



TOWN OF WARNER

P.O. Box 265, 5 East Main Street
Warner, New Hampshire 03278-0059
Land Use Office: (603)456-2298 ex. 7
Email: landuse@warnernh.us

Zoning Board of Adjustment

Minutes of September 14, 2022

Town Hall in the Lower Meeting Room

1. The Chair opened the ZBA meeting on at 7:05 PM.

A. ROLL CALL

Board Member	Present	Absent
Jan Gugliotti (Alternate)	✓	
Beverley Howe		✓
Elizabeth Labbe	✓	
Barbara Marty (Chair)	✓	
Lucinda McQueen	✓	
Harry Seidel (Vice Chair)	✓	

Also present: Janice Loz, Land Use Administrator

The Chair opened the meeting at 7:05 PM. The Chair elevated Jan G. to participate as a voting member in the absence of Beverley Howe.

2. NEW BUSINESS

A. Application for a Variance. Case: 2022-04

Applicant: Estate of Carol Pletcher, Jennifer Pletcher, Executor

Agent: Nicholas Edraos

Address: 443 Kearsarge Mountain Road

Map/Lot: Map 18, Lot 27

District: R-3

Description: To remove building addition at 443 Kearsarge Mountain road and replace with slightly larger addition. Variance to the terms of Article VII, C. 1. b.

The Chair expressed condolences to the applicants, Jennifer and Nick, for the loss of their parents, Larry and Carol Pletcher, they were well known and respected in the community.

The Chair introduced the application for a Variance for renovations and an addition to the Pletcher home on 443 Kearsarge Mountain Road. The Board went through the checklist to verify if the application was complete. The Chair noted she did not have the abutter's

APPROVED MINUTES

list in her packet, and noted it wasn't online under the case files. Janice said a new version of the packet was just uploaded on September 13, 2022. Janice will check and upload whatever is missing. Janice said she scanned the file multiple times and was having issues with pages not scanning.

The Chair asked why the State DOT was notified. The applicant, Nick Edraos, said the State Park is at the end of the road, therefore it is a state road. The Chair noted they had verification from the applicant's attorney as to clear ownership, for Jennifer Pletcher, Executor of the Estate of Carol Pletcher. The Chair thanked the applicant for that documentation. The packet is supposed to include a drawing to scale of the existing structures on the lot indicating the dimensions, distance, and the abutting property lines. A drawing was found, the Chair asked the applicant whether the drawing was to scale. Nick said it is, he is a cartographer. Harry said there is no indication of homes on the abutter's property. He asked if there were homes directly across the street. Nick said there are no homes directly across the street. He indicated on the map the additional lots owned by Jennifer and Nick.

Harry Seidel made a motion to accept the application as complete. Elizabeth seconded the motion. Discussion: None. **Voice Vote Tally:** 5 – 0. The board accepted the application as complete.

The Chair asked the Board if they had any questions before the application is presented to the board. There were no questions from the board.

Jen Pletcher introduced herself as the daughter of Larry and Carol Pletcher. She also introduced her husband, Nick Edraos. Nick said they need more room in the house. There are two parts to the house the old historical section of the house, post and beam, and a dark basement. There was an addition put on in the 1980's, which was built on concrete slab. They hired a structural engineer to evaluate the house. The basic solution for expansion was to build a second floor onto the existing addition. The builder looked at the structure and said they had to rebuild from scratch. They are going to dig a basement and put on a garage as well. There will be a two-story addition with a garage attached. The over-arching principle for them is to not alter or hurt the historic part of the house. There is also a well and they don't want to impact that either.

Granting the variance will not be contrary to the public interest because: The reason they want a variance is because it is an R-3 zone which requires a 50-foot setback from the Right-of-Way (ROW). The house is already within the setback. Because of the angle of the house, the corner of the historic house is about 25-feet from the public ROW. From that corner the house angles away from the road. They had engineers consult on this, there is no way to put a stair well in without expanding the existing footprint. They came up with a four-foot bump out to house the bottom of the stairs. Nick said it doesn't go against the public interest because they are already 25-feet away from the ROW. Even though the four-foot bump out is four feet from the existing plane of the house it still isn't (closer than) 25-feet from the road. They essentially are not making it worse.

Harry confirmed that because the house has a slight angle relative to the road the addition is not encroaching beyond the closest part of the house. Nick affirmed.

