

Present were: McDonough, Jeton, Brown, Boness, Baime, Ranalli

The meeting opened at 7 p.m.

Petition No.: 3904 & 3923

Premises affected: 311 Lowell St

Petitioner: New Cingular

Members: Brown, McDonough, Baime, Batchelder, Boness

There was a request to withdraw without prejudice. Jeton made a motion to allow the withdrawal without prejudice. Baime seconded the motion & the Board voted (5-0) to allow the withdrawal without prejudice.

Petition No.: 3932

Premises affected: 70 North Main St

Petitioner: Jeffco

Members: Jeton, Baime, Ranalli, McDonough, Brown

There was a request to continue to 8/4/11. Jeton made a motion to continue to 8/4/11. Brown seconded the motion & the Board voted (5-0) to continue the hearing to 8/4/11.

Petition No.: 3941

Premises affected: 81 Holt Rd

Petitioner: Furlong

Members: Jeton, Baime, Ranalli, McDonough, Brown

There was a request to continue to 8/4/11. Jeton made a motion to continue to 8/4/11. Brown seconded the motion & the Board voted (5-0) to continue the hearing to 8/4/11.

Petition No.: 3945

Premises affected: 170R River Rd

Petitioner: New Cingular

Members: McDonough (Acting Chair), Brown (Acting Clerk), Jeton, Baime, Boness

Michael Dolan of Brown Rudnick, LLP, appeared on behalf of New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC (New Cingular) seeking a special permit to allow the installation of 3 new antennas & 1 equipment cabinet at an existing wireless communications facility. The existing facility is a 125' tall monopole tower & an associated equipment compound at the base. The tower is owned by Tower, LLC and supports the equipment of 5 wireless carriers. New Cingular is proposing to install 3 additional panel-type antennas mounted to an existing antenna support frame with an antenna centerline 85' above ground level. A single equipment cabinet is to be installed within the existing equipment shelter located at the base of the tower within the fenced equipment compound. The cables from the equipment shelter to the antennas are to be run within the interior of the monopole tower. The proposed panel antennas will have the dimensions of 96"x12"x6" (H, W, D). New Cingular provided a memo dated 6/13/11 providing evidence of compliance with the criteria of §6.1 and §9.4 of the Zoning Bylaw. Also submitted was an RF Engineering Affidavit indicating that the RF emission from these proposed antennas would not exceed the State & Federal standards, when combined with all other existing PWSA facilities at 170R River Road, Andover, MA. A "Structural Analysis Report" prepared by Paul J. Ford & Company, Structural Engineers, dated 5/11/11 concluded that the existing monopole structure & existing foundation have sufficient capacity to adequately support the existing, reserved and proposed loading, and that modifications are not required at this time. The petitioner also provided photo simulations, site plans, elevations and specifications for the

proposed installation as prepared by Atlantis Group and dated 06/10/11. No one else appeared at the public hearing to speak either for or against the petition. The Board voted to waive a viewing of the premises, closed the public hearing, & proceeded to deliberate.

The Board found that the proposed communication antennas and equipment at an existing communications facility is consistent with the intents & purposes of § 6.1.4 of the Andover Zoning Bylaw. By filling a significant coverage gap, the facility will aid in reaching Cingular's goal of providing adequate and reliable wireless telecommunications services in and around Andover and to all of Massachusetts. The proposed antennas will be required to be painted to match the existing structure with a non-reflective paint. A structural analysis of the capacity of the existing monopole and associated foundation was performed by Paul J. Ford and Company of Columbus, OH and submitted with the petitioner's application. The analysis indicates that the monopole will be at 71% of the allowable structural capacity with the installation of the new antennas. Upon review of the submitted information, the Board determined that the applicant has demonstrated compliance with the provisions Sections 6.1 and 9.4 of the Bylaw. Further, the proposed use will not be unreasonably detrimental to the established or future character of the neighborhood and town and that such is in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the by-law. The Board voted unanimously to issue a Special Permit under 6.1 of the Andover Zoning Bylaw on the following conditions:

1. All antenna cables are to be installed within the interior of the monopole and not run up the exterior of the structure.
2. All antennas and visible hardware be painted to match the existing structure with non-reflective paint.
3. The equipment shall be installed in substantial conformance with the plans submitted in the application, which are incorporated into this decision by reference.

