

TOWN OF ALTON
ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

MINUTES
Public Hearing
October 4, 2012
Approved 11/1/12

- **CALL TO ORDER**

Tim Morgan, Vice-Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:10 p.m. Tim Kinnon, Chair, was not in attendance at this meeting.

- **INTRODUCTION OF PLANNING DEPARTMENT AND ZONING BOARD MEMBERS**

Tim Morgan, Acting Chair, introduced himself, the Planning Department Representatives, and the members of the Zoning Board of Adjustment:

Ken McWilliams, Planner, Town of Alton
John Dever, Building Inspector and Code Enforcement Officer
Paul Monziona, Member
Lou LaCourse, Member
Steve Miller, Member
Paul Larochele, Alternate

- **APPOINTMENT OF ALTERNATES**

S. Miller made a motion to appoint Paul Larochele as an acting member for this meeting. Lou LaCourse seconded the motion which passed with four votes in favor, none opposed, and no abstentions.

T. Morgan explained that this meeting will end at 10:00 p.m.

- **STATEMENT OF THE APPEAL PROCESS**

The purpose of this hearing is to allow anyone concerned with an Appeal to the Board of Adjustment to present evidence for or against the Appeal. This evidence may be in the form of an opinion rather than an established fact, however, it should support the grounds which the Board must consider when making a determination. The purpose of the hearing is not to gauge the sentiment of the public or to hear personal reasons why individuals are for or against an appeal but all facts and opinions based on reasonable assumptions will be considered. In the case of an appeal for a variance, the Board must determine facts bearing upon the five criteria as set forth in the State's Statutes. For a special exception, the Board must ascertain whether each of the standards set forth in the Zoning Ordinance has been or will be met.

- **APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

Under Other Business, New Business, Upcoming Workshop was added.

S. Miller made a motion to approve the agenda as amended. P. Monziona seconded the motion which passed with five votes in favor, none opposed, and no abstentions.

- **NEW APPLICATIONS – ACCEPTANCE OF APPLICATIONS**

Due to the number of cases on the agenda, the Board at this time reviewed the two new applications for completeness; if any application were to be found incomplete, that would free the applicant from the burden of staying through the entire meeting.

The Board reviewed the application for Case #Z12-17, Richard and Pamela Ulrich, for completeness.

P. Monziona made a motion to accept the application for Case #Z12-17 as complete. L. LaCourse seconded the motion which passed with five votes in favor, none opposed and no abstentions.

The Board reviewed the application for Case #Z12-16, Robert H. Carlton, for completeness.

P. Monziona made a motion to accept the application for Case #Z12-16 as complete. P. Larochelle seconded the motion which passed with five votes in favor, none opposed and no abstentions.

- **CONTINUED APPLICATIONS**

Case #Z12-12 West Alton Marina Road	Appeal of Administrative Decision Map 17 Lot 11	Fortier, Tibbetts, & Fortier Shea Recreational Service District
--	--	--

On behalf of Brian A. Fortier, Deidre A. Tibbetts, and Allyson Ruth Fortier Shea, Paul C. Bordeau, PLLC, is requesting an Appeal of Administrative Decision regarding a decision made by the Code Enforcement Officer that the client needs to receive approval from the Alton Planning Board for Site Plan Design Review before the campground can be legally established on the property and reopened for business.

Attorney Paul Bordeau and applicants Diedre Tibbetts and Brian Fortier came forward to present this application.

The West Alton Marina owns 7 lots; the family owns a total of 11 lots. The lot in question, Lot 11, is leased and used by the marina but is owned by the Fortier family.

Attorney Bordeau explained that the decision being appealed is from a letter of June 12, 2012 from Code Enforcement Officer John Dever; the content of the letter implies that the parcel is being used as a campground when it is the position of the applicant that this is a marina with an acceptable use to allow camping on the property by boat owners, crew, and guests of the owners.

P. Monziona explained that the understanding of the Board is that whether the property is being used as a marina or a campground, an accepted Site Plan is needed. Mr. Bordeau agreed but added that the content of the letter implied that the use is that of a campground; the applicant is contesting that implication. There was further discussion during which Attorney Bordeau stated that the need for a Site Plan is not being contested; the contention is that the marina use is an accepted one and that includes the activities they have been engaged in for the last half century. The applicant does not disagree that a Site Plan approval is needed; there are two different pieces of correspondence from Brian Boyers implying that the West Alton Marina was in compliance with all state and local regulatory requirements. The ancillary camping use under the definition of the marina has been going on for many years. Mr. Fortier explained the various areas of the West Alton Marina property and how they are used for various activities; building and septic permits have been issued and nothing has been hidden.

