

DRAFT

**Minutes of the  
Zoning Board of Adjustment  
Meeting of January 6, 2026**

On January 6, 2026, a meeting of the Zoning Board of Adjustment was held in the Knightly Meeting Room at Salem Town Hall.

**PRESENT:** Edward Huminick Chair, Dionne Garon, Vice-Chair, Elaine Cottrell, Secretary; Daniel Guild, Claire Karibian, David Bruce, Alt present in audience.

Town Planner Jacob LaFontaine was present also.

Chairman Huminick called the meeting to order and introduced the board members. Members and alternates said they have visited the sites. He gave an outline of the meeting. He advised that the ZBA is a quasi-judicial board and that all testimony is under oath.

VIEW OF MINUTES

1. December 11, 2025 – Regular Meeting

Mr. Huminick said these are the minutes for the December 11, 2025, meeting.

Motion: Mr. Guild made a motion that they adopt the minutes as written.

Second: Ms. Cottrell seconded this motion.

Ms. Garon	In favor
Ms. Cottrell	In favor
Ms. Karibian	In favor
Mr. Guild	In favor
Mr. Huminick	In favor

Vote: 5-0

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Petition #01-2025-00044 Map 55, Lot 6805 14 SAMOSET DRIVE JAMES MENIATES JR & GAIL E MENIATES 2019 TRUST hereby requests a VARIANCE from Article III, Section 490-302C (1) of the Zoning Ordinance to permit the construction of an accessory dwelling unit with a 22 foot right side setback where 30 feet is required in the Rural District.

Abutters: Evans, Moore, Perez, Trudal, Hanninen, Antar, Mallous

Abutters present: Evans, Trudal

Mr. Huminick said there is a letter in the file authorizing Benchmark LLC to present.

## DRAFT

1 Mr. Huminick said there were a few questions from the last meeting that Mr. Maynard was going  
2 to come back and answer. Mr. Huminick said he is going to answer the location of the septic  
3 system, septic system approval, and existing site grades. One of the abutters asked how the  
4 runoff will affect the property. He will answer where the driveway will face and if there are any  
5 wetlands on the property. There were also questions about what the roof design was.

6 Mr. Maynard said he is prepared to answer these questions.

7 Mr. Huminick said the plan says Town of Windham.

8 Mr. Maynard said he would fix that. Mr. Maynard said he is here with Benchmark LLC. He said  
9 the property owners are looking to add an ADU behind the existing garage. He said one corner of  
10 the ADU is in the setback. The total encroachment into the setback is 100 square feet. The  
11 architectural plan was submitted, and it matches the floor, and it is an ADU. He said there is a  
12 driveway down the side lot line and a garage in the back. The driveway they do not need relief  
13 for.

14 Mr. Maynard said the Town Engineer asked for infiltration of trenches. He showed the Board  
15 where the trenches will be on the plan. He said the water will go into that area. They also added a  
16 small infiltration basin at the end of the driveway. He said the driveway is graded to make sure it  
17 will not go to the neighbor. He said it will be super elevated or pitched. He said the existing pool  
18 and concrete behind the home will be removed. He said with this gone there will be more grass.  
19 He said even with the driveway they still have more grass after the concrete has been removed.

20 Mr. Maynard said they did check for wetlands, and there are none on the property at all. He said  
21 he did not see any wetlands within 50 feet. He printed out a drainage flow map. He said all of  
22 that water goes down to Lake Street. He said the septic system will be 50 feet from the lot line.

23 He said the septic system has been state approved, and it was submitted to Mr. LaFontaine.

24 Mr. LaFontaine said they do have correspondence from Senior Engineer Jim Brown. He said if  
25 the variance is granted, he recommends infiltration of new roof runoff. He said he also spoke  
26 with the health officer earlier about the removal of the existing Lichfield. He said this will need  
27 to be done with the health officers' guidance. He said this shall be a condition of approval. He  
28 said the health officer and the applicant can work with that.

29 Mr. Maynard said they will not come out to do an inspection of the field is not tied to something,  
30 so they are going to do a lot of the work all at once.

31 PUBLIC INTEREST: Mr. Maynard said the variance is not contrary to public interest because  
32 this is a residential area; the lot is a single-family home. The subdivision was created when small  
33 lot sizes were used. The state has passed legislation to allow more housing options. The  
34 appearance will be similar to those in the area. The Septic system has been approved. He said  
35 they have added drainage measures.

36 SPIRIT OF ORDINANCE: He said the spirit of the ordinance is observed because the property  
37 is zoned rural. The proposal is to allow an ADU to be constructed. The addition will be  
38 constructed in today's building standards. Only the corner will encroach.

39 SUBSTANTIAL JUSTICE: Substantial justice will be done because granting the variance will  
40 allow an ADU to be constructed in the home. He said he has heard the abutters concerns, and  
41 they have added drainage. He said this will not affect them.

42 DIMINUTION: The value of the surrounding properties will not be diminished. The lot is zoned  
43 rural. The construction of an ADU will add value to the existing home.

## DRAFT

1 SPECIAL CONDITIONS: Literal enforcement would result in unnecessary hardship. The  
2 property does have enough land area. The shape of the existing home does have an odd angle.  
3 The footprint of the home is such that this is the most practical. There is no fair and substantial  
4 relationship between the general public purpose of the ordinance and this application. Site grades  
5 and existing location of the home limit the locations. The proposed use is a reasonable one. The  
6 ADU is proposed behind the building in the same shape as the home. The variance is necessary  
7 to enable reasonable use of the property.

8 Mr. Huminick asked the abutters if they had seen the renderings of the buildings.

9 The abutters said no, they did not.

10 They were given a copy.

11 Public participation:

12 Mr. Trudel came up to speak. He lives at 88 Lake Street, and he is a direct abutter. He said he  
13 asked at the last meeting about how the runoff would affect his property and his neighbor's  
14 property. He said the new plan is not the one that he was sent in the mail. The plan was put on  
15 the screen so he could see it.

16 Mr. Trudel said there are significant changes. He said the swimming pool taken out is a big  
17 change. He said if the drainage is satisfactory the board he does not have an objection to it. He  
18 said his concerns were vindicated.

19 Mr. Huminick asked Mr. Evans if he had any comments or concerns after hearing the  
20 presentation.

21 Mr. Evans came up to speak. He said he has not seen anything in the mail about the driveway,  
22 runoff, or roof design. He said this is the first time he is seeing the elevation plan. He said he is  
23 not satisfied.

24 Mr. LaFontaine said they do send the abutter notice but they do not include the packet. He said  
25 you would have to access those on the website. He said they are posted on the website and  
26 described where.

27 Mr. Evans said that he should have been told that a month ago.

28 Mr. LaFontaine said it is on the notification. He showed Mr. Evans the elevation plans.

29 Mr. Evans said it is wet back there, and he asked how there would be enough room for the  
30 garage. He said he pays for mosquito mitigation, and he does not think another pond is a good  
31 idea. He asked why the addition cannot go on the other side if they are taking out the pool. He  
32 said he did not buy the property to have an addition directly overlook his backyard. He said no  
33 one said anything to him about the project.

34 Mr. Maynard said the garage is just a driveway that is on the side of the house. He said it is a 12-  
35 foot-wide driveway. He said it meets the grading and there is a turning radius. He said he likes to  
36 hold 35 feet so they can back out.

37 Mr. Maynard said the drainage pond serves 2 functions. He said there is a compost mulch mix  
38 that goes in it. He said this allows the water that goes in to infiltrate and go into the ground. He  
39 said as larger storms come in, there is an overflow for it. He said removing the pool alone is  
40 enough mitigation. He said they added extra after that. He said the layout of the house puts this  
41 in the best location. He said they have gone above and beyond.

42 Mr. Karibian asked if they are going to ask for authorization for the steps as well.

**DRAFT**

1 Mr. Lafontaine said yes, they do want to have the steps that come down, and that is how it is  
2 proposed to be constructed.

3 Ms. Karibian asked what the squares were.

4 Mr. Maynard said it is a generator and an air conditioner. He said they are going to move to the  
5 side of the house.

6 Ms. Karibian asked where the driveway comes in from.

7 Mr. Maynard said it comes off of the existing driveway.

8 Ms. Karibian said there is a name that is incorrectly spelled.

9 Ms. Cottrell said they should not get tied up with that.

10 Mr. Maynard said legally he has to go by the tax card and that is what the record at Town Hall  
11 are.

12 Ms. Karibian said the last name is misspelled.

13 Mr. Maynard said he can fix that.

14 Public participation:

15 Mr. Trudal said he was not under the impression there was a garage under the ADU. He said the  
16 garage is not shown in the elevation. He said there is a 6-foot difference in height. He said the  
17 water will come pouring onto the driveway, and he does not know if the retention space will hold  
18 it. He said they have had some serious rainfall lately, and they do have wet areas.

19 Mr. Maynard said the architectural plan does show the garage off the back. He reviewed the  
20 elevation. He said he does not see any problems with the grading on the driveway. He said this is  
21 standard from a development standard. He also explained the grading of the pond and  
22 infiltration.

23 Mr. Evans came up. He asked what they were going to do with the propane tank if they were  
24 putting a driveway there. He asked if they would disturb the natural drainage ditch on the  
25 property lines. He said the very first winter he was in the home, the basement flooded. He said it  
26 seems like there will be a lot of things getting disturbed. He said with the trees removed will his  
27 basement start flooding again. He said this is not being considered.

28 Mr. Huminick closed petition 1.

29  
30 Motion: Ms. Cottrell made a motion to approve with the stipulations that the new roof and  
31 driveway runoff be infiltrated; the installation of the new septic field is in accordance with the  
32 health office, and a final as built plan, and names corrected on the plan to reflect legal records.

33 Mr. Guild mentioned they should fix the errors on the plan because there will be a title issue.

34 Mr. LaFontaine said it is a good idea to have a final as built. He said Mr. Maynard could submit  
35 that.

36 Second: This was seconded by Mr. Guild.

37 Mr. Guild said the variance is not contrary to the public interest because the state has expressed  
38 an interest in allowing more diverse housing options. He said the applicant has addressed the  
39 issues and revised the plan. The spirit of the ordinance is observed because only one corner is  
40 imposed on the setback. Substantial justice is done because they are directed by courts to do a  
41 balancing. He said this would allow the homeowner the maximum use of their property without  
42 opposing any harm. He said the applicant has gone the extra mile to address concerns. He said  
43 the properties surrounding it will not be diminished. Literal enforcement would result in

## DRAFT

unnecessary hardship. The shape of the existing home is an angle which building difficult. No fair relationship exists between the general public purpose of the ordinance and this application. He said this will not interfere with the quiet enjoyment of others.

Ms. Garron	In favor
Ms. Cottrell	In favor
Ms. Karibian	In favor
Mr. Guild	In favor
Mr. Huminick	In favor

Vote: 5-0

Petition #02 -2025-00046 Map 55, Lot 6762 18 SAMOSET DRIVE JOHN & DEANA DELVECCHIO hereby request a VARIANCE from Article VIII, Section 490-801C (4) and asks that said terms of the Zoning Ordinance be waived to permit expansion of the floor space of an existing 750 SF ADU to add a second floor that will result in a total floor space for the ADU of 1,806 SF, where 950 SF is the maximum allowed by the ordinance.

Abutters: Town of Salem, Fuller Revocable Trust, Kang, Antar, Hanninen, Cameron & Ciardello, Morrison  
Abutters present :none

Mr. LaFontaine said there is correspondence from the building department. They said the existing ADU does not have a certificate of occupancy. He said it was inspected in May 2024 at that time it had a partial pass. He said the deadbolt needs to be changed to a lever and doorknob system, and high-rise step into the building. He said the applicant has relayed these items have been done just not inspected. He said he directed him to the building department to get into the inspectional line. He said the condition would be prior to issuance for a building permit all outstanding permits need to be closed out.

Mr. Huminick said there is a letter in the file authorizing SFC Engineering Partnership to make the presentation.

Tara Aquilina was present for this item. She said this is located in the rural zone. She said the property is 8.5 acres. It has a 4-bedroom home and a 2-bedroom ADU. It is 225 feet from the roadway. The 750-foot ADU is attached to a one car garage. It was constructed in August of 2023. There is an onsite septic with approval for 6 bedrooms. There is also an onsite well. The proposal is to expand the current ADU. They want to construct a second floor. It will bring the total space of the ADU to 1,806 square feet. 950 square feet is allowed by the ordinance. No bedrooms will be added just living space. There will be no change to the driveway. The project will result in a more comfortable home for the owner's daughter and grandson.

PUBLIC INTEREST: She said the variance will not be contrary to the public interest because the request will not result in a change to the character of the neighborhood. The expansion will maintain a high-quality residential appearance. It matches the rest of the neighborhood. It will

## DRAFT

1 not create any health or safety hazards because no additional bedrooms will be created. It will  
2 not impact any wetlands.

3 SPIRIT OF ORDINANCE: The spirit of the ordinance is observed because the expanded ADU  
4 will maintain quality as required by the ordinance. The proposed ADU is an allowed use in the  
5 district. The ADU will meet all dimensional requirements.

6 SUBSTANTIAL JUSTICE: Substantial justice is done because the construction will allow for  
7 residential families to support the property owner. The additional space meets all requirements of  
8 the building code. There is no gain to the public by denying the request.

9 DIMINUTION: The surrounding properties will not be diminished because the improvement  
10 will increase the value of the subject property therefor increasing the value of surrounding  
11 property. The nature and use will be consistent with the neighborhood.

12 SPECIAL CONDITIONS: Literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in an unnecessary  
13 hardship. The special conditions are that this is an 8.5-acre property. It can easily support the  
14 minor increase in living areas. There is no fair and substantial relationship between the general  
15 public purpose of the ordinance and this application. There is no benefit or gain by limiting the  
16 square footage of the ADU. The ADU can be constructed without expanding the footprint. This  
17 is a reasonable request for a large property. There will be no negative impact on the surrounding  
18 area.

19 Ms. Aquilina said this space is for the daughter and grandson of the property owner while they  
20 care for the property owner. She said it meets the intent of the ordinance.

21 Ms. Cottrell said this would be over 100 percent of the maximum size of the ADU. She said she  
22 cannot recall approving one of this size. She said they could add an addition to the home and that  
23 would not require a variance, just a building permit. She said it is difficult to approve an ADU of  
24 this size because it sets precedent. She asked why they are adding to ADU and not adding an  
25 addition to the home.

26 Ms. Aquilina said she went to the home and met the family. She said the little ADU is bursting at  
27 the seams. He said they want the daughter and the grandson to stay there, but she just needs more  
28 living space. Mr. Huminick said he had the same concerns. He said the purpose of zoning is for  
29 health, safety, and welfare. He said they take applications on a case-by-case basis. He said that it  
30 would preserve more open space and he thinks that it upholds the spirit and intent of zoning.

31 Mr. Guild said the ordinance says you are not supposed to grant any variances larger than the  
32 current ADU space. He said balancing the land, the modification is small to the size of the land.

33 Ms. Garon said it would fit right in. She also said alternate construction would pose a hardship.  
34 There was no public participation.

35 Ms. Karibian said she does not think they meet the hardship.

36 Ms. Cotrell said she agrees.

37 Ms. Aquilina said raising the roof is better for runoff and environmentally.

38 Mr. Huminick said there was a case out of Nashua that set the precedent for substantial justice  
39 being done despite exceeding size limits.

40 Ms. Karibian said the size of the property should not come into play. She does not feel it is  
41 correct to allow it.

42 Mr. LaFontaine said they could build a duplex with a variance.

43 Ms. Cottrell said the literal enforcement of the ordinance does not have a benefit to the public.

## DRAFT

1 Mr. Huminick closed petition 2.

2  
3 Motion: Ms. Cottrell made a motion to approve with the stipulation to have the certificate of  
4 occupancy prior to issuing any new permits the existing permits must be closed out.

5 Second: This was seconded by Ms. Garon.

6 Ms. Cottrell said the variance is not contrary to the public interest because this is not impacting  
7 the health, safety, or welfare of the public. It is not changing the character of the neighborhood.  
8 The spirit of the ordinance is observed because the increase will maintain the neighborhood  
9 character, it is an allowed use, and the large lot size does permit expansion. Substantial justice is  
10 done because the expanded unit would allow for family support, and additional space does meet  
11 all other requirements. The values of the surrounding properties will not be diminished because  
12 ADUs increase the value of this property and the surrounding properties. The literal enforcement  
13 of the ordinance would result in an unnecessary hardship. She said there is no public gain to  
14 literal enforcement because they are building up.

15 Mr. Guild said he struggles because the ordinance says do not grant variances larger than this. He  
16 said he is not sure they have a hardship given they have other alternatives. He said they have to  
17 balance the differences, and he said there is nothing saying in this case they should not grant the  
18 variance. He said it would allow them to make maximum use of their property.

19 Ms. Karibian said she feels they are changing the rules and the ordinance. She said they have  
20 done that way too often. She said there will be heat and plumbing, and eventually it could be  
21 something else. She said because the property is large, they should not have privileges others do  
22 not. She said they do not have hardships, and they should not be granting.

23 Mr. Guild said the gain to the public for denying this is adherence to the rules as defined by the  
24 city council.

25 Mr. Guild said when there are provisions in the ordinance that say they should not grant the  
26 ordinance; it is hard for him to grant.

27 Ms. Cottrell said she does think this is a unique condition.

28 Mr. Huminick said the ZBA was created to grant relief. H said having an ordinance that says do  
29 not grant relief is counterintuitive.

30 Mr. LaFontaine said he wanted to correct the record and say they would need a variance for the  
31 duplex, and it would only be a half foot discrepancy. He said this is a curved street.

Ms. Garon	In favor
Ms. Cottrell	In favor
Ms. Karibian	Opposed
Mr. Guild	In favor
Mr. Huminick	In favor

32 Vote: 4-1

33  
34 Petition #03-2026-00001 Map 90, Lot 1288 175 MAIN STREET ROBERT A. SALEMI,  
35 TRUSTEE hereby requests a VARIANCE from Article IV, Section 490-401(C)(1) of the Zoning  
36 Ordinance to permit the existing two-family structure to remain on a lot having 163.05 feet of  
37 frontage, where 190 feet is required in the Business Office I District

## DRAFT

1  
2 Mr. LaFontaine said he got an email from Attorney Campbell that said it has come to his  
3 attention that there is a measurement discrepancy. He said it will be necessary to withdraw the  
4 application.

5  
6 Petition #04-2026-00002 Map 108, Lots 12501, 12657. 24 VIA TOSCANA, ARTISAN DR.,  
7 SOUTH VILLAGE DR. TUSCAN VILLAGE MASTER DEVELOPMENT, LLC hereby  
8 requests a VARIANCE from Article VII, Section 490-702(E)(2) of the Zoning Ordinance to  
9 permit two off-site, freestanding monument signs in the parking and access areas (Map 108, Lot  
10 12501), for the tenant (Whole Foods) located on the adjacent lot (Map 108, Lot 12657), where  
11 offsite signage is not allowed in the Commercial Industrial C District.

12  
13 Abutters: Tuscan Village Master Development LLC, OMJ Realty, Tuscan Village Block 1200  
14 LLC, Tuscan South Village LLC, Tuscan Village Jewel Building 1 LLC, Tuscan Block 2000  
15 LLC, TV Block 2000 Master Association, Rockingham 620 Inc, State of NH DOT  
16 Abutters present: None

17  
18 Mark Gross was present for this item. He is here to request a variance for off-premises signs.  
19 There are 2 monument signs. They are asking for 2 offsite monument signs. This is for the tenant  
20 of Whole Foods. He showed the Board the parcels where the signs would be. The first parcel is  
21 currently known as the South Village. The other parcel is known as Building 1300. Whole Foods  
22 will be on the first floor. He showed different views to the Board. There is underground parking  
23 for Whole Foods. They want to have the Whole Foods visible from Route 28. They anticipate  
24 that is where the traffic will be coming in from. He said there is a split on Via Toscana and it  
25 would be for way finding to identify where the store is.

26 The second sign is in the parking area. He showed pictures to the Board of the monument signs.  
27 He said they are allowed a pile up signs. He said they are using the smaller sign version. He said  
28 this is consistent with the other business in the village.

29 PUBLIC INTEREST: Mr. Gross said the variance will not be contrary to the public interest  
30 because the free-standing sign was designed to provide the public and the patrons of Whole  
31 Foods signage that will guide them to the store. He said this is defined as offsite sign in the sign  
32 standards. The configuration of parking is located on another parcel. The use of free-standing  
33 signs is allowed in the sign standards. The second sign requires a conditional use permit through  
34 the Planning Board. The signs will not adversely impact public health, safety, or welfare.

35 SPIRIT OF ORDINANCE: The spirit of the ordinance is observed because the purpose of the  
36 ordinance is to regulate signs providing information and advertising and in an orderly and  
37 affective manner. Restrictions on the sign protect the public from hazardous environments. The  
38 signs will not be a hazard and will be conducive to business. The sign is necessary to direct  
39 traffic. Both signs will provide directions and advertising. Mr. Gross said the advertising is  
40 stating that it is Whole Foods.

41 SUBSTANTIAL JUSTICE: Substantial justice is done because Tuscan Village is large scale  
42 development, and it relies on being a cohesive development. These signs conform to the sign  
43 standards for Tuscan Village relative to the design of the sign.



## DRAFT

1 DIMINUTION: The values of the surrounding properties will not be diminished because these  
2 monument signs are located adjacent to the entrance and parking. They are not adjacent to any  
3 residential homes. They will create additional tax revenue for the Town.

4 SPECIAL CONDITIONS: Literal enforcement of the ordinance will result in unnecessary  
5 hardship because the special conditions are this property is being developed un provisions that no  
6 other property is being developed under. This will distinguish it from other properties in the area.  
7 There is no relationship between the general public purposes of the ordinance and this  
8 application. This is large scale redevelopment, and it was realized that the type of signage would  
9 be unique. The current ordinance does not allow for this unique signage. This is why the Tuscan  
10 Village Sign Standards were developed. He said this layout of the sign is allowed under the  
11 standards but requires a variance due to the definition of being an offsite sign. Allowing offsite  
12 signs will not adversely affect public health, safety, or welfare. There is no benefit to the public  
13 that would outweigh the hardship.

14 The proposed use is a reasonable one. He said the large-scale redevelopment has received review  
15 from the Planning Board. The unique nature of the signage is critical to the success of the  
16 development. The offsite signs are reasonable given these conditions.

17 Ms. Karibian asked if it is kiosk and if it is set very close to the building.

18 Mr. Gross said it is not a kiosk and no it is not set close to the building. He showed the Board on  
19 the Plan where the signs would be. He showed the traffic and explained why they need the signs  
20 for way finding.

21 Ms. Cottrell said it is clear when you are driving because if you see the sign and keep going, you  
22 end up in a roundabout. She said it is hard to see.

23 Mr. Gross showed the street views to the Board and showed them the flow of traffic. He showed  
24 them where the signs would be. He also showed the Board where the lot lines are.

25 Mr. LaFontaine said they did discuss the need for an arrow, but they think if the sign is angled,  
26 they will not need an arrow. He said it might not be a bad idea to have an arrow.

27 Mr. Gross said at the top for the sign he could add an arrow.

28 Ms. Karibian asked why Whole Foods gets this attention, and other stores do not.

29 Mr. Gross said because this is a major tenant, and they need signs how to get to them. He said at  
30 the other stores you can see them.

31 Mr. LaFontaine said they do not want free standing signs all throughout the village. He said the  
32 applicant is mindful of that.

33 Mr. LaFontaine showed the Board where the Whole Foods will be and where the parking will be.  
34 There was no public participation.

35 Mr. Huminick closed Petition 4.

36 Mr. LaFontaine said he would ask the Board to consider two stipulations one would be that the  
37 sign would comply with Tuscan Village sign standards I-10E which is the free-standing sign for  
38 standalone tenants, and that a directional arrow is added to sign 1.

39  
40 Motion: Ms. Cottrell made a motion to approve with the stipulations that Tuscan Village Sign  
41 standards are adhered to in I-10E and the directional arrow is added to sign 1.

42 Second: This was seconded by Ms. Garon.

## DRAFT

Ms. Cottrell said the variance is not contrary to the public interest because it will not alter the character of the neighborhood. It will not adversely impact the health, safety, or welfare of the public. It will benefit this by directing more people to the correct location. The spirit of the ordinance is observed because the purpose is to regulate the direction of traffic and the signs for the purpose of providing information in an orderly and safe manner. The signs will not create a hazardous environment. Substantial justice is done because of the configuration of the lots. There is not a way to provide these signs. The value of the surrounding properties will not be diminished because this is not located near any non-Tuscan Village commercial properties, therefore the signs will not adversely affect the values. The Literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship because of the unique location of this large-scale redevelopment. There is no gain to the public for not allowing these signs to be placed.

Ms. Garon	In favor
Ms. Cottrell	In favor
Ms. Karibian	In favor
Mr. Huminick	In favor
Mr. Guild	In favor

Vote: 5-0

**Motion: Mr. Guild made a motion to adjourn.**

**Second: This was seconded by Ms. Cottrell.**

The meeting adjourned at 8:56pm

Minutes by: Jennifer Hernandez

Approved:      Zoning Board of Adjustment

Date