

**TOWN OF SUNAPEE
ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
MINUTES
JANUARY 4, 2024, 6:30 p.m.
SUNAPEE TOWN MEETING ROOM**

Members present in the meeting room: Jeff Claus, Jim Lyons, David Munn, Pierre Lessard, Chris Murphy, David Andrews

Members present online: Jamie Silverstein

Also present in the meeting room: Michael Marquise, Town Planner; Allyson Traeger, Land Use and Assessing Coordinator; Craig Heino, Code Compliance Officer

Chair Claus called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m. and appointed Mr. Andrews to sit in for Mr. Jewczyn.

CONTINUED CASES

Case #VA 23-09, Parcel ID 0133-0087-0000 on behalf of Sunapee Harbor Riverway, Quack Shack, 72 Main Street, Village Commercial District, requesting a **VARIANCE** from Article III, Section 3.40(c) to allow a 9.5' x 9.5' panelized freezer to be placed within the 50-foot shoreline setback of Sugar River.

DECISION: Continued until February 2024.

DISCUSSION:

Ms. Traeger noted this case was continued at the last meeting until February 2024.

Case #VA 23-15, Parcel ID 0104-0022-0000 on behalf of Growth Cap Management , LLC, 27 Prospect Hill Road, Village Residential District, requesting a **VARIANCE** from Article III, Section 3.10 to reduce the 10,000 square foot requirement per dwelling unit to allow the addition of five dwelling units. Reducing the 10,000 square foot requirement to 6,075 square feet.

DECISION: The request for a variance was denied.

DISCUSSION:

Rebert Parpinelli, owner of 27 Prospect Hill, appeared before the Board. There are currently 14 units in the building and he would like to add five additional dwelling units. Chair Claus noted this property received a variance in the past to increase the dwelling units from 12 to 14.

The applicant reviewed the criteria for the variance:

1. Granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest because the proposed plan does not conflict with the explicit purpose of the ordinance or alter the essential character of the neighborhood.

SUNAPEE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT – JANUARY 4, 2024

2. If the variance were granted, the spirit of the ordinance would be observed because it is in the public's interest to be upholding the spirit of the ordinance.
3. Granting the variance would do substantial justice because the benefit to the applicant should not be outweighed by the harm to the general public.
4. If the variance were granted, the value of the surrounding properties would not be diminished because the property at 27 Prospect Hill will increase value by adding five more units. So, all the surrounding houses should be increasing and not diminish the value of their properties.
5. Unnecessary Hardship
 - a. 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:
 - i. No fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property because they know of the potential of the building by adding five more units. If this variance is denied, it will be a hardship because they won't be able to provide more housing for the Town of Sunapee, even knowing that they have enough space in the building and parking lot for five more units.
- and -
 - ii. The proposed use is a reasonable one because it does not alter the essential character of the neighborhood. It is essential to have more housing for the city of Sunapee.

Chair Claus noted there is a letter from the Fire Chief that notes concerns; however, addressing these can be added as a condition. Ms. Traeger said the applicant is aware of these concerns. Mr. Parpinelli said he will do whatever is needed to meet the requirements and provide a safe living space. He will add sprinklers to the existing 14 units as well.

Chair Claus noted the hardship requirement is difficult to meet and defined what the Board requires. Mr. Parpinelli explained the area needs additional housing and he would like to provide it. Chair Claus said the Planning Board has put forth an amendment to the ballot to reduce the density to 7,000 square feet. If this passes, the applicant could legally add two units.

The Board discussed whether adding sprinklers to 19 units would be more financially viable than adding them to 14 units, and if this would be considered a hardship. Chair Claus said financial issues cannot be considered a hardship. Mr. Parpinelli said he cannot financially add sprinklers to the other units without constructing the additional five units.

Ms. Silverstein asked if the units will meet the HUD workforce housing requirements. Mr. Parpinelli said they are going to be accepting HUD Section 8 tenants. Ms. Silverstein noted this might open a different avenue under workforce housing development, if the criteria are met. Mr. Parpinelli will research this. Ms. Silverstein said per the subdivision regulations, a lot size reduction can go down to 5,000 feet. Mr. Marquise agreed this might be a possibility. Mr. Andrews noted this would be a Planning Board decision.