Attorney Bordeau explained that a Site Plan would have been obtained had the applicant believed he needed one. The letter from Mr. Dever implies that the property is being used as a campground which carries a different set of requirements than a marina; the interpretation of the use determines the Site Plan. A Site Plan is needed either way. Additionally, a Site Plan was approved on the property in 1999, but the permit expired before it was implemented. Attorney Bordeau talked about the difference between a campground and what is happening on this property – a campground would rent to the public while this property is strictly for the use of boat owners, the crews of the boats, and the guests of the boat owners. Attorney Bordeau read from the ordinance to illustrate the differences. Even though camping-like activities are present, any “campers” on the property are owners, crew, or guests.

The applicants have decided to expand the use of the property to actually include a full-fledged campground; this is completely unrelated to the West Alton Marina’s ancillary camping use. Attorney Bordeau gave the Board members a handout showing the location and use of Lot 17-11; this lot contains bathhouses, a rental camp, sales and storage, parking, recreational fields that are mowed to be used for games and camping activities. There are also entrance roads (the only access from Route 11 to the West Alton Marina) and launches. Lots 17-9 and 17-29 are also used by the West Alton Marina but they do not abut Route 11.

There was further discussion concerning the definition and use of this property as a marina. Restriction to boat owners, their crew, and their guests was explained by John Murray of West Alton Marina. There is a gatehouse that is manned; unfamiliar guests are stopped at the gatehouse. Additionally, Mr. Murray is familiar with the boat owners and guests and he knows who is in and out of the marina. The employees are all familiar with the process and will turn people away who think it is a campground. All owners and guests are checked in, and automobile passes are issued. The marina use for camping was discussed; S. Miller questioned why there cannot be other uses, such as an amusement park or a spa, if they are for the exclusive use of the marina patrons. Anything could be an expansion of the use as long as it is for the use of the marina. Attorney Bordeau explained that the ZBA interpretation of the intent of the ordinances determines the expansion of use. In this case, the question is whether the current use is permitted – grandfathering is not the issue here. The marina ordinance in Alton is unusual; West Alton Marina has operated since 1962 with the provision that people staying at the marina can stay on their boats, or they can bring a tent for camping. The Zoning Board of Adjustment has to make the decision as to which use – campground or marina – this property falls into.

In order to qualify as a campground, there must be at least one camp site; West Alton Marina has that. There must be provision for pitching a tent or parking a recreational trailer; West Alton Marina has that. Pitching and/or parking activities must be for sleeping; West Alton Marina has that. Residence must be temporary; West Alton Marina also meets that criterion. All of these activities meet the campground qualifications as well as the marina qualifications. According to the Attorney Bordeau, the difference is that a campground is open to the public and the camping use of the marina is for members, their crew, and their guests only.

P. Monziona questioned the role of the ZBA in this case; he understood that the basis of the Code Officer’s decision in this case is that whether this is a marina or a campground, a Site Plan is needed. The “for the public” definition is not expressly stated as part of the ordinance; P. Monziona questioned that as this property meets the definition of both the campground and the marina, why would the site plan differ between the marina and the campground if all activities are allowed? Attorney Bordeau explained that this is solely about the language in John Dever’s letter to the property owner; the letter specifically addresses the use as a campground without ever mentioning the marina use. A site plan is appropriate at this time for the marina use; coincidentally a site plan for a separate use as a campground is in the works at this time. The request is to find that this property is not being used as a campground, but as a marina which has similar use to a campground.

