

OSSIPEE PLANNING BOARD
Proposed Zoning Ordinance Changes
PUBLIC HEARING
Followed by
MEETING MINUTES
January 17, 2017

Minutes recorded and transcribed by Laura Nash, Planning Board Secretary, amendments are noted by ***bold/italic*** type.

Live Recording of meeting can also be found on <http://www.governmentoversite.com>.

Call to Order: Acting Chairman, Connie Billings called the Public Hearing to order at 7:00 PM.

Attendance by roll call: Connie Billings – Vice Chairman, Bob Gillette, Roy Barron, Dennis Legendre, Bruce Parsons, Rick St. Jean (Alternate) and Steve McConarty (ZEO). **Absent:** Frank Riley, Selectmen's Rep. and Ski Kwiatkowski – Chairman **Guest:** Richard Sager, Town Attorney

Chairman, Connie B., raised Rick St. Jean to voting status in place of Ski K. and Rick Morgan, Selectmen Rep. in place of Frank Riley.

Connie B. informed the attending public that the Planning Board meeting will commence after the Public Hearing.

Public Hearing on Petitions

Connie B. proceeded to read the first petition up for discussion.

- Are you in favor of the adoption of RSA 674:71, RSA 674:72 and RSA 674:73, the Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) RSA 674 shall be effective June 1, 2017? The ADU's shall comply with all sections of the Ossipee Zoning Ordinance.

Point of Order:

Bob G. called for point of order. Inciting Connie B. stepped down from this discussion since he is a co-signer of this petition. Connie B. replied he is only introducing the petition for discussion.

Connie B. acknowledged he is signer on this petition.

Public Discussion is Open:

Rick Morgan stepped in and gave an explanation and description of ADU's. By Law June 1, 2017, ADU's (Accessory Dwelling Units) go into effect and all Towns are mandated to adopt these three laws into their Zoning Ordinances. Morgan stated he too signed the petition with mixed reserves. But the Selectmen have provided some guidelines along with the Zoning Enforcement Officer to the Planning Board for consideration.

Nash clarified the new RSA laws is actually three laws not two. The law states that Town's need to adopt RSA 674:71 is the definition of an ADU. RSA 674:72 lays out the specifics for, ATTACHED ADU, and RSA 674:73 which provides the municipalities the option of adopting DETACHED ADU's.

Gillette stated that towns are not required to adopt detach ADU's and speculates there are no other surrounding towns adopting detached ADU's.

Lindsey Lord is there a limitation of how many ADU's are allowed. Gillette replied one.

Dallas Emory asked isn't it already allowed with a Special Exception through the ZBA. Connie answered sort of. If someone tears down a garage with existing living space above, the owner can rebuild with a Special Exception through the ZBA.

Joe Deighan commented on items listed from the NH Municipal Assoc. seminar on ADU's he attended. Noting minimum size 750 square feet and maximum size 1,000 square feet. Must be in all districts and can be permitted through 1) As a Matter of Right, 2) By Special Exception, and 3) Conditional Use permit. Morgan agreed but the rules need to be consistent for everybody. Deighan would also like to see that the RSA 674:72 VII - ADU maintains the aesthetic continuity with the principal dwelling unit.

Gillette clarified with Connie that the only thing on the petition is the adoption of RSA 674:71, 674:72 and 674:73 as written by the State with no other opinions per the discussions. Connie explained the only reason the petition was created was because the Planning Board members could not and have not come to an agreement on ADU's and the only way to get it on the ballot is by petition.

Jonathan Smith questioned the Board about the petition is to adopt the RSA's as written and then come back to revise them by June. Connie explain the petition will be on the ballot as written but there will also be an additional warrant article to adopt the listed restrictions.

Deighan suggested of just adopting the RSA 674:71, 674:72 and 674:73 as is and then come back to make changes. Several Board members erupted stating it would never get done. They have been working to get this far for three years.

Brief discussion addressing the young people population and housing issues within Ossipee was had. Morgan noted the only reason the Legislature got involved and passed by the Legislature is because it's an issue State wide and Planning Boards, like this one, have not been able to agree on a solution.

Dallas Emory addressed the requirements in RSA 674:71 and questioned if whoever wants to build an ADU could put a separate septic system. Connie replied yes. Roy addressed homeowners would still have to meet current Zoning Ordinances but was contradicted by Gillette and McConarty, who stated the State does not force you to have a separate septic system.