Chair Claus asked for public comment; there was none.

The Board closed public input and began deliberation.

The Board agreed more housing is needed. Mr. Murphy noted the 14 existing units will remain unsafe, if the additional five units are not approved, which could be considered a safety hardship. Ms. Silverstein

SUNAPEE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT – JANUARY 4, 2024

said she believes the addition of housing supports the Master Plan. The Board discussed the desire to give Ms. Traeger more power to be a gatekeeper to provide guidance to applicants through this process.

The Board voted whether to allow the applicant the opportunity to continue the case, but it was not supported.

Ms. Silverstein moved to deny Case #VA 23-15, Parcel ID 0104-0022-0000 on behalf of Growth Cap Management, LLC, 27 Prospect Hill Road, Village Residential District, requesting a VARIANCE from Article III, Section 3.10 to reduce the 10,000 square foot requirement per dwelling unit to allow the addition of five dwelling units, reducing the 10,000 square foot requirement to 6,075 square feet.

Mr. Lyons seconded the motion.

Mr. Andrews said while the project is worthy and needed, there is no clear hardship. It is better suited for the Planning Board to decide the limits for density. Mr. Munn and Ms. Silverstein agreed.

Chair Claus said the applicant has not noted any special conditions or characteristics of the property that unfairly burden it from other properties in the area; therefore, no hardship has been established.

Mr. Lyons does not believe under the zoning definition of hardship, the criteria have been met. He is concerned about the emergency vehicle access. He is extremely concerned that this is a public safety concern and more units would exacerbate that.

A vote was taken. The motion failed. *passed*

Chair Claus recommend the applicant speak with Town Planner Marquise for more information on the Planning Board amendment.

NEW CASES

Case #VA 23-16, Parcel ID 0104-0057-0000 on behalf of Hugh & Sarah McCann, 46 Oak Ridge Road, Residential District, requesting a VARIANCE from Article III, Section 3.10 to allow an increase of 48 square feet to replace the current 6' x 8' shed with an 8' x 12' shed within the 50-foot road setback. Reducing the 50-foot setback to 30 feet.

DECISION: The variance was granted.

DISCUSSION:

Chair Claus read this and the following case into the record, as they were discussed simultaneously.

Nick Robinson appeared before the Board representing Hugh McCann. He explained they propose extending the existing shed to be longer on both sides. The owner hits his head on the roof of the shed, causing injuries. The house is built on a crawl space, as the location of the water table does not permit a basement. The footprint of the property does not allow for the shed to be placed anywhere else.

Chair Claus explained this case was continued, so the applicant could provide evidence that the shed could not be built anywhere else on the property within the setbacks. Ms. Traeger shared photographs and a

SUNAPEE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT – JANUARY 4, 2024

map of the property. Mr. Robinson explained the layout of the property, including the location of the propane tank, trees, and a stone wall.

The applicant reviewed the criteria for the variance:

1. Granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest because changing the footprint of the size of the shed will not disturb the neighbors and the new shed will look nicer.
2. If the variance were granted, the spirit of the ordinance would be observed because a new shed will not impact the environment or present neighbor concerns. It will be placed on stone.
3. Granting the variance would do substantial justice because of the limited storage availability on the property as a result of how the structure had to be built due to the water table. There is no other location suitable for storage.
4. If the variance were granted, the value of the surrounding properties would not be diminished because the new shed would be in the same location.
5. Unnecessary Hardship
 - b. 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:
 - i. No fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property because the ordinances limit other location options.
- and -
 - ii. The proposed use is a reasonable one because garden/outdoor tool storage is reasonable.

Mr. Robinson clarified the shed is rotting, so needs to be replaced. The new style will no longer present the possibility of the owner hitting his head when entering the shed.

The Board discussed possible alternate locations for the shed on the property and the setbacks. Ms. Traeger noted a special exception was granted in 2004 to allow for the current placement of the shed.

Chair Claus noted the 100-year flood line is almost to the house.

Ms. Silverstein asked about the percentage of the impervious surface. Currently, with the house and the shed, it is 14.45. The proposed level is 14.83. The limit on the shoreline is 30.

Chair Claus asked for public comment; there was none.

The Board closed public input and began deliberation.