T. Morgan opened the floor to public input; there was no public input for this case.

Brian Fortier explained that the decision tonight is important because West Alton Marina has always had campers, as do other marinas around the lake. The decision is whether camping at a marina constitutes a campground or whether it is an overnight facility for marina users. P. Monziona asked for clarification of who the West Alton Marina is; it is an LLC operating on all three lots – 17-11, 17-9, and 17-29. The limited role of the ZBA at this meeting is to determine whether they agree or disagree with the Code Enforcement Officer's statement that a campground is being operated on this property. P. Monziona asked if the use would be broader if it were determined to be a campground because it would not be restricted to boat owners, their crew, and their guests. Attorney Bordeau answered that even though a Site Plan approval for a marina has not been obtained, that is the use. Both uses are permitted in that zone; P. Monziona stated that via Site Plan review, the applicant would be permitted to have either use, or to add the use of campground to a marina. Attorney Bordeau explained that for a campground there are greater infrastructure requirements, which the marina use does not meet.

S. Miller asked if there are any utility hookups; there are no hookups or specific sites or utilities in the camping area. There are campers and trailers present in different areas of the camping area at various times. S. Miller clarified through questioning that even though this is a marina, it has many characteristics of a campground. He wondered what would stop someone on the lake from putting in a boat slip and using his property or field for a camp for anyone who might come in via watercraft. The constriction on this property is not necessarily his concern; he is more concerned about creating precedent. Attorney Bordeau explained that the town ordinances protect against that type of activity because the definition of a marina under the ordinance is specific and requires far more than what S. Miller's scenario indicates.

This activity has been going on at West Alton Marina since the ordinance was crafted; Attorney Bordeau speculates that the ordinance was drafted as it is with West Alton Marina specifically in mind. P. Monziona questioned the interpretation of eating facilities, sleeping facilities, and retail facilities. The retail facilities are supplied by the marina, and the eating and sleeping facilities should also be supplied by the marina; in this case the eating and sleeping facilities are supplied by those who are camping. Per Attorney Bordeau, the word facility is at issue; there is no definition for the word "facility" in the ordinance. According to Attorney Bordeau, the improvements provided by the marina constitute supplying the facilities. Mr. Fortier mentioned his concern that the ruling here could affect his right to have marina members able to sleep on their boats.

Mr. Fortier addressed S. Miller's earlier comment by pointing out that marinas can only be located in the Recreational Service Zone; this would eliminate the single dock and field camping he brought up. There was further discussion concerning the definition of facility or facilities. S. Miller asked about the range of camping activities which could range from a tent to a fully equipped RV that could be used year round as a full residence. Attorney Bordeau explained that "residential" use could not happen because even though there are facilities for bathing, once the marina is closed and the boats are gone, the camping use is gone. The members deliberated the elements of the appeal; the decision to be made is whether the Board agrees with John Dever's ruling or if they are going to overturn it.

P. Monziona referred to J. Dever's June 12, 2012 letter; it specifically shows that the understanding of the Code Enforcement Officer is that there was a campground use. Information tonight indicates that this use is just for marina members. T. Morgan explained that a campground, by current definition, does not need to be open to the public and public access is not a necessary part of the campground ordinance. S. Miller asked about enforcement; the owners of the marina can determine who a guest is. He also asked why the applicant could not generate a site plan for a campground or marina, or both. L. LaCourse voiced concern that this decision will impact all the marinas in the area, not just the West Alton Marina. He is also

concerned that anything could be built for the use of the marina customers and defined under the marina use. T. Morgan explained that the decision tonight does not indicate that anyone else needs to be changed; this case is to address an interpretation of the Code Enforcement Officer's. There is no jurisdiction to influence people not before this Board. S. Miller again voiced concern over setting precedent; he does not see how this is different than other decisions that have been influenced by precedent. P. Monziona explained that S. Miller is correct; precedent has been considered in making past decisions. He also explained that the request of this application is simply to decide whether the Code Enforcement Officer correctly determined that this use is a campground versus a marina, and the applicant is arguing that the Code Enforcement Officer is wrong. The distinguishing factor is that the camping facility at a marina is for owners, crew and guests only while a campground is open to all; as currently written, this property could meet the definition of both a campground and a marina.

Given that the activity as described fulfills the definition of both campground and marina, P. Monziona made a motion that the decision of the Code Enforcement Officer not be overturned. S. Miller seconded the motion which passed with five votes in favor, none opposed, and no abstentions.

Case #Z12-15 Stockbridge Corner Road	Variance Map 5 Lot 17-1	Michael Gawlicki Rural District
---	------------------------------------	--

On behalf of Michael Gawlicki, Attorney Arthur W. Hoover of Alton Law Offices is requesting a variance for the installation of a 28 year old mobile home 12 feet in width on his property at a location to the rear of the property, approximately 700 feet from Stockbridge Corner Road.