Dallas Emory asked what if we don't adopt and of these what happens. Connie and Gillette stated RSA 674:71 and 674:72 would go into effect for Attached ADU's and detached ADU's would not be adopted.

Cheryl Sawyer asked the petition is detached ADU's to go to the voters. Connie replied yes.

Bruce Parson said the focus is on detached ADU's and why not have two separate warrant articles one for attached and one for detached. Morgan stated that's what the Selectmen have done by creating middle ground guidelines instead of doing all or nothing.

Board discussion over number of attached ADU's allowable under 674:72 (I). Gillette read the Articles of 674:72 for clarity.

Sam Martin questioned since the law states "may", is it up to the PB to place the restrictions and limitations. Connie B. replied no, it's up to the Town voters to approve or deny the recommended restrictions submitted by the Zoning Enforcement Officer. Otherwise, the new laws are very broad.

Rick Morgan clarified some of the confusion by explaining the difference between the State Law, the Petition and the Amendments.

State Law: 674:71, 674:72 and 674:73 – if the Town does nothing these laws go into effect as their stated, no restrictions and allows attached ADU's in every district zone. The Selectmen have provided to the

PB with a list of reasonable restrictions on ADU's. If the PB does nothing, none of the restrictions proposed by the ZEO & Selectmen will be in effect.

Parsons and Morgan stated once the Board votes on the petition, the Board would then create a separate warrant article with the proposed restriction, then have a second hearing on the restrictions only and then both the petition and warrant article would go to the voters.

Marie McConarty asked if the Board was going to let the public what restrictions are being suggested. Connie, Gillette and Morgan agreed the discussion would take place to night and a decision will be made on which restrictions to accept. But a second hearing will be on January 31st for voting by the Planning Board to recommend or not.

Sam Martin questioned how abutters would be notified. Steve McConarty stated anything over 1,000 square feet he would like to see it go before the ZBA for a Special Exception. Otherwise, abutters are not notified.

Discussion ensued over how many warrant articles there is going to be on ADU's, will it be one for attached and one for detached. One for the petition and one for the restrictions. Connie replied there will be one for the petition because by law it has to go to the voters. But there will be a second warrant article covering the restrictions for attached and detached ADU's.

Rick Sager, Town Attorney spoke about not being in favor of the petition because it will allow detached ADU's without any regulations on them. RSA 674:73 for detached ADU's the Municipality assumed if the Towns were going to allow detached ADU's, the Municipality would have put more restrictions on them. Sager introduced Steve McConarty's ADU Regulations and suggested the Board start talking about it instead of around it. Connie stated the Board is in discussion over the petition only at this point.

Connie closed the discussion on the petition.

Motion by Gillette move to not recommend the adoption of RSA 674:71, 674:72 and 674:73 the Accessory Dwelling Units. Seconded by Dennis Legendre. Parsons, Legendre, Morgan, Gillette voted in favor. St. Jean voted in opposition. **Motion passed 4 -1.** Barron and Billings abstained from voting as signers of the petition.

PETITION #2

Connie asked Gillette to read the petition:

- Pursuant to RSA 675:4 - To see if the Town will vote to amend Article 3.2 Zoning Map of the Ossipee Zoning Ordinance to change the zoning classification of Tax Map 8, Lot 22 from Village District to Roadside Commercial District.

Ash Fischbein addressed the petition. Gillette asked Ash what is the intended use of the property under Roadside Commercial zoning that they're not allowed to do now. Ash provided potential ideas and options to the Board and attending public of possible lot merger, outdoor events, non-profit fundraising opportunities, outdoor beer-fest, outside goal is to bring more dollars into the Town.

Gillette made a statement of not confusing the hearing of this petition with the Planning Board hearing criteria's for a Site Plan Review. Gillette ask Sager to provide input, which he agreed, the discussion tonight is for recommending or not recommending this petition by the Planning Board.

Francis Lord introduced and read a letter signed by residents of Covered Bridge Rd. opposing the zoning changed for the proposed lot. Mr. Lord feels it will ruin the tranquility of the area. Gillette explained this area is listed in the Village District and as such, it already has certain approval for Commercial activities.

Greg Howard referenced other businesses that have taken place down on Covered Bridge Rd over the years. He suggested if the residents are concerned with keeping the area a residential area would they be willing to put a Deed Restriction on their parcels to keep it residential zoning.