Boness will write the decision.

Petition No.: 3947

Premises affected: 149R Haggetts Pond Rd

Petitioner: New Cingular

Members: McDonough (Acting Chair), Brown (Acting Clerk), Ranalli, Baime, Boness

Michael Dolan of Brown Rudnick LLP represented New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC (New Cingular) requested a continuance to 8/4/11. The Board voted unanimously to grant the requested continuance to 8/4/11.

Petition No.: 3842

Premises affected: 84 Summer St

Petitioner: Gaunt

Present were: Jeton (Acting Clerk), Brown (Acting Chair), Boness, Baime, Ranalli

John E. Gaunt represented himself & his wife for a variance from §4.1.2 &/or a special permit under §3.3.5 to construct a 24' x 24' addition to the rear of the house that will not meet the minimum side yard depth requirement. The original house was built in 1905 and is slightly skewed on the lot. The eastern side lot line setback is 4.9' where 15' is required. The existing deck and porch will be razed and the addition will be constructed over their footprint. It will line up with the existing house and roof line, will be closer to the side lot line than both the existing porch and house because of the orientation of the house on the lot. The proposed addition will be 4.2' from the eastern side lot line at its closest point. The Board asked the Applicant if they could move the addition away from the eastern boundary so that it wouldn't come any closer to the eastern boundary than the house. There is a large ledge under the house on the western side. There's a full basement on the eastern side and a crawl space on the western side. The foundation had to be pinned to the ledge. A full basement is not planned on western side of the proposed addition for that reason. It would not be possible to move closer to the western lot line because of the ledge. No one else spoke either for or against the application at the public hearing. The Board voted to waive the view, close the public hearing and deliberate.

The proposal is to increase the non-conformity of an existing structure because it would be closer to the lot line than is the existing structure, a variance is required. The Board found that there was a hardship related to the soil conditions and topography of the lot due to the presence of the ledge running along the western side of the lot. The Board agreed that the Applicant's petition for the variance could be granted without substantial detriment to the public good & without nullifying or substantially derogating from the intent or purpose of the By-law. The Board voted to grant the variance from Article VIII §4.1.2, with the condition that the addition is constructed substantially in conformance with the Plot Plan and plans submitted with the application and that the addition comes no closer than 4.2' to the eastern boundary of the property. The Board voted to deny the special permit as moot. Baime will write the decision.

Petition No.: 3939

Premises affected: 139 Andover St

Petitioner: Bell / Bogan

Present were: McDonough (Acting Clerk), Jeton (Acting Chair), Boness, Baime, Ranalli

Recused: Brown

Member David Brown recused himself from the case because the petitioners had been clients of his. Mr. Bell represented himself and his wife in seeking a variance or special permit to allow the removal and reconstruction of a portion of an accessory structure that will not meet the minimum front yard depth requirements. The property is located at the intersection of Andover St. & Hall Ave., therefore the front yard setbacks apply to both streets. The accessory structure has a setback from Hall Ave of 21.4' where 35' is required in the SRA District. The proposal would remove the existing structure and rebuild it at the same location. The structure is in substantial disrepair. The applicant provided photocopies of photographs of the structure to demonstrate its condition. It is uncertain exactly when the structure was built but a photograph sets the date of construction prior to 1920. The accessory structure will be rebuilt on substantially the same footprint with an increased height of approximately 18' to match the soffit with the attached barn. No other members of the public came forward to speak in opposition or support of the petition. The Board voted to waive a viewing of the premises & to close the public hearing. The Board then proceeded to deliberate.

The Board considered that the improvement of the structure does not increase its non-conforming nature as it is proposed to come no closer to the street than the existing structure. The Board agreed that the proposal is not out of scale or character with the current neighborhood. As such, the Board concluded that the proposed changes to the structure would not be substantially more detrimental to the town or neighborhood than the existing structure. , that repairing the garage was more in the interest of the public good than allowing the continued existence of a dilapidated structure & that a hardship exists due to the mere existence of the structure and the financial burden of tearing it down.

The Board unanimously voted to approve a Special Permit under Article VIII, §3.3.3 to allow the removal and reconstruction of the accessory structure & denied as moot the variance from the requirements of Article VIII, §4.2.2 to allow the continued existence of the detached garage, subject to the following conditions:

1. Construction shall occur in conformity with the submitted certified plot plan (John Abagis and Associates, dated 9-14-2001)
2. No portion of the reconstructed structure shall be closer to the property lines than is any portion of the current structure.