Citing the length of the agenda and the fact that there is no time constraint on his client's need for this variance, Attorney Hoover requested a continuance, if said continuance would not count against his client.

P. Monziona made a motion to continue Case #Z12-15 until the November 1, 2012 meeting, with the continuance not to be counted against the applicant's allowed continuances. S. Miller seconded the motion which passed with five votes in favor, none opposed, and no abstentions.

- NEW APPLICATIONS**

Case #Z12-17 76 Rollins Road	Variance Map 63 Lot 33	Richard and Pamela Ulrich Lakeshore Residential District
---	-----------------------------------	---

On behalf of Richard and Pamela Ulrich, White Mountain Survey & Engineering, Inc. is requesting a Variance to seek relief from the property line setback requirements contained in Article 300, Section 327.A.2 and Section 327.A.3 to allow the construction of a 24' X 26' garage with 12" roof overhangs that would fall within the road front and side yard setbacks.

Jim Rines from White Mountain Survey and Engineering came forward to represent the Ulrichs. The lot is in the Lakeshore Residential District. The garage to be constructed is shown in the application; as designed, it would require 4.9 feet of relief from the side setback as measured to the eaves, and 16.1 feet of relief from the front right of way setback. Construction as designed would allow for the removal of two carports and a shed. The present nonconformity area is 461 square feet in violation of the setback with 10 square feet off the property and into the right of way; the proposed nonconformity is 383 square feet which is a 17% reduction. Given other features and improvements to the property, there is no other location for this structure.

The structure is a salt box design with the eaves extending over the doorway to reduce dripping right at the door. This is a two car garage; the current shed will not hold a vehicle, and the applicant desires to

remove the existing carports. Mr. Rines pointed out the location of the leech field as well as a steep drop in the terrain that limits the location of the garage. S. Miller asked if this could be turned into a two-story structure; Mr. Rines answered that there is storage area on the second level now with no plans to have living space. If that were to change in the future it would require a return to the ZBA for further variance. Various configurations and locations were discussed with the conclusion being that there is no other location or configuration other than that which is proposed. Snow plowing was discussed; this property is located on the private section of Rollins Road and the plowing on this road is the responsibility of the residents, not of the town. In addition to the plowing concerns brought up in the Road Agent's review, Ed Constantino, Alton Fire Department voiced a concern about fire exposure for this lot and the undeveloped adjoining lots. Residents on this part of the road have signed waivers of liability showing that they understand the risks of living on this type of road. Development of the adjoining lot is complete as there is no room for anything other than perhaps a small shed.

The amount of the setbacks was again discussed; the nonconformity decreased from the closest point requiring 4.9 feet of relief tapering to .4 feet of relief at the further corner. P. Larochelle asked about the location of the existing telephone pole; it is 23 feet from the existing building.

T. Morgan opened the floor to public input; there was none for this case. Public input was closed.

L. LaCourse asked for clarification concerning the reasonable use clause in the hardship section. P. Monziona explained that there are two sections to the hardship criterion; the first section has two parts. The second section addresses the reasonable use issue; this only comes into play if the criterion in the first section is not met.

WORKSHEET

P. Larochelle stated that the variance will not be contrary to the public interest. All members present agreed.

T. Morgan stated that the request is in harmony with the spirit of the ordinance and the intent of the Master Plan and with the convenience, health, safety, and character of the district within which it is proposed. This is a residential parking facility which is certainly within the intent of the Master Plan. All members present agreed.

P. Monziona stated that by granting the variance substantial justice would be done because the building will be less nonconforming and will improve the safety of the structure and be more in compliance with zoning. All members present agreed.

P. Larochelle stated that the request would not diminish the value of surrounding properties; there is no evidence to the contrary. All members present agreed.

S. Miller stated that no fair and substantial relationship exists between the general purpose of the ordinance and the specific application of that provision to the property, and the proposed use is a reasonable one. This is replacing two carports with a permanent structure which is complying with the spirit of the ordinance, and going into the setbacks is not significantly critical. T. Morgan agreed; special conditions of the property exist which make this positioning of the structure necessary, and there is no substantial relationship between the general public provisions of the ordinance and the specific application here, and the propose use is a reasonable one because it is simply an upgrade to the current use in that area. P. Monziona agreed; it is not only an upgrade but will improve safety. The special

condition of the land and location of the septic leech field hamper placement anywhere else on the property.