Ms. Silverstein moved to approve Case #VA 23-16, Parcel ID 0104-0057-0000 on behalf of Hugh & Sarah McCann, 46 Oak Ridge Road, Residential District, requesting a VARIANCE from Article III, Section 3.10 to allow an increase of 48 square feet to replace the current 6' x 8' shed with an 8' x 12' shed within the 50-foot road setback, reducing the 50-foot setback to 30 feet. Mr. Munn seconded the motion.

Mr. Andrews voted to approve, based upon the hardships of this property, some of which are shared by other properties and some are not. These include the high flood plain, the small size of the parcel, the high watermarks, and the limited ability to construct on the property. What is being requested does not move closer to the front setback.

SUNAPEE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT – JANUARY 4, 2024

Mr. Munn voted to approve, as the applicant is limited by many angles and waterlines.

Chair Claus voted to approve, as all of the criteria have been met.

Ms. Silverstein voted to deny. The applicant currently has a shed and the ordinance is not designed to give relief to allow construction of a larger shed. This does not meet the criteria for hardship.

Mr. Lyons voted to deny, as it does not meet the zoning definition of a hardship. He is concerned about the buildout and if everyone does this, the road will be crowded. It does not preserve the character of the neighborhood. It does not meet the spirit of the ordinance or the public interest.

A vote was taken. The motion carried 3-2-0.

Case #VA 23-16-A, Parcel ID 0104-0057-0000 on behalf of Hugh & Sarah McCann, 46 Oak Ridge Road, Residential District, requesting a **VARIANCE** from Article III, Section 3.10 to allow an increase of 48 square feet to replace the current 6' x 8' shed with an 8' x 12' shed within the 50-foot road setback. Reducing the 15-foot setback to 6 feet.

DECISION: The variance was granted.

DISCUSSION:

(See above case)

Ms. Silverstein moved to approve Case #VA 23-16-A, Parcel ID 0104-0057-0000 on behalf of Hugh & Sarah McCann, 46 Oak Ridge Road, Residential District, requesting a **VARIANCE** from Article III, Section 3.10 to allow an increase of 48 square feet to replace the current 6' x 8' shed with an 8' x 12' shed within the 50-foot road setback. Reducing the 15-foot setback to 6 feet. Mr. Lyons seconded the motion.

The Board repeated their comments from the prior case.

A vote was taken. The motion carried 3-2-0.

Case #SE 23-04, Parcel ID 0238-0038-0000 on behalf of JACK Properties LLC, Casey D. Yantosca, 286 Nutting Road, Rural Residential District, requesting a **SPECIAL EXCEPTION** from Article IV, Section 4.95 to allow for a Short-Term Rental Owner-Not-in-Residence in the Rural Residential District.

DECISION: The special exception was granted for a **three-bedroom** residence.

DISCUSSION:

Casey Yantosca, owner/applicant, appeared before the Board. He explained they purchased this property for personal use as well as for a short-term rental. They want to make sure they are doing everything by the book, considering the current attention being paid by the Board to short-term rentals. He described

SUNAPEE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT – JANUARY 4, 2024

the property and their intent to rent to families for a minimum three-night stay. There are other short-term rentals with owner-not-in-residence in the neighborhood.

The applicant reviewed the special exception criteria:

- 1. The selected site is an appropriate location for the proposed use.** The ordinance contemplates the existence of a special exception. They will allow people to reside in the home to take advantage of the area. There are other STRs in the area that are grandfathered in, so they are not doing anything that is outside the spirit of the use of the property.
- 2. Adequate and safe highway access is provided to the proposed site and that there is adequate off-street parking provided for the proposed use.** It has a long driveway where numerous cars can park. The surrounding roads are paved and it is accessible by emergency vehicles.
- 3. Adequate method of sewage disposal is available at the proposed site.** There is a 1,750-gallon septic tank.
- 4. The proposal will not be detrimental, hazardous, or injurious to the neighborhood.** There are other STRs in the area. The prior owner of this house is the applicant's management company representative.
- 5. The proposed use is consistent with the spirit of the Ordinance and intent of the Master Plan.** Section 9 of the Master Plan, Economic Development, has sections that encourage home-based occupations and businesses, and supports mid-scale businesses and services where appropriate. There is a reference to lodging in the verbiage. This STR will bring revenue to the Town. Nothing done with this house will adversely impact the quality of the lake and the beauty of the area.

