

**SOMERSWORTH ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
MINUTES OF MEETING
DECEMBER 6, 2023**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Matt Keiser – Chair, Richard Brooks, Keith Perkins, Brad Fredette, Anthony Jones, and Ken Hilton

EXCUSED MEMBERS: Ken Vincent

STAFF PRESENT: Dana Crossley, Planning Technician
Anna Stockman, Planning Secretary

The meeting was called to order at 7:00pm.

Keiser appointed Hilton as a voting member.

1) Approval of the minutes:

Brooks MOVED to approve the November 1, 2023 minutes.
The MOTION was SECONDED by Hilton.
The MOTION CARRIED 5-0-0.

2) OLD BUSINESS

a. Any old business that may come before the Board.

3) NEW BUSINESS

a. **K9 to 5 Dog Services LLC/Jacqueline Pierce is seeking a Variance from Table 4.A.2 to allow a commercial kennel on a property located at 15 Rocky Hill Road, in the Agricultural District, Assessor's Map 12 Lot 13, ZBA#18-2023. PUBLIC HEARING**

Crossley provided an overview of the application. She stated the applicant is seeking to establish a commercial kennel to keep no more than fifteen total dogs onsite, which would include the owner's dogs. She said commercial kennels are permitted in the Agricultural District through special exception so long as the following two additional criteria have been met, including the lot area is not less than five acres and no building or open enclosure for keeping of dogs shall be located within one hundred feet of any lot line. She said the subject lot is approximately 0.287 acres and the areas for keeping the dogs are within one hundred feet of lot lines. She said due to those factors, a variance is required. She said if the application is approved, the proposal would require site plan approval by the Planning Board. She said there are no prior Zoning Board or site plan applications found related to the property. The applicant has answered the five variance criteria and the application is ready for the Board to take action.

Jacqueline Pierce of **15 Rocky Hill Road** was in attendance to represent the application. She stated clients do not come to her house, she has a shop in Dover that the dogs stay at during the week and the dogs stay at her house overnight. She stated the commercial kennel would not increase traffic or create any parking issues. She said she cleans up her property all of the time. She said the dogs are quiet and she doesn't allow them to bark. She said she has been operating a commercial kennel for the past four and a half years in the same location and the operation has only become an issue recently because she was not aware she needed to apply for a variance to do so. She stated there is so competition with other businesses in the surrounding area and she noted the business generates revenue for the City.

Keiser opened the public hearing.

Rita Casey of **17 Rocky Hill Road** introduced herself as an abutter. She stated Pierce is a very responsible dog owner, and that Pierce is outside with the dogs where she has a kennel. She said if the dogs bark, Pierce quiets them right down. She noted Pierce is her quietest neighbor. She stated Wells Street is very noisy, there are many kids riding bikes and yelling and cars, trucks, and motorcycles. She said Pierce is a very quiet

neighbor, the dogs bark for two or three minutes and then she quiets them down. She said she wants to support Pierce and her endeavor, and Pierce has been her neighbor the whole time Casey has lived there.

Larry Francoeur and **Paula Francoeur** of **1 Wells Street** introduced themselves as abutters. L. Francoeur stated he has lived at his residence for over fifty years. He said his house and Pierce's kennel are within fifty feet of each other. He said he can see the kennel from his TV room and he can't walk in his yard or do any yardwork without the dogs barking. He noted Pierce does quiet the dogs down. He said they have been living doggy daycare for almost four years. He said they have spoken to both the previous and current Code Enforcement Officer about the kennel. He said Pierce has brought home anywhere from four-to-eighteen dogs randomly, and they have complained about it. He said the dogs bark at his grandkids when they are walking up and down the street. He asked the Board if they would like to look at a kennel from their TV room.

P. Francoeur stated they have a privacy fence that is a foot or so away from Pierce's chain-link fence. She said if one walks by, the dogs can't see them but they will charge at the fence and bark. She said she has counted up to twenty-two dogs that Pierce has had in that area. She said even when they are playing, they are growling and barking. She said they pay hefty taxes and there are too many dogs and too much commotion and noise. She said in the summertime, there have been days when Pierce will leave the property and the windows will be open and the dogs that are left in the house will bark. She said her grandkids are afraid of them. She said it is nothing personal against Pierce, there are just too many dogs. She said the previous Code Compliance Officer had informed her that Pierce could have as many dogs as she wants and to call the police. She said the issue has been ongoing. She stated she is retired and home a lot, and the dogs are a nuisance. She noted she has three horses across the street. She said the previous owners had three dogs and they were not an issue. She said people walk down the street to walk their dogs and Pierce's dogs will bark when somebody walks or bikes by. She noted the challenge of keeping multiple dogs quiet, trained or not, within a small area. She said she is glad the meeting is being held so they can express their concerns.