Gillette read the commercial uses permitted for this area of Village District zoning.

Lindsay Lord spoke as a business owner, Hobbs has newspaper advertising for not-for profit uses of the building and feels there are already several locations in Town to accommodate such uses. But main concern is for safety of the area with customers parking up and down the street, drinking and partying.

Ash Fischbein addressed the concerns of traffic, noise and having other events there will no issues of complaints. Ash states he has a letter from Chief Eldridge indicating no incidents down Covered Bridge Rd. during events. Is actively bringing businesses to Town, finding investors, and trying to lower the tax base. Ash brought attention to the fact NHDOT will be adding a traffic light at the intersection Routes 16 and 41 and to align with Covered Bridge Rd.

Kathy Lord rebutted Ash Fischbein comments.

Morgan and Fischbein exchanged interpretations of Zoning Articles 34.2 and 35.2 for Outdoor Events. Morgan again asked what is it that you cannot do now under Village District as the reasoning to change the area to Road-side Commercial.

Francis Lord addressed issues with trash littering and trespassing to get down to the lake.

Connie, Roy, Morgan inquired about parking. The Board asked for Rick Sager's opinion.

Sager gave a comparison of Uses Allowed verses Not Allowed in the Village District and Roadside Commercial and did not see a lot of difference. But if they go for a Site Plan Review, they would have a form that spreads over two districts which may present a problem with the Planning Board. Sager felt by the owners having plans for the use of the property in the future is not what the Board should be looking at right now.

Bruce Parsons demanded that Connie or Gillette read the differences between uses allowed verses not allowed between the Village District and Roadside Commercial. Ash commented the only difference is Article 4.4 Structures and Uses per Lot. Rick Sager read Article 4.4 and noted the only difference was

Terry Bryant spoke of having no problem with the private events Hobbs has held. But when they want to hold general public outdoor events to make money.

Roy noted if the only difference is the structures and every other use is permitted then why the need to change the district.

Greg Howard questioned why the need for all the specifics for what Ash wants to do with the property. The focus should be on the merits of the petition not all the other specifics being asked. Roy B explained there is no difference the Board always specifically ask why the change, what the benefit is and what the benefit is not. It's the Board jobs to way both sides of the story and make a recommendation.

Bruce made note no decision will be made tonight. The Board can only recommend or not recommend the petition to the voters. The final decision is up to Town's people when they go and vote.

Sam Martin noted the underlying tone is being able to merge the two lots.

Ash Fischbein replied by changing the zoning it gives them the flexibility. As a business flexibility is key, it's very large building with outdoor seating and with that comes a very large tax base. We need to make money

for every square footage of space. If the lots were together, it would make it easier. All we want to do is make a difference in the Town.

Roy reiterated the fact that everyone has to provide their argument for why the change.

Ash Fischbein stated his two final arguments of wanting hold concerts, outdoor events, and beer fest. It just doesn't seem to be what you want to hear. Thanked everyone for their time and read a letter written up by the Ossipee Chamber of Commerce.

Mark McConarty asked if Case #16 – 7 – SPR for Valley Point would be heard tonight. Connie stated it has been continued until February 7, 2017 at 7:00 PM.

Motion by Gillette to move to recommend the change because the owner of the largest employer in town says it will enhance the viability of that business. No one seconded the motion. The Chairman called the motion dead because as stated by Gillette, just because he is one of the large employers in town does not mean the Board changes its process to accommodate them.

Motion by Roy Barron to make a motion to not recommend at this time.
Connie noted he has to make a recommendation either way.

Motion by Roy Barron move to not recommend the Town to amend Article 3.2 Zoning Map of the Ossipee Zoning Ordinance to change the zoning classification of Tax Map 8, Lot 22 from Village District to Roadside Commercial District. Seconded by Rick St. Jean. Roll call vote was taken.

Connie – A, Bruce – Y, Dennis – Y, Roy – Y, Rick Morgan – Y, Bob G. – N, Rick St. Jean - Y
Motion passed as not recommended by the Planning Board by a vote of 5 – Yes, 1 – No, and 1 – Abstained.

4.2 FIRE RUINED BUILDINGS

No owner or occupant of land in any district shall permit fire or other ruins which are uninhabitable to be left indefinitely, but within one (1) year **(two (2) years)** shall remove or refill the same to clear ground level or shall repair, build or replace the structure.