APPROVED MINUTES

The Chair referring to the drawing asked if the edge of Kearsarge Mountain Road is actually the ROW. Nick said he thinks what would be the ROW, which is the stone walls and the tree line. It would be 50-feet from the other stone wall. He used the stone wall as the existing ROW. The Chair said Tim Allen the town's road agent would be able to tell you exactly. The Chair said when they write the decision they like to reference the legal ROW.

By granting the variance, the spirit of the ordinance is observed because: Nick said the ordinance was obviously written after the house was built and they are already within 25-feet of the ROW. He said they are not going to be any closer than they are now.

By granting the variance substantial justice is done because: Nick said without doing this they cannot do anything with the house. They really want to save the historic property. If they add to the back, it will severely impact the historic nature of the house. The historic front of the house is on the side. They don't want to add on to that side and lose all the historic windows. Justice is done because they are trying to save what people would like them to save.

Granting the variance will not diminish the values of surrounding properties because: Nick said they own the property across from this house, they are not interfering with anyone's site or views. There is a person who lives on the other side of the barn, which they cannot see from their house. They are not really impacting anyone else's quality of life.

Elizabeth asked if the barn is going to be impacted at all. Nick said the barn is 80-to-100 feet away from the house. The garage will go between the house and the barn. Janice said the abutter did inquire if there would be any change to the barn and she told them, no, not in this proposal and they seemed satisfied with that.

Literal enforcement of the provisions of the ordinance would result in an unnecessary hardship: Nick said not allowing us to build where intended would wreck the historic character of the house they are trying to save.

The Chair said the applicant already had something under the "*proposed use is a reasonable one*" criteria which reiterates what they have been saying. The Chair said the existing antique structure is already within the setbacks. Nick agreed.

Nick said the antique structure has two stair wells that are not up to code. When Carol was ill, they had to move her downstairs. If they needed someone with a stretcher, they never would be able to get up the stairs to the second floor. They want to put in a stairway that is up to code. The windows are older, and they need egress windows for the kids' bedrooms. They discussed a lot of these things with the structural engineer and the architects. They don't want a lot of stairs to trip over in the dark or if there is a fire. They want large egress windows and a stairwell built to code.

The Chair asked if there were questions or comments from the board. There were none.

The Chair opened the hearing for public comment.

Rebecca Courser, Warner Historical Committee, referenced the "L" part of the original structure. She said a lot of times that is the first part of an original structure. She wondered

APPROVED MINUTES

if she could take pictures of the inside and outside of the home. Nick said, definitely, but he doesn't think there is anything there that is original. Jennifer said she is welcome to come and take pictures. Rebecca asked if it is post and beam. Nick said that part is not.

The Chair agreed that sometimes when a structure comes down it is interesting to see the original structure.

The Chair closed the public hearing and entered board deliberations.

Harry said the purpose of the setback is to ensure there isn't a feeling of density. There are side-yard setbacks and front-yard setback, so houses are not too close to each other to avoid dense development. In this case a structure exists, and it is not going to become closer than the existing structure or anymore non-conforming. Most importantly they own the property across the street. There isn't a house across the street that is right against the ROW as well, he thought that was significant. Harry said when they talk about the nature of these requests for relief, they are driven by the specifics of the case. In this case, there isn't a house across the street there isn't a feeling of developmental density. So, the purpose of this ordinance is not going to suffer by this development. Also, the existing antique house has a typical antique stairway that is completely non-functional. If an old building is saved that is one of the greenest things that could possibly be done. They are going to put in a new stairway in the antique house, they need that bump forward to be able to rise enough to get under it and into the house and have an entry through the addition. Also, they have the upstairs of the old house and the upstairs of the new addition all because of the four feet of relief. So, it really creates a use of the antique structure. Harry thinks that is substantial justice.

Jan G. said she agrees with Harry. She thanked the applicant for considering keeping the old structure. Commenting that many homeowners wouldn't bother.

The Chair said it is often more expensive to try to save an historic building.

Jennifer wanted to comment on the density, it is not set in stone as, they continue to work on the conservation easement of the property. So, there would not be a density of houses to be built in the near future because of the conservation easement. Nick added there would never be a house across the street. The Chair referenced the easement and asked if they were taking out the three-acre lot across the street. Jennifer said there are two excluded areas. One has a shop on it and a barn and there is an additional excluded area that cannot be seen from the house. The Chair asked if the part of the property they are living on is part of the easement?