Ranalli will write the decision.

Petition No.: 3943

Premises affected: 5 Dufton Rd

Petitioner: Teichert

Present were: McDonough (Acting Clerk), Jeton (Acting Chair), Boness, Baime, Ranalli

Recused: Brown

McDonough noted for the record that Brown recused himself and left the room since the Teicherts have been his clients. The applicant, Mrs. Teichert, represented herself & her husband seeking a variance or special permit to construct additions & alterations that will not meet the minimum front and side yard setback requirements and/or for a modification of Decision # 3917 to allow a change to the roof line allowed in that decision. The dwelling, constructed in the 1920s's, does not conform to current setback or lot size requirements. The addition would add a two story extension to the rear of the house and remove the existing front porch, adding a two story addition in its place within the footprint of the existing front porch. No portion of the proposed addition to the rear would be within the drainage easement. It was noted that a portion of the existing deck is within the easement. The front addition would extend no closer to the road than the existing front porch. The applicant stated that the previously approved design, Decision#3917, was financially infeasible due to structural support issues with the existing house. The proposed deck has a side setback to the South of only 3.0 feet. The applicant confirmed that there is no house on the lot to the south. The lot on the south side has been classified by the Town of Andover as unbuildable and has been conveyed to the Conservation Commission. No other members of the public came forward to speak in opposition or support of the petition. The Board voted to waive a viewing of the premises & to close the public hearing. The Board proceeded to deliberate.

The Board determined that hardship exists due to the narrowness of the lot & the placement of the drainage easement to the rear of the house. The Board agreed that the proposal is in character with the surrounding neighborhood & that the proposal is in scale with the current neighborhood. The Board agreed that since the lot adjacent to the proposed three foot setback is unbuildable, the proposed alteration would not adversely impact a direct abutter. The Board concluded that the proposed changes to the structure would not be substantially more detrimental to the town or neighborhood than the existing structure. The Board finds that approval of this project will not tend to impair the status of the neighborhood and that permission will be in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the regulations of the Zoning By-Laws. The Board unanimously voted to approve a variance from the requirements of Article VIII, §4.1.2 to allow the construction of the additions and denied as moot the special permit, subject to the following conditions:

1. Construction shall occur in conformity with the submitted certified plot plan (John Abagis and Associates, Job# 5771, dated 7/6/2011)
2. No portion of the reconstructed structure shall be closer to the street than is any portion of the current front porch.

Ranalli will write the decision.

Petition No.: 3940

Premises affected: Post Office Ave

Petitioner: Musgrove LLC

Present were: McDonough (Acting Clerk), Brown (Acting Chair), Jeton, Baime, Boness

Landscape Architect Christian C. Huntress of Huntress Associates, Inc. appeared on behalf of the Petitioners. The Petitioners wish to allow the placement of temporary outdoor tables, chairs & umbrellas on Post Office Avenue, a private way controlled by the petitioner. The seating areas will be secured with planters and granite blocks, as shown on the site improvement plan prepared by Huntress Associates, Inc., dated 5/27/11, revised 7/5/11. Seating would be seasonal, April 1 to October 31, and includes a total of 16 tables & 64 chairs in 3 secure locations. The proposed outdoor seating areas will be within six (6) existing parking spaces presently designated for use by the existing restaurants. The Petitioner contends: 1) That the shape of the lot and structures do not allow for additional parking to be established within the property; 2) That literal enforcement of the parking criteria within the zoning bylaw creates substantial hardships, financial and otherwise, to the petitioner and their tenants. The proposal was reviewed twice through the town's Inter-Departmental Review process, had been informally presented to the Zoning Board of Appeals in June 2011, and had received unanimous approval from the Design Review Board (DRB) on June 8. The Andover Planning Dept provided a letter of support dated 7/5/11. DRB also provided a memo dated 6/14/11 detailing their review & support of the plan. In an email dated 7/7/11 the Fire Department's Fire Prevention Officer Lt. Pomerleau noted that the petitioner

had made the two revisions requested for public safety reasons. Mr. Huntress indicated that the Police Department's safety officer had not provided written approval prior to leaving on a trip, but stated that he had verbally signed off on the project during the IDR process. Several questions were posed about the project's impact on area parking and the capacity of the existing parking supply to meet both the peak and off-peak demands of this proposed project. Additionally, the board explored details of public safety implications. When questions were posed related to liquor service the board noted that issue was under the purview of the Board of Selectmen. The Board voted to waive a viewing of the premises and to close the public hearing & to deliberate.