S. Miller made a motion to approve the request for Variance for Case #Z12-17. P. Monziona seconded the motion which passed with five votes in favor, none opposed, and no abstentions.

Case #Z12-16 Route 28 South	Special Exception Map 8 Lot 49	Robert H. Carlton Rev. Trust Rural District
--	---	--

Robert Carlton is requesting a Special Exception to Article 400, Section 401 to have a boat, trailer and water-craft storage.

Robert Carlton came forward to present his case. He is seeking a Special Exception for boat storage on his property off Route 28. There was already approved boat storage on this lot, but he is moving the location; the new location is delineated on the plans. The proposed boat storage would have limited visibility from the road. This would not be part of the campground, and would be accessed through the emergency entrance to the park which is behind the old tire warehouse. There will be no building; boats will be shrink- wrapped for storage. The storage area would be shared between Mr. Carlton and Gillen's Marina. The current RV park is where the boat storage area had been located.

The Conservation Commission has voiced concern about the number of boats to be stored; the area is about 400 feet long with a width that would allow 2 rows of boats with room for emergency access. Most of the boats would be on trailers but a few would be on blocks. The total number of boats is estimated to be approximately 100 boats.

Pollution control was discussed; the old location was 50 feet from the shore, and the new location is also 50 feet from the shore. Storage in the old location has been going on for six or seven years. The boats are completely wrapped, so in order to have a spill the engine, the boat, and the wrap would all have to leak. S. Miller questioned DES requirements for any type of pollution control measures to keep fluids from leaking into the land if the engine were to crack and leak. Per J. Dever, Best Management Practices for boat storage do not address any type of containment. There will be no maintenance or boat washing; this could be a condition if the Board chooses.

If a Special Exception is granted, the applicant will then go before the Planning Board where traffic, number of boats, etc., will be addressed via the Site Plan.

Storage would be mainly through the winter; during the summer trailers would be stored and a few of the boats would be moved in and out through the summer. Mr. Carlton will be renting use of the space to Gillen's Marina but would like to have the ability to rent storage space on his own to guests of the RV park.

J. Dever brought up a letter from a member of the public who said that they were unable to view the plans; the plans have been on file in the Planning Office since the application was made. The letter is not from abutters.

T. Morgan opened the floor to public input. Maureen Parker came forward and stated that she had drafted the letter mentioned above. The Conservation Commission has not reviewed the updated plan. Mrs. Parker was also concerned about valet service which would add extra traffic and hazard from the storage facility to the public launch. The original approval for storage from 2007 stated that valet service was not to be allowed. She also stated that the Conservation Commission was questioning how the determination of individual boat locations would be determined. J. Dever explained that the plan received by the Conservation Commission did not show the highlighted area to delineate the location of the storage.

Further detail as to specific location within the storage area will be determined through the Planning Board Site Plan process.

Mr. Carlton explained that the access to the storage property will be regulated because there are a limited number of keys to the locked gate; boat owners would not be able to access the storage area without being accompanied by one of the key holders.

P. Monziona questioned whether the previous storage area had been granted through a Special Exception; Mr. Carlton answered that it was. P. Monziona asked about the conditions of the Special Exception granted previously; Mr. Carlton answered that the 50' setback had been a condition, but there were no others. There is no valet service; the boats come in and out once a year. There may be a few people who use the park through the summer who choose to bring their boats back and forth from the RV park to the lake. T. Morgan asked if a condition that there would be no valet service or temporary storage except for guests at Turtle Kraal RV Park would be acceptable; Mr. Carlton answered that it would be.

S. Miller brought up his friendship with the Parkers; he does not feel that it creates an issue and he does feel that he can make an independent and objective judgment. Board members agreed that there is no need to recuse, based on S. Miller's assertion that he can make an objective judgment.

WORKSHEET

All members agreed that a plat has been accepted in accordance with Town of Alton Ordinance 520-B.

All members agreed that the specific site is appropriate for the use; it is an area hidden from view. It is hidden and gravel-covered, and is outside of the 50' buffer line. T. Morgan asked for a condition that maintenance of the 50' DES shoreline setback.