L. Francoeur stated this has taken away their privacy, and they have been residents of their property for a long time. He stated they are the ones that have gotten the brunt of everything. He posed the question to the Board of whether they would want a dog kennel next door to them. He said they are not trying to hurt anyone financially. He noted they have taken videos of the operation, and they are totally against it.

Crossley stated the Planning Office received two letters from abutters related to the proposal. She read aloud the following voicemail received from Karen and John Salter of 18 Rocky Hill Road.

"My name is **Karen Salter**; I live at **18 Rocky Hill Road**. I got a notice about tomorrow night's Zoning Board meeting. I'm look at New Business (on the meeting agenda) of the K9 to 5 Dog Services owned by Jacqui Pierce across the street from me, and see she wants to put in a commercial kennel at her property at 15 Rocky Hill Road. As a neighbor and an abutter, I am totally against this happening across the street. She already has about ten dogs there as it is and they can be disruptive at times. There is a lot of traffic coming in and out currently without her business being here. It is a residential area and it shouldn't be allowed for commercial business. My husband and I, John Salter and Karen Salter of 18 Rocky Hill Road, who are across the street from this, put in our opposal (opposition) to this business across the street. If you want to give me a call and let me know that this information will get sent to the Planning Board (Zoning Board), that would be wonderful. Thank you."

Crossley read aloud the following email submitted by **Jan Williams** of **13 Rocky Hill Road**.

"I am writing to voice my concerns regarding the variance requested by Jacqui Pierce at 15 Rocky Hill Road for a commercial kennel on her property.

This is not personal as I have no issues with Jacqui. We have a friendly relationship and I love dogs. My biggest concern is the noise level with so many dogs there, particularly in the summer. I understand that Jacqui does her best to keep them from barking but dogs bark no matter how hard you try keep them quiet. I'm most concerned about the noise in the summer months when they are all outside and we have our windows open. I know that that they are with her in Dover during the week but weekends when they are here is when we want to be outside enjoying our own back yard.

Another concern I have is that, within the next few years, I plan to sell my house. I worry that buyers will not be interested in living near a commercial kennel. Although property values have risen over the past few years, I believe that increase has been market driven and that having a kennel close by could affect my resale value.

I also think that adding a commercial business will change the landscape of this neighborhood. If this business is allowed, will there be more? Even though we are zoned as agricultural, with the exception of Tri-City Christian Academy, this is a residential neighborhood. It has been for the past 20+ years I have lived here and I hope it can remain as such.

Thank you,

Jan Williams
13 Rocky Hill Road"

Keiser asked the applicant for clarification regarding her operations in Dover versus in Somersworth.

Pierce stated the dogs sleep at her house. She said the dogs go to her shop in Dover and they get training and daycare. She said she is there ten hours a day Sunday through Friday. She said her days off are on Saturdays when she is still working and training the dogs.

Keiser asked for clarification on whether people drop their dogs off and then pick them up in Dover. He asked whether she transports dogs from Dover to her house, and for the approximate total number.

Pierce responded yes; customers almost always pick up their dogs in Dover. She said she transports dogs from Dover to her house. She said she has seven dogs of her own and she brings home fifteen dogs total at the most. She said she doesn't bring dogs home on a daily basis, it depends on the number of boarding and training dogs she has with her. She said that right now, she has one other dog at her house including her seven dogs. She said she is usually fully booked during the holidays but during the week, she is not usually fully booked, so usually she has four-to-eight additional board and train dogs, not eighteen-to-twenty-two dogs which she said is incorrect. She said the most dogs she has had at her house is sixteen dogs.

Keiser asked whether people pick up their dogs from her house Monday through Friday at night.

Pierce stated Monday through Friday pick-up takes place at the shop only, it is never at her house on those days. She said sometimes clients drop off their dogs at her house between 8:00am and 9:00am on Saturdays and pick them up that afternoon. She said every weekend, she has an average of two clients dropping their dogs off at her house. She said she thinks her neighbors have the belief that she is building something, not doing what she has been doing for the past four and a half years. She said they have never had an issue.