Janice interjected and asked if they are reopening the public hearing. **The Chair said let's reopen the public hearing so the board can ask questions of the applicant.**

Jennifer said the house lot is not part of the easement.

The Chair said they will go through the five criteria and vote on each one. Janice said it would really help if they answered each one of the criteria and had members make comments on the record. The Chair affirmed. Janice thanked the Chair.

APPROVED MINUTES

Granting the variance will not be contrary to the public interest because: Harry said there will be no harm to the public by granting the relief. There will be a benefit to the property owner in saving the structure, which is also in the public interest.

Harry wondered if there is a public benefit to strict adherence to the ordinance. In this case, he does not think there is a public benefit without allowing some relief.

The Chair noted there it is a public benefit to save an historic home and preserve the character of the town.

Jan G. said it is a public detriment if the board didn't allow this and they were forced to do something different to this post and beam home.

The Chair said if you look at a lot of historic towns especially south of us, historic homes are wiped out at an alarming rate and huge mega-mansions are replacing them and resulting in towns that have lost their character. The Chair said it is not contrary to the public interest, it is beneficial.

Elizabeth said it is not contrary to the public interest because it isn't changing the setbacks. She has a question about the measurements and the 32-feet versus 29-feet. Nick said the middle corner will be setback 25-feet, the far corner is 37-feet.

Janice asked the applicant what they used as a determining factor for the ROW. Nick said there is a rock wall and a tree line along the side of the road. Usually, the rock wall determines the property line. It seemed to be about 50-feet from the rock wall on the other side of the road. Nick said most ROW's are 50-feet wide so he used that, from the center line to the rock wall. Janice said she spoke with Tim, Department of Public Works, previously and it is tricky to determine ROW, he said not all roads are created equal some have been updated. The new updated roads are wider. The ROW is the middle of the road out, but to determine the middle of the road you have to take into consideration the unpaved swaths on either side of the road. The Chair said they may have the applicants consult with Tim before writing a decision. She thinks it is very important to have the exact measurement. Janice suggested they could say that nothing is to be built any closer than the existing closest point, which is not going to change. Janice said you could say don't encroach any closer than the closest point. The Chair said correct and not to reference the ROW.

Lucinda said she thinks it is wonderful, living in an old country house, we want to keep it as original as possible.

Harry made a comment about the ROW and the 50-feet between the stone walls. In his experience stone walls are one of the best remaining border lines that we have. Surveyors always look for a stone wall. A stone wall doesn't move. Stone walls are on both sides of the road, they are 50-feet apart. He would bet his bottom dollar that is the physical ROW. Commenting that the road agent certainly would not want to have his trucks hit the stone wall. He honestly believes the 50-feet between the stone walls is probably the ROW.

Janice suggested that maybe they could get Tim to write something for the board for future reference on how to calculate the ROW. The Chair said whenever they have an application which involves the ROW, just always have Tim look at it. Janice said that is something the whole board would have to decide on. The Chair said they could talk about that.

APPROVED MINUTES

By granting the variance, the spirit of the ordinance is observed because: The Chair said the historic post and beam house won't be any closer to the road. The spirit of the ordinance ensures this project is not going to impinge on the public's health and welfare. The house will not be any closer to the road than it is currently.

Harry said the ordinance implies that people are allowed reasonable use of their property as long as it does not infringe on others. So, this project is within the spirit of the ordinance.

The Chair said it is an antique house and like many houses built in Warner before ordinances were enacted, it already exists with an encroachment on the setbacks. Janice asked the Chair if she is saying it is already non-conforming. The Chair said, yes. Lucinda said it is grandfathered.

By granting the variance substantial justice is done because: Jan G. said substantial justice is saving the old house and making the kids safe.

Elizabeth said it sounds like it would be a safer home because they will have the upstairs egress and bring the stairs up to code.

Granting the variance will not diminish the values of surrounding properties because: The Chair said the applicant owns some abutting properties and they are going to increase the beauty of the home, as you can tell by the drawings. She said this should increase the ambience of the neighborhood making the house a show piece.

Elizabeth referenced the back side of the house where it is close to the road and wondered if that is a front entrance. Nick said as you come up the road you see the old historic front entrance, inside there is the stairwell and the living room and dining room. He said, it is not a used entrance. Elizabeth asked if they are coming in-and-out of the bump out area of the home. The Chair clarified where they are going to put the porch. Elizabeth asked if they are going to have parking by the entrance. Nick said parking is going on the side.