All members agreed that there is no factual evidence that property values in the district will be reduced due to incompatible uses; boat storage has been done here for a number of years.

All members agreed that there were no objections from abutters based on demonstrable fact; the Parkers raised some questions, but there were no objections voiced at all.

All members agreed that there would be no nuisance to pedestrian or vehicle traffic including the location and design of access ways and off street parking; T. Morgan asked for a condition that there be no temporary or valet storage except for guests of the Turtle Kraal RV Park. P. Monziona added that the Planning Board will explore this use in detail during the Site Plan review.

All members agreed that appropriate and adequate facilities and utilities would be provided to insure proper operation of the structure; there is no great need for facilities and utilities. P. Monziona requested a condition that no repair or maintenance is to be done at this facility.

L. LaCourse, P. Larochelle, T. Morgan, and P. Monziona agreed that there is adequate area for safe and sanitary sewage disposal and water supply. L. LaCourse added his request for the restriction to boat maintenance or repair. S. Miller disagreed but would be in agreement conditioned on restricting repair and maintenance, and having some measures in place to control hazardous spills.

All members agreed that the proposed use of the structure is consistent with the spirit of the ordinance and the intent of the Master Plan, boat storage is appropriate because of the proximity of water to the campground and is an ancillary use to the campsite.

L. LaCourse made a motion to grant the variance for Case Z12-16 under the conditions that there is to be no valet service except for guests of Turtle Kraal RV Park, that there is no maintenance or repair of boats in that area, and that DES setbacks be maintained. P. Laroche seconded the motion which passed with five votes in favor, none opposed, and no abstentions.

- **OTHER BUSINESS**

Previous business – None

New Business – The Local Government Center is sponsoring ½ day Zoning Board and Planning Board Workshops on October 27, 2012. Fees will be covered by the Planning Department. Interested members should contact the Planning Office.

Minutes of September 6, 2012 – S. Miller made a motion to approve the minutes of the September 6, 2012 meeting as presented. L. LaCourse seconded the minutes which passed with five votes in favor, none opposed, and no abstentions.

J. Dever asked when it would be appropriate for him to provide input in the case of an appeal for administrative decision, such as the case heard earlier. The intent of the letter was important and he felt he could have clarified it. The whole point of the appeal is to get the decision of the Board. Board members were of the opinion that his input could be either during Public Input or during direct questioning from the Chair.

S. Miller brought forward a proposal to increase compensation for the recording secretary from \$15.97 to \$18.00, which represents an increase of \$2.03 per hour. The average rate is \$15 per hour. He cited different standard requiring copious, detailed notes required to defend a possible judicial decision, which exceeds the responsibility of other Board's in Alton. Typically a three hour meeting would generate two or three pages; the current recorder far exceeds that. He went on state that Mary's work is outstanding; it is always on time and he cannot remember the last time she missed a meeting. To replace this position with the standard the Board is used to would not be at \$15 per hour. He has seen the work of other people who transcribe; if they took on this function, it would be nowhere near the quality. Adding \$2.03 per hour makes an even \$18.00 per hour, and the issue would not need to be addressed again for a year or two.

P. Monziona agreed with S. Miller's comments concerning the quality of Mary's work; the Board is fortunate to have minutes of this quality and that quality has saved the town aggravation and perhaps expense. He voiced no understanding of pay scales for this type of work, but will defer to S. Miller due to his experience and membership on the Budget Committee. T. Morgan agreed and added that Mary deserves to be complemented and compensated for her work; he will also defer to S. Miller. T. Morgan asked about procedure at this point; J. Dever will bring the wishes of the Board to Ken McWilliams.

S. Miller made a motion to recommend to the Town Planner that he increase his budget by \$2.03 per hour, for a gross pay of \$18.00 per hour, for the number of hours necessary for Mary Tetreau to do her job. L. LaCourse seconded the motion which passed with five votes in favor, none opposed, and no abstentions.

S. Miller added that K. McWilliams is in favor but he does have a different figure in mind; this vote is advisory.

- **ADJOURNMENT**

P. Monziona made a motion to adjourn. L. LaCourse seconded the motion which passed with five votes in favor, none opposed, and no abstentions. The meeting adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the Zoning Board of Adjustment will be on November 1, 2012 at 7:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary L. Tetreau, Recorder, Public Session