Mr. Lyons asked if the applicant would be willing to put a limit of nine people as a condition of the special exception and he agreed.

Chair Claus expressed his concern over meeting criteria 3. The Health Officer sent a letter stating that the property was approved by the state for a three-bedroom home and it is listed as a four-bedroom home. The Town assessing card lists the house with four bedrooms. The applicant noted he does not know when the permits were put in but per the DES, the code for a four-bedroom house is a 1,250-gallon septic tank. Mr. Marquise said the septic tank is not the governing factor; the leech field design is sized for a three-bedroom house. The applicant said he is limited to 120 days of rentals and his family will only stay in the house on weekends and a couple of weeks, so it will not be inhabited full time. He offered to have the septic tank pumped annually, but the Board said he cannot sidestep the bedroom limitation in this manner. Mr. Marquise said it might be possible to show an expanded design of the leech field to obtain a stamp of approval from the state for four bedrooms and recommended speaking with a designer.

The Board discussed the applicant's options and suggested moving forward with an application for a three-bedroom house, then returning with an application for a four-bedroom house, if the situation changes.

Chair Claus asked for public comment; there was none.

Ms. Silverstein moved to approve Case #SE 23-04, Parcel ID 0238-0038-0000 on behalf of JACK Properties LLC, Casey D. Yantosca, 286 Nutting Road, Rural Residential District, requesting a SPECIAL EXCEPTION from Article IV, Section 4.95 to allow for a Short-Term Rental Owner-Not-in-Residence in the Rural Residential District, reviewing the special exception criteria: the selected site is an appropriate location for the proposed use; adequate and safe highway access is provided to the proposed site and that there is adequate off-street parking provided for the proposed use; adequate method of sewage disposal is available at the proposed site for a three-bedroom residence, which would limit the

SUNAPEE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT – JANUARY 4, 2024

occupancy to two per bedroom plus one for a total of seven; the proposal will not be detrimental, hazardous, or injurious to the neighborhood; and the proposed use is consistent with the spirit of the Ordinance and intent of the Master Plan. Mr. Lyons seconded the motion. A vote was taken, the motion carried unanimously.

Case #VA 23-17, Parcel ID 0104-0001-0000 on behalf of Kimberly & Robert Hofeldt, 1040 Main Street, Village Commercial District, requesting a **VARIANCE** from Article III, Section 3.10 to allow a 16' x 30' deck to be built within the 75-foot road setback, reducing the road setback to 67 feet.

DECISION: The variance was granted.

DISCUSSION:

Kimberly and Bob Hofeldt appeared before the Board to present their plan to build a deck on the back side of their house. The deck will be 30' x 12', which is changed from the original proposal of 30' x 16'.

Mrs. Hofeldt reviewed the criteria for the variance:

1. Granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest because while it is 8 feet within the 75-foot setback requirement to Route 11, by reason of exceptional topographical conditions and the elevation from Route 11 to the property, the deck will be virtually unseen from the road, thus not altering the essential character of the neighborhood or threatening public health, safety, or welfare or otherwise injuring public rights.
2. If the variance were granted, the spirit of the ordinance would be observed because while they understand it is in the public's best interest to uphold the spirit of the ordinance, they strongly believe building this deck will have no adverse impact.
3. Granting the variance would do substantial justice because no harm will come to the general public or abutters. Due to the lot shape and being surrounded on three sides by roads, this is the only feasible location for the deck. It also aids in the creation of the stormwater management plan, which will shed water away from the foundation of the home.
4. If the variance were granted, the value of the surrounding properties would not be diminished because the proposed deck cannot be seen from or across Route 11. The one abutting property that will be able to see the deck will be greatly improved with a beautiful deck.
5. Unnecessary Hardship
 - c. 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:
 - i. No fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property because due to this property's unique location, its proximity/elevation from Route 11, the 0.29-acre size of the lot, and the property being surrounded by three roads, the zoning restriction as applied to this property does not serve the purpose in a fair and substantial way.

- and -
 - ii. The proposed use is a reasonable one because it does not conflict with the explicit or implicit purpose of the ordinance, does not alter the character of the neighborhood, and does not threaten the health, safety, or welfare of the public. It will allow the

SUNAPEE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT – JANUARY 4, 2024

owner to improve the area by creating a stormwater management plan while creating an outdoor living space.

Mr. Andrews clarified there is a water problem in the basement, so the water management system is needed; however, the deck is a separate issue. The water management system is being incorporated into the deck construction. Mr. Hofeldt explained he has tried to mitigate the water problems in the basement, with little success. He hopes constructing a deck with a gutter system will solve the problem.

Mrs. Hofeldt noted that due to being within 200 feet of Otter Brook and their proposed footprint being less than 30% impervious, they have worked with the DES to establish a stormwater management plan. She also shared the DES Shoreline Permit by Notification and the criteria to obtain this. She noted they meet the required setback from Cooper Street, but not from Route 11. She explained that 33% of the deck would be outside the setback.

Mr. Andrews noted an abutter has voiced a concern regarding water running across Route 11 and carrying oil, gas, and pollutants into Lake Sunapee. Mr. Hofeldt said the water is being diverted into dry wells and Mrs. Hofeldt pointed out the location of the dry wells.

Ms. Silverstein noted the plans were designed for a 30' x 16' deck, not a 30' x 12' deck. Mrs. Hofeldt said they notified the state and were not required to make any changes, since the size decreased.

Chair Claus asked for public comment; there was none.

The Board closed public input and began deliberation.

The Board discussed the possible hardship, including the slope of the property, the location of the house on the property, the drainage issue, and the stormwater management system. They noted the other properties surrounded by three roads are not impacted by the road setbacks like this site is.

Ms. Silverstein moved to approve Case #VA 23-17, Parcel ID 0104-0001-0000 on behalf of Kimberly & Robert Hofeldt, 1040 Main Street, Village Commercial District, requesting a VARIANCE from Article III, Section 3.10 to allow a 12' x 30' deck to be built within the 75-foot road setback, reducing the road setback to 67 feet. Mr. Lyons seconded the motion.

Mr. Andrews voted to approve, based on the hardships of being surrounded by a number of streets, the steep slope in the back, and the water issues. The design to handle the runoff will prevent pollutants crossing Route 11 and going into Lake Sunapee. Mr. Munn and Ms. Silverstein agreed.

Chair Claus voted to approve, as they met the five criteria.

Mr. Lyons voted to approve.

A vote was taken, the motion carried unanimously.

Case #VA 23-18, Parcel ID 0149-0030-0000 on behalf of Kimberly & Scott Rouleau, 775 Route 103, Rural Residential District, requesting a VARIANCE from Article III, Section 3.10 to reduce the 15-foot side setback to 11' 2" for an addition to a preexisting nonconforming structure.

SUNAPEE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT – JANUARY 4, 2024

DECISION: The variance was granted.

DISCUSSION:

Chair Claus read both of these cases into the record, as they were discussed simultaneously.

Eric Buck of Terrain Landscaping and Design, LLC, appeared before the Board, representing property owners Mr. and Mrs. Rouleau. He presented the proposal, which is to demolish the existing house and construct a new one on the same footprint, adding a small garage. The existing house is within the side yard setback. They will stay within the height/width/length dimensions of the existing house. The shed will be relocated within the side yard lot lines. They will be adding a stormwater management system to collect runoff from the buildings. The impervious surface will be reduced by making the driveway impermeable. They have their DES shoreline permit and are moving forward with the septic redesign application.

The Board discussed reducing the size of the proposed garage or changing the orientation to remain outside the setbacks. Mr. Andrews clarified the hardship is the narrow shape of the lot, as it offers a small buildable area.

Chair Claus asked for public comment; there was none.

Mr. Buck reviewed the criteria for the variance:

1. Granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest because the proposal does not alter the essential character of the neighborhood. It is consistent with the residential district and does not threaten public health, safety, or welfare.
2. If the variance were granted, the spirit of the ordinance would be observed because it is not impacting public health, safety, or welfare. The essential character of the neighborhood and the Route 103 corridor is being upheld.
3. Granting the variance would do substantial justice because it would allow for a modern home to serve the family's needs, allow for better stormwater filtration, and reduce the overall impervious surface.
4. If the variance were granted, the value of the surrounding properties would not be diminished because the new construction will be done tastefully and in a way that would hopefully add value to the neighborhood.
5. Unnecessary Hardship
 - d. 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:
 - i. No fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property because the lot is long and skinny. The minimum lot size in the zoning district is 1.5 acres; this lot is .25 acres.
- and -
 - ii. The proposed use is a reasonable one because they plan to reconstruct a house that has been on the property since 1965.

Mr. Buck noted the wetlands that create the restriction are not on their property.

SUNAPEE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT – JANUARY 4, 2024

The Board closed public input and began deliberation.

The Board noted the lot is smaller than the surrounding lots and the setbacks create limitations. Ms. Silverstein said there are a number of hardships presented by this lot.

Ms. Silverstein moved to approve Case #VA 23-18, Parcel ID 0149-0030-0000 on behalf of Kimberly & Scott Rouleau, 775 Route 103, Rural Residential District, requesting a VARIANCE from Article III, Section 3.10 to reduce the 15-foot side setback to 11' 2" for an addition to a preexisting nonconforming structure. The variance is relevant to the east side of the property as presented in the application. Mr. Munn seconded the motion.

Mr. Andrews voted to approve, as the size and shape of the lot presents a hardship.

Mr. Munn voted to approve, as the lot presents difficult restrictions.

Chair Claus voted to approve, as the unique shape and location of the adjacent wetlands present a hardship.

Ms. Silverstein voted to approve, as the lot is only 50 feet wide and the surrounding lots are significantly larger, so the buildable envelope is only 20 feet wide, with wetlands on the east side of the property.

Mr. Lyons voted to approve.

A vote was taken. All were in favor. The motion carried unanimously.

Case #VA 23-19, Parcel ID 0149-0030-0000 on behalf of Kimberly & Scott Rouleau, 775 Route 103, Rural Residential District, requesting a VARIANCE from Article II, Section 2.30 to reduce the 25' wetland setback to 18' 8" with a total of 375 square feet to be within the 25' setback.

DECISION: The variance was granted.

DISCUSSION:

(See above case)

Ms. Silverstein moved to approve Case #VA 23-19, Parcel ID 0149-0030-0000 on behalf of Kimberly & Scott Rouleau, 775 Route 103, Rural Residential District, requesting a VARIANCE from Article II, Section 2.30 to reduce the 25' wetland setback to 18' 8" with a total of 375 square feet to be within the 25' setback on the east side of the property as depicted on the plan presented. Mr. Lyons seconded the motion.

The Board members voted to approve, for the reasons stated in the prior case.

A vote was taken. All were in favor. The motion carried unanimously.

MISCELLANEOUS

SUNAPEE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT – JANUARY 4, 2024

OPEN BOARD POSITIONS: Chair Claus noted the terms of Mr. Lyons and Mr. Munn are expiring.

Mr. Munn announced he is retiring from the Board and his occupation. Mr. Lyons announced he is also retiring from the Board. Chair Claus thanked them for their service on the Board.

Ms. Traeger said anyone interested in running for office must declare with the Town Clerk between January 24 and February 2 to appear on the ballot.

Ms. Silverstein asked the alternates to let the Board know if they intend to run for the open positions, so they can backfill the alternate positions. They indicated two of the three alternates intend to run.

CHANGING RULES AND PROCEDURES: Chair Claus said the Board would like to revise the rules and procedures to give Ms. Traeger more power as a gatekeeper. Ms. Traeger described the changes she has made to the application forms and will share them with the Board to review.

Mr. Murphy noted that none of the applicants at this meeting answered the hardship criteria adequately. He asked where the disconnect is and what the Board can do to improve this. Ms. Traeger said she refers applicants to materials that explain the requirements as well as examples of similar cases. She noted that if the form is online, a link could be provided that describes the requirements for a variance.

The Board agreed they will continue to work on improving the application, but also are comfortable with helping applicants understand the requirements.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Lyons made a motion to adjourn at 9:27 p.m. Mr. Munn seconded the motion. A vote was taken, all were in favor. The motion carried unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 9:27 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Hanggeli
Recording Secretary

Jeff Claus, Chair

Michael Jewczyn

David Andrews

Chris Murphy

Jamie Silverstein

Jim Lyons

David Munn

Pierre Lessard