Per RSA 674:28, III change 1 year to 2 years

4.3 HEIGHT REGULATIONS

The building height for all buildings whose primary use is residential shall not exceed two and one-half (2-1/2) stories, or thirty-five (35) feet, whichever is less. The building height for all buildings, whose primary use is non-residential, shall not exceed three stories, or thirty-five (35) feet, whichever is less. These height limitations do not apply to domestic radio and television antennas, silos for storage of feed crops, church towers, water storage structures, chimneys, or wind operated devices. ***Per RSA 674:28, II and 674:25, IV, (d)***

(Striking underlined and italicized from description)

4.4 (a): Structures and Uses per Lot - Amend second sentence to read, “An accessory structure may be permitted on the premises consistent with the use of the principal structure; an accessory structure intended for use or occupancy as a dwelling must comply with regulations pertaining thereto.” Per RSA 674:71, 674:72, and 674:73

9.5 EXPIRATION OF APPROVAL

If the industrial use has not commenced within one (1) year, **(2) years**, the approval for such use shall be null and void. ***Per RSA 674:28, III change 1 year to 2 years***

9.6 DISCONTINUANCE; EFFECT

If the Industrial use is discontinued for one (1) year, (2) years, the land reverts back to the original Zoning District.
Per RSA 674:28, III change 1 year to 2 years

Board discussion over interpretation of this law as written ensued. Sager gave an example of if someone seeks a variance to start up an industrial use and later abandons said industrial use for more than two years, the variance would be null and void and the property would revert to its previous status. After discussion with the Board, Sager suggested changing the wording to state:

“9.6 DISCONTINUANCE; EFFECT

If the Industrial use is discontinued for (2) years, said use shall be deemed abandoned”

Motion by Connie B. Seconded by Roy B. to approve Articles 4.2, 4.3, 4.4 and 9.5 as amended. A Unanimous vote was taken.

Connie B. announced discussion and approval of Article 9.6 will take place at the next Public Hearing on January 30, 2017 at 7:00 PM at the Freight House. Planning Board members agreed.

Connie as Chairman called for closing the Public Hearing at 9:14 PM.

Planning Board Meeting

Connie as Chairman Called to Order the Planning Board Meeting at 9:15 PM.

Meeting Minutes: Review and approve Meeting Minutes of 01/03/2017

Motion by Roy B. and seconded by Rick St. Jean to approve the minutes of 01/03/2017 as written. No further discussion. All voted in favor by show of hands.

Unsatisfied Conditions: (continued from previous PB Mtgs) Status Quo

Board	Date	Applicant	List of Conditions
PB	11/03/15	LBWD	Ltr. stating manufacturing/light industry only. – To be sent by PB
PB	09/20/2016	WWSCR-Northgate Ossipee, LLC	SPR granted pending remaining conditions: Pending #1: Water Supply Approval
PB	09/20/2016	WWSCR-Northgate Ossipee, LLC	SPR granted pending remaining conditions: Pending #2: Subdivision Approval
PB	09/20/2016	WWSCR-Northgate Ossipee, LLC	SPR granted pending remaining conditions: Pending #3: NHDES Septic Approval

New Business:

- **Case# 17-1-BLA:** Arnie Martel c/o Mar-Cor, LLC and Ossipee Agg. Corp. Tax Map: 277 Lot: 4, 278/2&3 and Wolfeboro 48/9 JBE 15128.

Motion by Connie B. and seconded by Roy B. to accept the application as complete. No further discussion. All voted in favor by show of hands.

Bradford Jones of Jones & Beach Engineering, Inc. presented the case for the Boundary Line Adjustment for Arnie Martel c/o Mar-Cor, LLC and Ossipee Aggregate. Corp. The new boundary line will split tax map 278 Lot 2 in order to square up tax map 277 lot 4 and tax map 278 lot 3.

Motion by Connie B. and seconded by Roy B. to approve the Boundary Line Adjustment. No further discussion. All voted in favor by show of hands.

- **Case # 16-7-SPR:** (Email received 01/15/2017 requesting a continuance until 02/07/2017) Valley Point, LLC c/o White Mtn Survey, Tax Map: 7 Lot: 11. Build a 5,000 sq. ft. convenient store w/ 25 parking spaces, drive-up window for coffee & prepackaged food, 8 - fuel pumps.

