. Walker stated per what Tavis Austin said 90% of applications would fall under this. Stated the Hart application is indicative of this. Stated it is almost identical to this one. Stated the application was for a variance to build a shed 1 foot off of the property line. Their lot is much smaller than Mr. Beckwith’s, being .16 acre, not close to .50 acre. This board did not bring it up during the appeal that the lot was too small. Mr. Walker stated it is a permitted use accessory structure under 175-91 B under accessory uses. Just above that is 175-91 A3 which states you can have a duplex. 175-91 B and 175-91 A3 are both accessory structures. The Hart’s relied upon that variance and it was granted in a 5-0 vote. Suzanne Ryan stated there is a difference in making a change to an existing home and putting up a new accessory structure. These are different. Mr. Walker stated 175-91, section A – one of the following is permitted; A3 duplex, a permitted use in this district. B also permitted are accessory structures. Suzanne Ryan noted that was amended in 2017. Sabet Stroman questioned how it was approved without meeting requirements for a duplex.

Mr. Hart, 20 Libby Street, said Mr. Walker mentioned how his property is not wet, however things have changed since the start of this project. There is now additional mud and silt on the patio and driveway. Questioned the drainage plan and how the stormwater from the bottom of Mr. Beckwith’s property will get to the storm drain. Stated his appeal to the variance for his property was for a shed, not a duplex with parking and draining. Sarah Silk asked how long the mud and silt has been happening. Mr. Hart replied he didn’t have a definite date, but it was sometime after the 9/11 meeting during one of the big rainstorms.

Audrey Cline, representing Roger Kent, stated in support of Mr. Brown’s appeal. Attorney Walker is counting on the non-conforming section, empty parcels and non-conforming allowances have nothing to do with this case, this parcel is single family. In order to change use, it needs to meet the standards for the new use; when you change use, you have to meet the zoning that is in place at this time. Different from a shed, an accessory use for a single-family dwelling does not change the use of the parcel, and ADU does not change the use of the parcel, but a duplex does. Audrey Cline stated what Attorney Walker stated about Mr. Brown’s appeal, can only deliberate about what is on the application is wrong. Audrey Cline reads from Loughlin ZBA Standard Review in

administrative appeals, in summary the ZBA has no obligation to review appeals from decisions of administrative officials from the beginning, however per NH RSA 674:33-II the ZBA has all the powers of the administrative official from whom the appeal is taken when hearing and deciding appeal. Audrey Cline stated 175-129 change from one type to another unless off street parking has to be increased, there's an increase in footprint, new building and development of a use not located in the building.

Luke Freudenberg questioned Audrey Cline's statement in reference to "through the process." Tavis Austin acted as agent, Director of Planning, for Town of Wolfeboro. Mr. Beckwith submitted his application, went through the process. Potentially someone could argue this should be torn down even though it went through the process, is this your intent? Audrey Cline replied this is not the intent, intent is that zoning lays out regulations, which need to be followed by everyone. Luke Freudenberg pulls out a building permit application to show what it looks like. Explains that there is a 30-day appeal window, and nowhere in it does it show that, so there could be someone that feels they have gone through the process and done everything right. Sabet Stroman stated according to the Town Attorney he acted at his own peril, starting construction quickly. Mr. Brown is following the appeal process. Even if the 30-day appeal window was on the application, it matters when the plaintiff found out about it. Audrey Cline replies that what she believed is being said is someone has gone through the process, is given a paper that says "you're good to go" that should be true, but in this case it is not. Audrey Cline stated the contractor is responsible for all compliance with building and zoning codes per state law.

Cate McMahon asked Tavis Austin prior to Mr. Brown's appeal, how did the duplex get approved with the dimensions being different. Tavis Austin replied 175-55 frontage and lot area does not apply to the lot. Lot size becomes a relevant factor for boundary line adjustments or subdivision. If it's a legal non-conforming lot that has never been challenged, then you can do permitted use. Cate McMahon stated not the lot size, the sq ft inside. Definitions are not grandfathered, and a duplex is more or less equal size units. Tavis Austin replied it says proportional, the upstairs and downstairs are proportional to each other in size. It does not say living space has to be proportional in size. Suzanne Ryan reads definition of dwelling. Stated to Luke Freudenberg that the application is definitely lacking, however it does state the board recommends becoming familiar with zoning ordinance for relief. There is a certain burden upon the applicant as well.

Bill Swaffield stated rehabbed Libby St back parking lot at Kingswood Press, culver was put in at the bottom corner of parking lot. Recalled last winter Libby St was very icy. Questioned definition of a duplex, as garage and apartment does not seem to fall into that. Suzanne Ryan reads the definition of a duplex. Bill questioned if this was a duplex or an ADU. Suzanne Ryan replied an ADU is not a part of this.

Mr. Brown, 30 Libby St, reads page 5 from his appeal application. See attached. Cannot speak to other neighbors not bringing forth appeals. Stated he has spent months trying to get information. Stated most neighbors are not directly affected because they aren't at the bottom of the hill.

Mr. Hart questioned the sq. ft. of the duplex, and if the garage in the duplex would be used for the tenants in the apartment. Suzanne Ryan replied there is only a lawful permit for a garage.

Mr. Walker hands out a copy of drainage plans, table of contents for Wolfeboro zoning from 9/25/23 part 1, and part 2, and letter from the water/sewer department stating the problem at neighboring house had been fixed.

Suzanne Ryan stated although obligation is on the applicant to do due diligence, the whole application will be taken into consideration.

Mr. Walker would like it to be pointed out that Mr. Beckwith received a permit for garage, apartment, and deck a year ago with no appeals.

It was moved by Luke Freudenberg to close the public hearing. Sarah Silk seconded the motion. Roll call vote: Luke Freudenberg – yes, Sabet Stroman – yes, Sarah Silk – yes, Suzanne Ryan – yes, Cate McMahon – yes. The motion passed (5-0-0).

Deliberations:

Suzanne Ryan noted issues not to be considered:

1. Procedural issues to the Planning Board application
2. Complaints about procedure with Planning Department
3. Historical decisions
4. Lack of action regarding drainage – not ZBA jurisdiction
5. Whether or not the property owner continued building after the appeal was filed in violation of 676-6, ZBA has no authority.
6. Interpretations of terms of Zoning Ordinance that were not raised by Mr. Brown.
7. Construction, interpretation or application of terms of Zoning Ordinance made by Mr. Austin in issuing the building permit.
8. If other abutters, or members of the public bring forth new challenges, these are not part of the appeal.

Suzanne Ryan stated the ZBA needs to be sure that 676-5 2 B ordinance was properly applied and construed to the building permit application. Minimum lot size was challenged under 175-89 A-2. Stated the board needs to answer if there is a minimum lot size for a duplex and does this parcel meet that minimum requirement. As for erosion and drainage, more specifically stormwater management plan is for non-residential development, may not apply but drainage for parking may apply. Parking challenged under 175-129 and 175-36. Did the administrative official improperly interpret the parking requirement? The Statutory Authority of ZBA allows to revoke, reverse, affirm, wholly or in part, modify determination of appeal of administrative official. If results find mistakes, and permit was improperly granted ZBA may reverse and revoke permit. Big issues are stormwater management vs drainage, lot size and definition of duplex.

Suzanne Ryan noted duplex is 748 sq ft, and residential dwelling is approximately 2000 sq ft. Sarah Silk noted the owner had stated would be utilizing garage space, so would not be able to include that in area for duplex, substantial inconsistency in sizes. Sabet Stroman stated Zoning administrator should take the most conservative or restrictive approach. Duplex requires a parking plan, one was not submitted with the application,

therefore a conservative or restrictive approach was not taken. Sarah Silk questioned if the permit should have been permitted without all the items required.

Suzanne Ryan stated it is pretty clear that the lot size does not meet the requirements per 175-89 A:two. C1 district requires a minimum of 21780 sq ft, or .5 acres. Parcel in question has 8715 sq ft, or .2 acres. Does not meet minimum requirement. Suzanne Ryan asked the board if it was believed Dimension controls had been met.

Luke Freudenberg answered yes, as the zoning ordinances are ambiguous and written in such a manner that even the board is questioning interpretations. Sarah Silk answered it is two problems, 1. Math and 2. Being grandfathered in section 1. The dimensions are lacking. Sabet Stroman answered lot size does not conform. Cate McMahon answered agreed on lot size. Luke Freudenberg stated agreed on lot size but not about grandfathering.

Suzanne Ryan stated 175-175 B definition of a duplex requires two dwelling units of similar proportions. Town record shows residential dwelling at 2400 sq ft, and drawing plan for duplex is approximately 748 sq ft. Sabet Stroman stated does not meet definition. Sarah Silk agreed. Cate McMahon agreed. Luke Freudenberg stated duplex issue isn't relevant to this case. This is not a fundamental problem brought by the appellant. Is not proportional based on current zoning.

Suzanne Ryan stated the town attorney's interpretation of grandfathering in section 1 is a left-over reference that was missed, and that grandfathering should not apply since there was not a duplex there before. Suzanne Ryan stated as for stormwater drainage – not residential. Sarah Silk mentioned drainage would be a civil matter but there is case law that you cannot increase runoff for your neighbors. There is a problem there that needs to be remedied but does not believe ZBA has jurisdiction.

Suzanne Ryan posed the question was construction and interpretation of the application of the terms of the Zoning Ordinance met, made by the administrative official in the course of issuing the building permit. Consensus is dimensional controls – no, proportion – no, and legal advice is it's not grandfathered. Luke Freudenberg stated a large part of the argument would be held in what they were told not to consider. Therefore, he sides with the building permit being issued properly. Sarah Silk stated all agree it is a pre-existing non-conforming lot. There are some things with confliction interpretations, but it is pretty clear section 1 is for BOS and section 2 is ZBA.

Suzanne Ryan moved a draft motion – to uphold the appeal and reverse the building departments decision, and revoke 7/26/2023 building permit 2023000468, lot 217-013, Mr. Beckwith, as the construction and interpretation or application of the Zoning Ordinances were in error as follows:

1. 175-89 A:2 Dimensional Controls
Lot size is .20-acre, ordinance requires 21780 sq ft, or .50 acre.
2. 175-175 B Definition Duplex
Requires two dwelling units of similar proportions. Plan 927-22 reflects Duplex is approximately 748 sq ft, residential living space 2400 sq ft per tax card.

3. The board finds that the proposed duplex change from second floor storage is not grandfathered. No duplex on property before, just a single-family dwelling use.

It was moved by Sarah Silk to accept draft motion as read. Sabet Stroman seconded. Roll call vote: Luke Freudenberg – no, Sabet Stroman – yes, Sarah Silk – yes, Suzanne Ryan – yes, Cate McMahon – yes. The motion passed 4-0-1.

Sarah Silk stated the notice of decision will state the process for an appeal.

Suzanne Ryan stated the hearing is now closed. The second item on the agenda is a public hearing for Roger Kent, would be best to open and move to continue it. Tavis Austin stated the board needs to determine jurisdiction first.

- b. **Roger Kent** – 16 Libby Street – Tax Map # Lot # 217-013 – Case # 08-AAD-23 – Public Hearing for an Appeal of Administrative Decision, the issuance of building permit # 2023-468 for the creation of a duplex, based upon sections: 175-89 (2), 175-91 K, 175-128 C. (2), 175-129, 175-136, and 175-175 of the Wolfeboro Planning & Zoning Ordinance. Formal Submission/Public Hearing

Suzanne Ryan stated Appeal for Roger Kent, 16 Libby St, 217-013, Case 08-AAD-23. Per 674:33 Power of Zoning Board of Adjustments. Would move the board has jurisdiction. Luke Freudenberg questioned when the discussion of timeliness of the appeal would come in. Sarah Silk replied at the hearing.

It was moved by Suzanne Ryan that the Zoning Board of Adjustment has jurisdiction. Sabet Stroman seconded. Roll call vote: Luke Freudenberg – yes, Sabet Stroman – yes, Sarah Silk – yes, Suzanne Ryan – yes.

Suzanne Ryan asked the Representative for Mr. Kent if would like to continue with a board of 4. Representative replied no. Suzanne Ryan stated hearing would be continued to Monday, November 6, 2023, at 7:00 pm.

III. Approval of Minutes
None.

IV. Adjournment

It was moved by Luke Freudenberg to adjourn the October 2, 2023, Zoning Board of Adjustment meeting. Sarah Silk seconded the motion. All members voted in favor. The motion passed.

There being no further business before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 10:08 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,
Sierra Pawnell
Sierra Pawnell