Keiser asked her about what she has structurally for the dogs at her house.

Pierce stated she has a large 16' by 13' foot living room and a dining room area attached to it that has some kennels in it and a woodstove that she doesn't use. She said there is no exterior building and she is not building anything, just using the same space that she has been using for the same purpose since she bought the house in June of 2019.

Keiser asked whether she has a fence on her property and for the height of her fence. Keiser asked whether the dogs are allowed outside of the fence, such as being walked in the neighborhood.

Pierce responded yes; she has a six-foot chain-link fence. Pierce stated she usually takes the board and train dogs out for lessons, they are either doing lessons in the house, in the yard, or on a walk. She said she doesn't usually take dogs for walks on Rocky Hill Road due to the risk of safety around passing vehicles. She said that sometimes she will take a dog down Wells Street but it is few and far between.

Keiser stated the two areas of the Ordinance she is seeking a variance from, including the five-acre requirement to have a dog kennel in the Agricultural District and the other requirement to not be able to have a dog kennel within one hundred feet of a property line. He asked Crossley for clarification on why Pierce would need a waiver from the one hundred feet requirement.

Crossley stated the lot is too small, if the enclosure is one hundred feet one way from one property line, it is within one hundred feet of the other property line.

Keiser asked Pierce about what is unique about her property such that it is ok not to meet the five-acre requirement or to be within one hundred feet of the property line.

Pierce stated Casey lives next door and she is home all of the time. She noted Casey's point that Pierce is the quietest person on the street. She stated she is not sure why the noise is a problem. She said her home has been previously gutted and renovated, so the home is well insulated. She noted she has a Ring camera so she can quiet the dogs if they are barking and she is not home. She said the dogs that don't quiet down get bark collars. She said she didn't know she needed to apply for a variance when she first moved into the property.

She noted the previous Code Compliance Officer had sent her paperwork to apply for an Home Occupancy Permit, which she had completed and she had not been contacted afterward. She said, this year, her neighbors have been complaining about everything she has done. She said her neighbors have barked at her dogs, thrown things into her yard, and recorded her from their house.

Fredette referenced the hardship criteria and other criterion that evaluates whether the request is contrary to the spirit of the Ordinance. He stated his interpretation of the spirit of the Ordinance is to allow for enough space for a buffer to the neighbors amongst other things. He asked about how the proposal is not contrary to the spirit of the Ordinance.

Pierce asked for clarification on Fredette's question. She stated she has no argument for her proximity to next door neighbors, it is a small lot.

Fredette asked about the quantity of square feet that she has and for the size of the space she has for the dogs.

Pierce stated her home is 1,850 square feet. She reiterated the approximate dimensions of the rooms within her house where the dogs stay.

Brooks asked whether she has the ability to house the dogs overnight at her Dover location.

Pierce responded no, that is why the dogs stay at her house. She said the original landlord was against allowing for the boarding of dogs at her location in Dover. She noted she never wants to have dogs left unsupervised overnight. She said she has had her shop for six and a half years and used to board dogs at her former home in Newmarket. She said she has always brought the dogs home with her so they don't have to be locked in kennels for ten-to-thirteen hours like other boarding businesses.

Fredette referenced the aerial photograph and asked about the square box for the dogs outside.

Pierce stated that is the fenced-in area for the dogs.

Fredette asked for clarification on whether the fenced-in area is a portion of her yard versus the entirety of her yard.

Pierce responded yes; the fenced-in area is a decent size but not the whole yard. She said her own dogs are probably louder than any boarding dogs she handles. She said one of her dogs does charge at the fence and she controls him immediately. She said the second her neighbors are outside; she brings the dogs inside.

Keiser closed the public hearing.

Fredette said he appreciates what Pierce is trying to do. He said in some ways, he feels the proposal is contrary to the spirit of the Ordinance and he doesn't see where it meets the hardship criteria. He said the Board has heard concerns from abutters, including concerns regarding property value.

Brooks stated the Board did hear abutters concerns about their property values, and the Board didn't receive any good explanation of any hardship. He noted she does have a fenced-in area towards Wells Street, that fence seems to be within a couple of feet within the property line. He noted it is clear Pierce doesn't have the room the Ordinance calls for in this case.

Regional Impact:

MOTION: Fredette MOVED that the variance request of K9 to 5 Dog Services/Jacqueline Pierce **DOES NOT HAVE POTENTIAL FOR REGIONAL IMPACT.**

The MOTION was SECONDED by Perkins.

The MOTION CARRIES 5-0-0.

Keiser stated something to remember is the variance goes with the land. He said sometimes regardless of the good intentions of the current landowner, if a variance is granted, any future landowner could also have a kennel, and they may not be as concerned as the existing property owner. He said he agrees that there are three criteria that the Board has established that haven't been met, including that granting the variance wouldn't have an effect on adjacent property values, the hardship criteria, and meeting the spirit of the Ordinance. He clarified the criteria as #1, #3, and #5 as not being met.

MOTION: Fredette MOVED that the request of K9 to 5 Dog Services/Jacqueline Pierce for a Variance from Table 4.A.2 to allow a commercial kennel on a property located at 15 Rocky Hill Road be DENIED FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:

1. The Board found the variance would diminish surrounding property values
2. The hardship criteria have not been satisfied as the Board found the property does not have unique characteristics that make the property unfairly disadvantaged by the Zoning Ordinance
3. The Board found the proposal is contrary to the spirit of the ordinance

The MOTION was SECONDED by Perkins.

The MOTION CARRIES 5-0-0.

- b. **Dominique and Diana Metreaud are seeking a Variance from Section 19.24 a. b. & f. to allow an accessory dwelling unit (ADU) that is detached and not internally connected on a property located at 10 Down Street, in the Residential/Single Family/A (R1A) District, Assessor's Map 3 Lot 54, ZBA#19-2023. PUBLIC HEARING**

Keiser opened the public hearing.

Crossley provided an overview of the application. She stated the applicant is seeking to establish an accessory dwelling unit within the existing detached garage. She said as the ADU is proposed to be within the detached structure, the ADU would not be connected internally as required by the Ordinance. She noted accessory dwelling units are permitted on any property containing an owner-occupied single-family dwelling. Provided they meet the criteria set forth in Section 19.24 in the Zoning Ordinance. Research of the property concluded there are no Zoning Board or site plan applications related to the property. She noted the applicant has addressed the five criteria and the application is ready for the Board's review and action.

Diana and Dominique Metreaud were in attendance to represent the application. Di. Metreaud stated their property is located near the end of Down Street. She said no change would be made to the exterior of the buildings and utilities would be dependent on the main house. She said the ADU would not diminish property values. She noted the ADU would be located within the existing structure, and used by her son. She said the space is 584 square feet, 24' by 24' above a garage, and the stair access is interior. She said this would allow her son to have his own space, and she noted the housing market is tough. She said they are on social security and as they get closer to retirement, their family members would possibly live in the larger house, and she and her husband would live in the ADU if they didn't need as much space. She said no additional people would be on the property, she and her family each have their own vehicle. She referenced the hardship criteria and stated the unique feature of their property is their large, detached garage. She noted the structure is not attached; it is eighteen feet from their house. She said to add an addition to attach the primary residence to the detached garage, it would need to be large and it would block their access to the backyard. She described the sides of their property near the property boundaries and noted the fenced-in backyard. She said the appearance of the garage's exterior would remain the same but the interior of the space would be aesthetically nicer. She said their proposal is not contrary to the spirit of the Ordinance because they are not trying to create multifamily housing or change the character of the neighborhood as all changes would be internal to the garage.

David Landry of 14 Down Street stated he resides in the home at the end of the street. He stated his concern is not so much related to the conversion of the garage into living area. He stated when the garage was built, the person that built it wasn't much of a carpenter and he would like to see a contractor look at that building before someone lives there. He noted the inconsistency of the siding on the garage's exterior and there are no utilities or insulation. He said he lived next door to the property when the garage was built. He noted his concern is regarding safety, he doesn't want to see anyone get hurt or see the building collapse.

Keiser asked whether they plan on making any changes to the exterior of the building.

Do. Metreaud responded maybe a window. He noted his neighbor is correct, the exterior would need to be freshened up, but the interior construction is solid. He said he has no objection to having someone come to inspect the space.

Keiser noted the ZBA doesn't deal with code compliance and if the variance were granted, they would need to obtain a building permit application and the proper inspections.

Fredette referenced the hardship criteria and he asked the applicant to identify a hardship as the Board would need to find their property different from other properties in the area that would allow the Board to grant the variance based on that difference.

Do. Metreaud stated their detached garage is unique as it is one of the largest garages in the neighborhood. He said one of their attractions to the home is that the yard is fenced in and he stated the only way to access the backyard is in the area between the house and the garage.

Di. Metreaud stated if they were to make an addition to meet the criteria, on one side of the house there is a tree and that's the end of the property line and the other side is an area that connects to the backyard.

Keiser referenced the aerial view of their home. He stated to the left of the house, there is a side yard that appears to span twenty-to-thirty feet from the house to the property line.

Do. Metreaud stated due to the trees located on that side of the house, there is only sufficient space to walk around the exterior of the house.

Keiser asked about what is on the interior of their home on that side. He asked whether there is a door on that side of the house. He asked if there is a door on the back side of the house.

Do. Metreaud stated there are two bedrooms and no door on that side of the house. He said there is a sunroom on the back of the house that has a door to the backyard and a bulkhead door to the basement.

Keiser asked whether the basement is finished and if they have considered putting the ADU in the basement.

Do. Metreaud responded the basement is not finished and they haven't considered putting an ADU there. The space is not livable, there is a low ceiling and when it rains, some water enters the basement.

Keiser clarified the sunroom door provides access to the backyard. He stated the requirement is that the ADU is connected to the house and the purpose is to prevent neighborhoods from appearing as multi-family. He said for the Board to approve a variance, they want to make sure the character of the neighborhood is upheld. He noted the Board does not take money into consideration. He provided a brief overview of what the Board needs to evaluate while considering the variance.

Do. Metreaud stated it would not be suitable to construct the ADU on the back of their property as it would take up space where the children play.

Keiser stated a key component is not to change the characteristics of the neighborhood. He said, in his opinion, if it still looks like a garage, then they wouldn't be changing the characteristics of the neighborhood. He presented an example where if they were to build on the first floor of the garage and put a bay window on one side and a front door on the other, the structure would look like a house. He stated the applicant's proposal is the second floor of the garage and the stairs are on the inside of the structure. He asked whether there are windows on the back of the garage. He asked for the location of the access door.

Do. Metreaud stated there is no access door at this time, there are currently two, hinged garage doors. His plan would be to install a personal access door on the front corner of the garage but it would require them to move the fence in the front back by approximately four feet.

Di. Metreaud stated the access door would not be visible from the road as it would be located on the side of the garage.

Brooks stated that regulating ADUs is relatively new to Somersworth. He noted the City has the jurisdiction to regulate them with criteria, which the City has done. He asked whether there is any regulation that prohibits or insists one to have a kitchen in an ADU. He stated the City's regulations state that utilities have to be shared but they leave it at that.

Crossley stated an ADU would likely have a kitchen. She stated the City's regulations do not reference kitchens. She noted the requirement for shared utilities including electric, water, and sewer. She stated the City's regulations do reference bedrooms and utility connections.

Brooks asked whether Code Enforcement would review egress and other life safety components.

Crossley responded yes, building permits and a Certificate of Occupancy would need to be applied for.

Brooks asked about the extent of the construction that would be involved.

Do. Metreaud stated the work would be internal with the exception of an access door and a window.

Brooks asked about the height of the basement and whether the basement runs the full length of the house. He stated an option would be to locate the ADU in the basement.

Do. Metreaud stated the approximate height of the basement is seven feet and the basement spans the full length of the house.

Do. Metreaud stated it is complicated as there is an elevated area where there used to be a woodstove. He noted the moisture issue and said it is not a welcoming living space.

Fredette referenced the plan and asked whether the door would be located on the side. He asked for further clarification on the proposed floor plan.

Keiser closed the public hearing.

Fredette stated ADUs are challenging and he said while each case has to stand on its own, he said he tries to look at the hardship criteria closely for cases like these to consider in future decisions. He said he doesn't think the application meets the hardship criteria to the necessity that it needs to be based on the current definition that we use for an ADU in Somersworth.

Hilton stated he thinks the application does meet the hardship issues in terms of the cost of housing and if it would provide another housing unit to take care of the family in the future, it would be a benefit. He said that should be a consideration. He noted in the past, the Board has voted on proposals that were too close to the property line and because of hardship in the family, the Board allowed those things. He said he thinks this would be a good opportunity to keep the family together.

Keiser stated he is wrestling with it because he is looking at the criteria of A, B and F that the application does not meet, and he noted they all are interrelated. One of key things to consider is the purpose of the Ordinance and the reasoning behind the criteria that must be met for an ADU. He said these are the criteria that must be met for an ADU so it doesn't look like a duplex.

Regional Impact:

MOTION: Hilton MOVED that the variance request of Dominique and Diana Metreaud **DOES NOT HAVE POTENTIAL FOR REGIONAL IMPACT.**

The MOTION was SECONDED by Perkins.

The MOTION CARRIES 5-0-0.

Keiser referenced the characteristics of the neighborhood and stated he is trying to weigh whether there is enough uniqueness and whether the proposal still meets the intent of the Ordinance, and whether the applicants are unnecessarily burdened.

Jones stated he doesn't have a strong opinion, and he would like to see this be approved but he feels the applicants' only avenue is to adjust the zoning by right. He noted ADUs are defined at the state level as attached. He said he thinks the reason Somersworth only allows them to be attached is because that is how it is defined at the state level.

Keiser referenced a case in Rye in which someone applied for an ADU, and a condition of approval was that the ADU would be attached within some period of time.

Jones stated part of the battle is whether having a detached garage is a hardship. He said he would argue that is not a unique characteristic given that the neighbor also has a detached garage. He said the hardship would have to be limited to this lot, and that is not the case here.

Brooks stated there has to be some sort of modification to make the space ready to live in. He asked about the parameters of the proposal and what would stop them from making the whole building a house and remodel it so it no longer looks like a garage. He said he sees both sides and thinks ADUs are a good idea, however, the question is how they are regulated. He stated the Board could consider limiting an approval to only the upstairs of the garage so the building remains an ADU and not a separate residence.

Fredette stated while it is outside of the purview of this board, it's important to consider it is going to require work to connect utilities to this structure. He said he thinks ADUs are a great idea. He referenced the state definition and said he thinks the Board should follow the state's definition as guidance unless there are extreme mitigating circumstances. He said he doesn't think that locating the ADU on the second floor of the garage meets the definition of uniqueness.

Hilton asked whether a covered walkway would count as attached.

Keiser stated a breezeway would not meet the criteria for an attached ADU.

MOTION: Fredette MOVED that the request of Dominique and Diana Metreud for a Variance from Section 19.24 a. b. & f. to allow an accessory dwelling unit (ADU) that is detached and not internally connected on a property located at 10 Down Street be DENIED FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:

1. The Board found the variance does not meet the spirit of the Zoning Ordinance
2. The hardship criteria have not been satisfied as the Board found the property does not have unique characteristics that make the property unfairly disadvantaged by the Zoning Ordinance
3. The Board found the variance would alter the character of the neighborhood

The MOTION was SECONDED by Brooks.

Discussion:

Crossley provided the clarification that the RSA does allow communities to decide if they don't want ADUs to be attached. Attached ADUs have to be allowed somewhere in municipalities' ordinances but municipalities make the decision on whether or not they can be detached.

Fredette stated he understands ADU regulations are a topic of discussion at the City level. He said the best route in cases such as these is for the City Council to consider amending the regulations.

The MOTION CARRIED 4-1-0, with Hilton opposing.

c. **Any other new business that may come before the Board.**

Crossley noted the 2024 meeting schedule is in members' packets. She said if any applications are received, there will be a ZBA meeting on January 3rd, the first meeting of 2024.

Fredette proposed postponing the July 2024 meeting by one week as the scheduled meeting falls on July 3rd, the day before Independence Day.

Crossley stated that will be discussed with Director Mears.

Hilton asked about what it would take for the City Council to review the City's ADU regulations.

Keiser stated if the Board feels strongly about an issue, they can propose an idea to the Director of Planning and Community Development. The Planning Board would then consider recommending that proposal to be brought before City Council.

Crossley stated if there is something the Board is receiving a lot of applications for, she could bring the ZBA's proposals for potential amendments to Director Mears for her review and potential workshops with the Planning Board.

Brooks stated he recently attended a housing focus group. He said a number of topics were discussed, including housing. He said Mayor-elect Gerding has expressed an interest in reviewing zoning and potentially making some changes.

Crossley referenced Brooks' points and stated the City's Housing Master Plan chapter is in the process of being updated. She said ADUs are a big conversation and it is on Director Mears' radar of things to look at, discuss, and explore whether amending the Ordinance to allow for flexibility for ADUs is the right choice for the City. She said it would be reiterated to the Director that such amendments were discussed at the meeting.

MOTION: Hilton MOVED to ADJOURN the meeting.

The MOTION was SECONDED by Brooks.

The MOTION CARRIED 5-0-0.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:18pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Anna Stockman
Planning Secretary