Motion by Roy B. and seconded by Bob G. to approve the request for continuance until February 7, 2017. No further discussion. All voted in favor by show of hands.

Old Business:

- **Plan NH – Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU's):** Steve McConarty presented to the Board the regulations drafted by the Zoning Enforcement Officer and the Board of Selectmen.

Amendments:

Accessory Dwelling Unit Regulations:

Accessory Dwelling Unit is a secondary Dwelling Unit* (a) attached and subordinate to a SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING** or (b) Detached and subordinate to a SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING**.

Section

Where permitted, an accessory dwelling unit shall comply with the following:

1. A maximum of one (1) ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT (ADU) per property is permitted. An ADU shall not be permitted on property where more than one DWELLING UNIT currently exists.
2. Exterior ALTERATIONS, enlargements, or extensions of the SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING or detached ACCESSORY STRUCTURE are permitted in order to accommodate the ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT. However, no such change is permitted which would ALTER the appearance of the SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING to look like a duplex or any other multi-family STRUCTURE (i.e. the house should not look like it was designed to occupy more than one family). The construction of any access ways into the house and/or detached structure which are required for access to the ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT shall be located to the side or rear of the BUILDING whenever possible.
3. An ADU shall have an area of no less than three hundred (300) square feet and no greater than one thousand (1,000) square feet.
4. A minimum of one dedicated OFF-STREET PARKING space shall be provided for the ADU.
5. The SINGLE – FAMILY DWELLING (and detached ACCESSORY STRUCTURE, when applicable) and LOT shall not be converted to a condominium or any other form of legal ownership distinct from the ownership of the SINGLE – FAMILY DWELLING. In order to ensure compliance with this requirement, the property owner/s at the time the ADU is established shall be required to execute a restrictive covenant running in favor of the Town, which shall be recorded in the Carroll County Registry of Deeds and a copy of which shall be provided to the Planning and Community Development and the Tax Assessor prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.
6. The property owner/s must occupy one of the two DWELLING UNITs. Electric, water and sewer utilities shall be metered on a single bill.

7. Where municipal sewer service is not provided, the septic system shall meet NH Water Supply and Pollution Control Division requirements for the combined system demand for total occupancy of the premises.
8. A certificate of use by the Zoning Administrator is required to verify conformance with the preceding standards.

***DWELLING UNIT** means a building or entirely self-contained portion thereof containing complete housekeeping facilities not in common with any other DWELLING UNIT, except for vestibules, entrance halls, porches or hallways.

**** DWELLING, SINGLE – FAMILY** means a detached building containing one (1) DWELLING UNIT only.

Board discussion ensued over whether the amended regulations would take precedence over the petition. Consensus was it will be two different warrant articles and will stand on their own merits.

Roy B. questioned #6 of the regulations if the owner passes away and the next of kin sells the property, what happens with the ADU? Discussions ensued of not being able to address every scenario and the Boards will have to amend the zoning ordinance as the situations arise.

Dennis L. questioned #3 pertaining to minimum size of no less than 300 square feet.

Gillette read Rick Sager's suggested changes to the wording on some of the regulations as follows:

#4. To add (shall be provided for *each bedroom* in the ADU)

#5. Delete the first sentence and start the amended regulation with *"The property owner/s at the time the ADU is established shall be required to execute a restrictive covenant running in favor of the Town, which shall be recorded in the Carroll County Registry of Deeds and a copy of which shall be provided to the Planning **Board** and Tax Assessor prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy."*

Roy B. contested having utilities on one bill. After discussion, the Board agreed to delete second sentence.

#6. Delete second sentence - *Electric, water and sewer utilities shall be metered on a single bill.*

Connie and Morgan discussed scenarios of owner occupy if the property owner is through a Trust or LLC and how to enforce owner occupy. Steve McConarty suggested implementing these regulations and they can be revised each year in the future but the Town needs to have a starting guideline of regulations.

#8. Delete entirely.

Delete entirely - **DWELLING UNIT means a building or entirely self-contained portion thereof containing complete housekeeping facilities not in common with any other DWELLING UNIT, except for vestibules, entrance halls, porches or hallways.*

Delete entirely - *** DWELLING, SINGLE – FAMILY means a detached building containing one (1) DWELLING UNIT only.*

Open to Public Discussion:

Carol Gartland noted this is a tough decision because either way someone may get hurt and someone will benefit. But the Town needs housing and limiting to one ADU will help to prevent ruining the Town. Connie noted there are factors that will limit ADU's. 1. Based on lot size because of setbacks. 2. Money, more attending residents disagreed with this factor.