Relief was requested under Sections §9.4 & 3.1.3.f.8 of the Zoning Bylaw. Section 9.4 sets forth conditions under which special permit applications will be reviewed, and Section 3.1.3.f.8 (Table 1) identifies temporary outdoor seating as a use allowed by Special Permit from the Zoning Board of Appeals. The Board found that the proposed use is appropriate for the area & that the proposal meets all five criteria set forth in Section 9.4.2. The testimony of the town's senior planner provides ample evidence that the proposal meets the community's social and economic needs. Comments from the town's public safety officials assure that the proposal addresses traffic, parking and loading needs, and that utilities and other public services are adequate. The board specifically addressed parking via a variance in Decision #3944. The board finds that the proposal is in keeping with the neighborhood character and structure and will not have a negative impact on the natural environment. This application does not proposed any changes to the existing buildings. The board voted unanimously to grant the Special Permit. Jeton will write the decision

Petition No.: 3944**Premises affected: Post Office Ave****Petitioner: Musgrove LLC****Present were: McDonough (Acting Clerk), Brown (Acting Chair), Jeton, Baime, Ranalli****Alternate: Boness**

Landscape Architect Christian C. Huntress of Huntress Associates, Inc., appeared on behalf of the Petitioner's request to allow the placement of temporary outdoor tables, chairs and umbrellas on Post Office Avenue, a private way controlled by the petitioner. The seating areas will be delineated and secured with planters and granite blocks, as shown on the submitted site improvement plan prepared by Huntress Associates, Inc., dated 5/27/11, revised 7/5/11. This seating would be seasonal, April 1 to October 31 at the latest, and includes a total of 16 tables and 64 chairs in three secure locations. The proposed outdoor seating areas will be within six (6) existing parking spaces presently designated for use by the existing restaurants. The Petitioner contends: 1) That the shape of the lot and structures do not allow for additional parking to be established within the property; 2) That literal enforcement of the parking criteria within the zoning bylaw creates substantial hardships, financial and otherwise, to the petitioner and their tenants. The petitioner's assertion is that relief may be granted without detriment to the public good & and without nullifying or substantially derogating from the intent or purpose of the Bylaw. Mr. Huntress presented a table showing the number of parking spaces available on property controlled by Musgrove LLC. By his calculation, based on the parking requirements adopted by Town Meeting in May, 2011, an aggregate total of 50 spaces would be required to serve the existing tenants' uses. There are currently 44 spaces available on-premises, 29 of which are provided by lease to specific tenants and 15 of which are provided in common. The spaces are located along Post Office Avenue and in a parking lot which is accessed from Post Office Avenue. In addition to the private parking spaces, there are two municipal parking lots located nearby, behind the Old Town Hall. This proposal had been reviewed twice through the town's Inter-Departmental Review process, had been informally presented to the Zoning Board of Appeals in June 2011, and had received unanimous approval from the Design Review Board (DRB) on June 8. The Andover Planning Dept provided a letter of support dated July 5, 2011. DRB also provided a memo dated June 14, 2011 detailing their review and support of the plan. In an email dated July 7, 2011 the Fire Department's Fire Prevention Officer noted that the petitioner had made the two revisions requested for public safety reasons. Mr. Huntress indicated that the Police Department's safety officer had not provided written approval prior to leaving on a trip, but stated that he had verbally signed off on the

project during the IDR process. Several questions were posed about the project's impact on area parking and the capacity of the existing parking supply to meet both the peak and off-peak demands of this proposed project. Additionally, the board explored details of public safety implications. The Board voted to waive a viewing of the premises and to close the public hearing, and then proceeded to deliberate.