Literal enforcement of the provisions of the ordinance would result in an unnecessary hardship: The Chair said the applicant couldn't do this if they had to set everything 50-feet back. Janice asked for clarification on the Chair's comment. The Chair said if they literally enforced the ordinance, it would create a hardship where they would have a less usable property.

Elizabeth said enforcing the ordinance might create a barrier to salvaging the older home. Harry said he agreed and asked if the meetings were taped recorded. The Chair said, yes.

The Chair noted she didn't hear any dissention from members on any of the five criteria of the variance application. The Chair asked for comments from the public. Jere Henley, of 484 Kearsarge Mountain Road (abutter) said he had no problem with the project, it will not diminish anything on their property.

The Chair closed the public hearing.

Harry Seidel made a motion to grant a variance for case 2022-04 for the Estate of Carol Pletcher, Executor Jennifer Pletcher, to allow the removal of an addition at 443 Kearsarge Mountain Road and to be replaced with a slightly larger addition that requires a Variance to the terms of Article VII.C.1.b.

APPROVED MINUTES

The Chair asked about defining findings. Janice asked if the board wanted to use the answers to some of the criteria as their findings. The Chair said, yes.

The Chair asked Harry if he wanted to include all five criteria in the findings. Harry commented, yes and that it could be stated pretty simply. Harry said it is not contrary to the public interest and the spirit of the ordinance is observed, substantial justice is done, and it will not diminish the surrounding properties.

Janice asked if those were statements or findings. Harry said findings. Janice said when you say not contrary to public interest, why is that? Jan G. said because no additional encroachment is involved than already exists. Janice said, thank you.

Harry called for a point of order and asked if in findings of fact is it necessary that we regurgitate the entire meeting into the findings of fact. Because it is going to be very lengthy to do that every time, they have a hearing. Essentially, they are repeating what has already been discussed and the merits of the case. The Chair said not to regurgitate everything but make a cogent point on each of the criteria. Harry said do we need to do that tonight. The Chair said she thought the board could do that tonight.

Janice stated that when the decision is written she will take statements made by the board for each of the criteria and include it under facts and findings. So, if the board does not want to work on them tonight, they do not have to. She noted that the Chair is going to look over the decision before signing it. If the board prefers, they can select statements that were made to include into the facts and findings.

The Chair said personally she would like the decision to be as close to the motion as possible. So, that what the board is voting on is very close to what the written decision ends up being. The Chair said this is a point beyond the motion, they are sort of suggesting amendments to the motion.

The Chair said for instance granting the variance will not be contrary to the public interest because the house is already within the setbacks so there is not an additional encroachment, so the public's interest is not affected by this project. Jan G. said that sort of covers all the things, it is in the spirit of the ordinance because you are not changing the footprint. Jan G. said they are taking a less than desirable building and putting up a desirable building. Janice confirmed that Jan G. is suggesting the explanation could be used for both the spirit and public interest criteria. Jan G. said the fact that it is more desirable is kind of irrelevant the reason why we are here on the zoning board is because there is an encroachment, but it is no different than the existing encroachment. Jan G. believes all five criteria are irrelevant because they are not making anything worse.

Harry asked if the motion was acceptable, and the Chair said it was perfect. Janice suggested they put more findings in since it is a variance, a variance is a higher standard to meet and harder to get. Jan G. said there is no additional encroachment...the Chair interjected and said there is a motion on the floor and Harry has the floor so once he finishes, we can suggest amendments to the motion.

Harry said maybe this is a point of order, because it seems to him, they are being asked to write an awful lot. If there was a denial of the relief there would need to be some real meat-on-the-bone, as to why the board is denying it. In this case the board is looking at a

APPROVED MINUTES

simple relief request and it is fairly obvious that it checks all the boxes. So why do they have to set a new standard about making a long statement about each of the criteria. If there was a denial, he thinks it would be different. Because in a denial you need to have the reasons really spelled out. Harry doesn't mind if they give a brief description. He commented that Janice seems to want more than that.

Janice said, brief is perfectly fine, she just wants to make sure that the board gets more than one statement in the facts and findings. In order to write the decision everything on the record supporting that decision is a benefit.

Jan G. brought up the HB 1661 document which was in the board's packet. She read number 73, which states that if the board does not approve an appeal that reasons for a denial need to be included, but it does not address an approval. Harry said that is a good point. The Chair said if it was a denial, they would need very specific points and strong reasons because that is something that could be appealed. Jan G. said she can see the logic in at least having a brief reason. The Chair said one or two statements supporting the points or even the first three criteria which are supported by the fact the home is pre-existing and already within the setbacks so substantial justice, spirit of the ordinance and public interest are all set. The Chair said it could be that brief.

Harry said for the second criteria granting the variance the spirit of the ordinance is observed. The historical structure is saved and made useful moving forward. The Chair said, perfect. Harry suggested anyone could jump in and contribute. The Chair said they will let him continue with the motion.

Harry said substantial justice is done when the relief requested benefits the homeowner but does no detriment to the public. The Chair said, perfect.

Jan G. said the fourth criteria, granting the variance will maintain an historic value and replace an aging structure.

Harry commented that he really liked that they had a designer who came up with a thoughtful design that historically connects to the existing building. It's nice they spent the money to have an addition done.

Jan G. asked if they needed to respond to number 5 and the Chair said they were good. If the four criteria are supported, then the fifth criteria is not necessary. The Chair said you don't have to prove hard ship if you meet the first four criteria. Later corrected to say that only applies to relief for people with disabilities.

Elizabeth seconded the motion. Discussion: None. **Roll Call Vote:** Jan Gugliotti – Yes, Elizabeth Labbe – Yes, Lucinda McQueen – Yes, Harry Seidel – Yes, Barbara Marty – Yes. The motion to grant the Variance to 443 Kearsarge Mountain Road, Map 18, Lot 27 was approved 5 - 0.

The Chair said within five days the decision will be posted. The Chair said anyone aggrieved by this decision has 30 days to appeal. The Chair thanked the applicant.

B. HB 1661 – Summary of changes – Discussion

APPROVED MINUTES

The Chair reviewed the House Bill 1661 handout with the board. The Chair said these changes may or may not be considered for adoption into the boards Rules of Procedure (ROP).

The Chair said online there is a testing component to the training, which can be done anonymously after attending municipal training. Wrong answers are noted with the correct answer and corresponding law. The Chair said there is great training available online for members. Janice said the Town will pay the fee for training.

The Chair discussed the need for publication of fees by the Town. If application fees are not published, then the applicant can refuse to pay them. Janice said the fees on the applications need to be updated to be in line with costs. The Chair agreed. Janice said the fees are noted in each application for an appeal. She will take the fees notification and put it clearly on the Zoning Board web page.

The next section of the HB 1661 the Chair discussed was about written findings. The legislature says that decisions shall include specific written findings of fact to support the decision. Failure to have findings of fact supporting a disapproval shall be grounds for automatic reversal and remand by the superior court upon appeal. Janice passed out examples of ZBA decisions the Land Use office has always included findings and criteria on all decisions. When Janice attended the training on HB 1661 she asked if listing the responses to the conditions and criteria qualifies as facts and findings and the instructors agreed. The problem has been that some Zoning Board's do not go through responding to the conditions or criteria in their meetings. The Chair said the decision will always have facts and findings which will hopefully mirror the motions.

The next item the Chair discussed was the ZBA timeline. The ZBA must approve or disapprove an application within 90 days of the date of receipt. The Chair said this item may change the board's ROP. Janice asked if that includes continuations of hearings? The Chair read that the applicant may waive this requirement and consent to extensions that may be mutually agreeable. Jan G. said if they do not agree to extend, the board can deny it without prejudice. The Chair commented that before the board had to hear the application with 30 days.

The Chair said the next item has to do with fee shifting and bonds. If the applicant can prove gross negligence, bad faith or malice on the part of the ZBA in a decision and it is appealed then the applicant can collect their fees.

3. REVIEW OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: July 13, 2022. August 10, 2022. August 16, 2022.

A. July 13, 2022 Minutes: Grammatical changes, additions, deletions, and item numbering edits made to Pages, 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9.

Harry made a motion to accept the minutes of July 13, 2022 as amended. Jan Gugliotti seconded the motion. Discussion: None. **Voice Vote:** 5 – 0.

B. August 10, 2022 Minutes: Grammatical changes, additions, deletions made to pages, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17. During the edit process the board had a robust discussion about workforce housing and the median income percentages and interpretation of the ordinances.