Greg Howard noted if you have a check list of regulations along with the current Zoning Ordinances, the Board would have created a basis to start with. It's better than not having regulations. Morgan said that's exactly what the Selectmen have proposed by limiting to one ADU per lot and architecturally designed with the primary dwelling.

Sam Martin commented on #6 for owner occupy. She would prefer to have the regulations in place and be able to remove or change later than trying to implement rule after the fact. Heated discussion ensued.

Dennis L. stated having Zoning Ordinances in place is fine. But if you do not have policies and fines to levy in place to enforce the violators, then what useful are the regulations. Connie gave an example to Dennis but Morgan stepped in and noted you can "what if" but you are not going to be able to address every scenario.

Motion by Bruce P. to move to adopt the Accessory Dwelling Unit Rules to whatever we put forward as amended by Rick Sager. Seconded by Dennis but Dennis ask Steve McConarty if he is satisfied with the way it's written and satisfied it will provided him with a guidance.

Discussion opened:

Ted appears to be a conflict with #3 of the proposed regulations and 674:72 VII for minimum size of ADU allowable. Morgan stated the State says you cannot put a cap of less than 750. But Steve McConarty is proposing a no less than 300 square feet and a maximum size of no more than 1,000 square feet.

Bruce P. and Bob G. requested to end the discussion and move for a vote. Connie called for a vote. Requested the secretary to re-read the motion. Gillette voiced his interpretation of the motion. Connie stated Parsons made the motion he needs to re-state it. Disagreement ensued over how it was worded and Gillette tried to insert other wording and Zoning Ordinance article 35.1 into the ADU amendments. Connie and others explicitly told him he cannot make any changes because Parsons made the motion.

Parson restated his motion. **Motion** by Bruce P. to move to adopt the Accessory Dwelling Unit Rules to whatever we put forward as amended by Rick Sager. Seconded by Dennis. Connie stated a Yes vote to accept the Amendment and a No vote if you do not accept the Amendments. A Roll Call vote was taken.

Rick St. Jean – Yes, Bob – Yes, Rick Morgan – Yes, Roy – Abstain, Dennis – Yes, Bruce – Yes, Connie – Abstained. Motion passed 5 – 0 with 2 Abstaining.

Bruce questioned if there will be a separate article to accept detached ADU's. Connie and Steve told Bruce detached ADU's was part of the ADU Amendment Regulation he just motioned for a vote and passed.

Article 35.1 (a) (1) the Board declined to put forward.

- **Master Plan 2016 Revision** – Work Group Committee: Bob Gillette, Rick St. Jean, And Dennis Legendre: No Update
- **Jones & Beach Engineers, Inc.** invoice = \$6,679.75: Bob G., read his letter to the Board. **Motion** by Roy B. and seconded by Bob G. to have secretary generate a formal letter and send to Jonathan Ring at Jones & Beach. No further discussion. A unanimous vote was taken.

Any Other Business Which May Come Before This Meeting

- LRPC Invoice: Land and Use Books in the amount of \$153.00 to approve the amount of \$90.00 for PB portion of bill. **Motion** by Connie B. and seconded by Bob G. to approve payment in the amount of \$90.00 for the PB portion of \$153.00 to LRPC for the purchase of 2016 – 2017 edition of the Land and Use Books. No further discussion. A unanimous vote was taken.

- ZBA – NOD – Town of Freedom, BOS: Request for Administrative Appeal – Denied, Estate of Young & Sloan: Request for Variance Granted, Jarmoc: Request for Variance – Denied, American Campground: Request for Variance – Granted. Connie read the Notice of Decisions to the Board for information purposes only.

Adjournment

Motion by Roy B., seconded by Rick, to adjourn the meeting.

All voted in favor by show of hands.

The meeting adjourned at 10:19 PM

Public Hearing # 2: January 31, 2017 @ 7:00 PM

Next Meeting: February 7, 2017 @ 7:00 PM

Minutes approved by majority vote of the Board on – _____
Date

Condict (Connie) Billings, Chairman