The Chair designated Mr. Boness to sit as an alternate for the deliberation. The Petitioners have requested relief under Section 5.1.4.12.a of the Zoning Bylaw which sets forth requirements for outdoor parking for uses within the General Business district. The Board finds that the proposed use is appropriate for the area; specifically a private way controlled by the petitioner, whose tenants (restaurants, commercial and office) will be most affected by this decision. The Board finds that within the downtown area there is sufficient parking capacity within a reasonable walking distance to this site. The Board further finds that literal enforcement of the parking criteria within the Zoning Bylaw creates substantial hardships, financial and otherwise, to the petitioner and their tenants. The Board finds that relief may be granted without detriment to the public good and without nullifying or substantially derogating from the intent or purpose of the Andover Zoning Bylaw. The Board voted unanimously to approve the variance from the parking requirements of Article VIII, §5.1.4.12.a, provided that no more than six (6) parking spaces are seasonally removed from service in accordance with the plans submitted with the application. Jeton will write the decision.

Petition No.: 3938

Premises affected: 1350 & 1350R South St

Petitioner: SunGen LLC

Present were: Brown (Acting Clerk), Jeton (Acting Chair), Ranalli, Baime, Boness

Attorney Mark S. Johnson of Andover appeared on behalf of the Petitioner, SunGen Mark Andover, LLC ("SunGen"). Mr. Cale Inoue of SunGen was also present. SunGen Mark Andover, LLC proposes to install a 4± MWh solar photovoltaic facility located on a roughly triangular property. The lot is bounded by a National Grid electrical transmission corridor to the west, Interstate 93 to the east and the Shawsheen River and the Andover Village Improvement Society's (AVIS) Susan Sanborn reservation to the north. It will include a fixed ground-mounted photovoltaic solar facility, on 17.4 acres of the overall 40.9 acre parcel, and two small transformer pads and just under 7 acres of shade-tree management along the southern and eastern boundaries of the site. Access to the facility would be via an 18' wide gravel driveway off the end of South Street, with a "Tee" turnaround to facilitate emergency response. Construction access to the facility would be exclusively via South Street and, upon completion, the site would be monitored remotely. The operation is a passive use; no employees housed on site and limited vehicle trips for maintenance. The facility would be approximately 718' from the nearest residentially zoned property, which is located off of South Street in Tewksbury. Construction activities as part of the installation include, but are not limited to, racking system installation, electrical component installation, interconnection activities, tree trimming/cutting, and access construction/enhancement.

The site has a sandy soil base with scattered trees along the interior of the parcel and thicker tree vegetation along the outer (western) border of the site with an existing gravel and soil access path from the end of South Street in Tewksbury which crosses the transmission corridor and provides limited access. Multiple access easements are located leading to and on the property. SunGen proposes to use a new 50' wide access easement to connect to an existing 60' easement crossing the National Grid corridor, leading to the edge of the project property boundary. An existing 4' chain link fence is located along the border with the MassDOT (I-93) right-of-way along the eastern border of the property.

Approximately 80% of the arrays will have a maximum height of 8-11', although some western ends of the arrays may reach 15-18' above existing grade. Electrical runs and wiring will be located underground in conduit in accordance with Town of Andover and Commonwealth of Massachusetts requirements. No additional lighting is proposed at this time and due to the nature of the completed project no additional parking is proposed.

Attorney Johnson's 7/7/11 memo to the Board sets forth his contention that the proposed facility is allowed as-of-right because of Andover's status as a "Green Community" under the Green Communities Act of 2008, which assists municipalities "along a path of enhanced energy efficiency and renewable energy toward zero net energy." Andover is one of only 53 Green Communities in the state, and, thus qualifies for renewable power and energy efficiency grants. To qualify, cities and towns must demonstrate a commitment to reducing energy consumption, seeking clean renewable energy projects, and providing clean energy economic development, as codified in the MGL Chapter 25A, Section 10(c). Johnson submitted the Inspector of Buildings' April 2010 letter to the Department of Energy Resources to satisfy the requirement that mandates as-of-right renewable energy uses. The letter concludes that Section 3.1.3.D.2 of the Zoning Bylaw's Table of Use Regulations satisfies the M.G.L. c.25A, §10(c) requirement for allowed alternative energy uses in the Town. Mr. Johnson contended that the proposed PV facility succeeds in complying with the spirit and intent of the Green Communities Act, and such use should be deemed allowed as-of-right.