APPROVED MINUTES

Harry made a motion to accept the minutes of August 10, 2022 as amended. Jan Gugliotti seconded the motion. Discussion: None. Voice Vote: 5 – 0.

- C. **August 16, 2022 Minutes:** Grammatical changes, additions, deletions made to pages, 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11.

Harry made a motion to accept the minutes of August 10, 2022 as amended. Elizabeth Labbe seconded the motion. Discussion: None. Voice Vote: 5 – 0.

4. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- A. Rules of Procedure Document – Discussion Tabled.

5. COMMUNICATIONS AND MISCELLANEOUS

A. Short Term Rentals

The Chair said the ZBA will be asked to join a meeting with the Planning Board and the Select Board to discuss Short Term Rentals (STR). The Chair said this has become an issue in town, with people renting their homes and disturbing their neighbors. She said there is no definition or ordinances addressing this issue. The Chair said the ordinances do address Boarding Houses, which some people think is a STR. She handed out information from the Municipal Association concerning STR's. On the handout are three topics such as, whether a town already regulates short term rentals, how to amend the ordinances, and the need for a site plan review. The Chair said there is a question whether a STR is a business and would it require a site plan review. She told the board they are going to be invited to be part of the town's conversation on this issue. She asked members to quickly contribute their thoughts on this subject.

Elizabeth said businesses, Bed and Breakfasts, motels, and hotels have regulations they have to adhere to. It doesn't seem fair to people who are doing what they are supposed to be doing and adhering to the rules. She referenced Gossler Pond in Salisbury and those camps, she would be curious to see what kind of laws they would have to adhere to, which may be different than the Maples Inn's regulations.

Harry said STR's are a serious threat to the peace of a community. It's potentially difficult for a community to deal with a residence that is rented out and the owners are not present. There could be noise, traffic and other disturbances. Zoning is supposed to protect property owners.

Lucinda thought there should be some rules on STR's.

Jan G. thought there should be a definition of the threshold. Somebody having a family member stay to help pay for the mortgage for a couple of months may be different than other situations. Although there should be some protection for neighbors. There needs to be a threshold for when something may potentially become a nuisance.

The Chair said when a home that is not the primary residence of the homeowner is rented out it becomes a business.

Janice said usually STR's are defined as anything rented for under 30 days and usually the owner is not in residence. She said lodging house and Bed and Breakfast are

APPROVED MINUTES

referenced in the USE Table. There was a legal case recently that determined lodging house's can be identified as a STR. She said it should be discussed with the Planning Board whether that is enough or whether it needs to be teased out a little more. Janice said the arguments for STR's have been that people want to use their house as an income generator to offset taxes. Other statements may include, it is my house, and you cannot tell me what I can and cannot do with it. Janice said she thought there are places in Warner where it could be alright, maybe around a lake or a pond for instance, to do a STR. She believes the Planning Board's job is to look at where there are places in Warner where this would be acceptable and to define the parameters. So, if there is a four-person septic and routinely 20 people stay in a house, that could be problematic. Also, when you live in a neighborhood a resident gets to know the rhythm of their neighborhood then all of a sudden, the next-door neighbor is a different person every week. Potentially the whole rhythm of the neighborhood could be upended, she can understand where that can create stress for neighbors and potentially effect values of homes.

The Chair said when houses are close it could be very disruptive. The Planning Board and Select Board are looking for guidance. If they come up with zoning ordinances and the ZBA has to enforce them or are asked to make Special Exceptions, we need ordinances to give us guidance.

Janice said as the ZBA prepares for the conversation with the Planning Board and Select Board they should think about which districts could accommodate a special exception or a variance and how do you envision that working. Also, what does the board expect the definition to be.

Jan G. said maybe a residence with one bedroom and 20 acres would have a different level of restriction opposed to a larger residence with more capacity.

Janice said potentially the Select Board would be running the meeting, she and Judy are working on scheduling the meeting.

The Chair said her sister-in-law is a real estate broker in Vermont, people are paying above market rate for houses and then flipping them into STR's. It effects the housing stock and is disruptive to neighborhoods.

6. ADJOURNMENT

Lucinda McQueen made a motion to adjourn at 9:55 PM. Elizabeth Labbe seconded the motion. Voice vote: 5 – 0. The meeting was adjourned at 9:55 PM.

Respectfully submitted by:

Janice L. Loz