In the alternative, Johnson argued that if it's not allowed as-of-right, the grant of a Special Permit for the facility as an "essential service" under §3.1.3.E.6 is appropriate. In relevant part, §10 of the Zoning Bylaw defines an essential service as follows: "Transformer station, substation, pumping station, telephone exchange, telephone or radio repeater or other similar utility installation..." While §10 doesn't define any of the terms used in the definition of an essential service, the solar facility clearly falls within the definition of a substation when considering the nature of the facility. Electrical substations typically consist of the following three types—each of which addresses a different aspect of the grid—collection, transmission and distribution. Today's emphasis on renewable energies such as wind and solar power, electrical collector substations are able to collect and transmit electricity throughout the grid.

This proposal consists of a large solar array that will collect solar energy, convert it into electrical energy and then transport this electricity to the grid for use elsewhere. Even if the facility wasn't deemed to be a substation, it is certainly "a similar utility installation," that facilitates the movement of a necessary public service.

The requested variance is from the setback requirements due to the irregularly shaped triangular lot that, although situated entirely in Andover, is only accessible via South Street in Tewksbury. The proposed arrays are located as near to the south and east borders of the project site due to proximity of clear areas provided by the National Grid transmission corridor and the MassDOT Interstate 93 right-of-way. These two large swaths of "treeless" land allow relatively unobstructed sunlight to reach the proposed arrays, allowing more energy production due to a lower horizon line allowing more sunlight to reach the arrays in the early and late hours of the day as well as from low sun angles found during late fall/early spring/winter in New England. Additionally, more diffused sunlight will be absorbed by the array on cloudy days. The larger expanses of open areas allow more light to be reflected onto the PV array (as opposed to being absorbed by trees or other nearby objects). By acquiring the necessary solar easements from National Grid and MassDOT, electricity production increases significantly while impacting fewer natural resources. To attain a similar low horizon line, trees would have to be cut to the same distance and height as the existing clear swaths are now to be as effective.

Further, the presence of a State Listed Endangered Species found on the northern portion of the site is equally as important to maintain the environmental cost-benefit balance of the project. SunGen has worked with the Massachusetts Agency of Natural Heritage and Endangered Species ("NHES") to identify where and what the impacts from the proposed project would be on those species. NHES personnel support the proposed placement of the arrays to best maintain the existing habitat. The placement of the arrays in the manner proposed increases the production capability of the facility, relatively (per KWh produced) lowers the cost of the installation and decreases most (if not all) of the environmental costs of the project. The spacing of the arrays has been condensed as much as possible, consistent with allowing maintenance vehicular access. The applicant has received a very positive response from both the Planning Board and the Conservation Commission, which is expected to issue an order of conditions at its next meeting. The Planning Board has held 2 public hearings and it is anticipated that the Planning Board will close the public hearing at its

meeting of 7/26/11. The applicant filed an Environmental Notification Form with the Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs and on 6/8/11: there was a finding made that the project does not require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report. The applicant has spoken with the Andover Village Improvement Society regarding the possible donation of the northern portion of the site to AVIS, but requested that any such potential donation not be made a condition of approval of the project.

Several residents and other interested parties addressed the Board with their concerns and comments. Steven Fink, founder of the organization Sustainable Andover, stated his support, citing the educational opportunities afforded by a project designed to coexist with endangered species, and the project's environmental benefits. Donald Quinn of 1310 South Street (the last house on the street in Tewksbury) was not opposed to the project but was concerned that tree-cutting could affect his view. Alix Driscoll, speaking for the Andover Conservation Commission, stated that the Commission had closed its public hearing on the project and that an Order of Conditions was being drafted. Dina Castilia, Realtor and Tewksbury resident at 51 Field Stone Circle, expressed concerns about potential health issues and the occasional flooding of South Street. Susan Stott, representing AVIS, stated that AVIS supports the project as the lowest impact potential use of the site. They view the potential for increased access to the Sanborn reservation as a plus. Kaija Gilmore, Inspector of Buildings, stated that she would have no problem with an as-of-right finding under §3.1.3.D.2, but that, since the proposed facility does not consist of any enclosed structure, she feels that allowing the facility by Special Permit under §3.1.3.E.6 as an "essential Service" is more appropriate.

The Board voted to continue the public hearing to Wednesday, July 20, at 7:00 PM.

Discussion Item: Other zoning related matters

There was a motion to adjourn & a second. The Board voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting.