

City of Keene
New Hampshire

ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
MEETING MINUTES

Monday, March 3, 2025

6:30 PM

**Council Chambers,
City Hall**

Members Present:

Richard Clough, Chair
Edward Guyot, Vice Chair
Joseph Hoppock
Tad Schrantz
Adam Burke

Staff Present:

Evan Clements, Planner, Deputy Zoning
Administrator

Members Not Present:

Zach LeRoy, Alternate

I) Introduction of Board Members

Mr. Hoppock called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM and explained the procedures of the meeting.

II) Voting: Chair and Vice Chair

Mr. Hoppock stated that his term on the ZBA has expired, and he is serving until his replacement arrives, which he believes will be next month.

Mr. Hoppock nominated Mr. Clough for Chair. Mr. Guyot seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Chair Clough nominated Mr. Guyot as Vice Chair. Mr. Hoppock seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

III) Minutes of the Previous Meeting: November 4, 2024

Mr. Clough stated that the minutes of the previous meeting are from December 2, 2024.

Mr. Hoppock made a motion to approve the meeting minutes of December 2, 2024. Mr. Guyot seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

IV) Unfinished Business

Mr. Clough asked if there was any unfinished business. Mr. Clements replied no.

V) Hearings

- A) ZBA-2025-01: Petitioner, Cedarcrest Inc., represented by Megan Ulin, from ReVision Energy, requests a variance for property located at 91 Maple Ave., Tax Map #227-018-000. This property is in the Conservation District and is owned by Cedarcrest Inc. The Petitioner requests a variance to permit the installation of a medium scale solar energy system in the Conservation District per Article 7.3.5 and Table 8-1of the Zoning Regulations.**

Mr. Clough introduced ZBA-2025-01 and asked to hear from staff.

Mr. Burke stated that he needs to recuse himself due to a conflict. Mr. Clough replied that Mr. Burke is recused and now they have a four-member Board. He asked the Applicant if they wish to proceed.

Evan Clements, Planner, stated that the subject parcel is an existing five-acre lot at the location of the Cedarcrest Center for Children with Disabilities, a residential care facility that provides medical, therapeutic, and educational care for children with special needs. He continued that the site is located on the eastern side of Maple Ave., approximately 600 feet from the Route 12 interchange in the Low Density District. The Applicant seeks a Variance to permit the construction of a medium scale solar energy system on approximately 1.6 acres of land to be acquired by Cedarcrest from the City of Keene and incorporated into the subject parcel via a lot line adjustment. The 1.6-acre land area is currently zoned Conservation and is part of the Monadnock View Cemetery. With the adoption of the Land Development Code (LDC) in 2021, the entire city underwent a rezoning effort. The Conservation District allows two uses, open space, which is undeveloped green space intended to stay that way, and cemetery. The intent of zoning the Mountain View Cemetery as Conservation is to acknowledge the unique land use that is a cemetery and what would be appropriate for it.

Mr. Clements continued that a medium-scale solar system is not permitted within the Conservation District. It is worth noting that this portion of the cemetery is not viable for cemetery plots, due to the presence of underground utility lines. This project came before the ZBA on April 1, 2024, when the City of Keene intended to construct the solar project in the same general location but keep the project on the cemetery parcel at 512 Park Ave. At that time, the ZBA granted a Variance for large-scale solar energy system use and a dimensional variance to encroach into the 50-foot setback required by the Conservation District, Article 7.3.5, and the Solar Energy System Conditional Use Permit Ordinance, Article 16.2.3 of the LDC.

Mr. Clements continued that the surrounding land uses immediately adjacent to the subject parcel includes religious uses to the north and east, single- and multi-family dwellings to the south, single-family and a hospital use to the west, and cemetery to the southeast.

Mr. Guyot asked if it is correct that Cedarcrest is on a five-acre parcel, and if the 1.6 acres would be added to that, for 6.6 acres in total. Mr. Clements replied that it is correct.

Mr. Guyot continued that his other question is about the previous solar energy system the ZBA approved. He asked why Article 16.2.3 of the LDC does not apply here in this preamble. Mr. Clements replied that in doing the lot line adjustment, the Applicant is acquiring enough land area that they will not be able to site the array within the required 50-foot setback.

Mr. Hoppock asked if it is correct that the array is too big for the building's roof. Mr. Clements replied yes, it is approximately 30,000 square feet.

Mr. Clough asked if the Board had any more questions for Mr. Clements. Hearing none, he asked to hear from the Applicant.

Megan Ulin, Solar Project Developer with ReVision Energy, introduced herself. Jim Yannizze stated that he is the Director of Finance at Cedarcrest. Ms. Ulin stated that as Mr. Clements mentioned, this project has come out of the evolution of an agreement ReVision had with the City to explore solar development on several parcels of land, one of which is this general area of the cemetery. With the letter of intent, in agreement with the City, solar development was being pursued to help achieve the goal of 100% renewable energy offset and to allow the opportunity for local non-profits to be system owners and system off takers of solar energy systems. They might not have the land necessary to do so, which is the case for Cedarcrest. Cedarcrest is fortunately located in direct proximity to the cemetery area being explored for solar development, which facilitates the project for several reasons.

Ms. Ulin continued that Cedarcrest's facility requires electricity demand of about 543 kilowatt hours per year. Their lot size and building roof line are not sufficient to accommodate a system that would meaningfully offset that electricity usage. The only way for them to install a solar energy system to reduce their electricity bills and make use of solar energy is through acquiring land and through a ground-mounted solar energy system, which they propose here. Through that process, and because the system is proposed, the system location is directly proximate to Cedarcrest, they can tie in behind their electricity meter for a direct reduction in their electricity load. Because of that, and because Cedarcrest will have the opportunity to own the system down the line – currently, they are in an agreement to purchase the power from it – it made sense to pursue a Boundary Line Adjustment for ownership simplicity, rather than a long-term lease.

Ms. Ulin continued that the proposed location for this iteration of the project improves the project because it no longer requires a dimensional Variance. It is a more efficient use of the land space, and it brings it into further compliance with the Zoning Regulations for the Conservation

District. This project will offset about 67% of Cedarcrest's electricity usage. This site is a benefit because it is very similar to how accessory systems are treated in other areas. It will be able to directly offset Cedarcrest's electricity usage. As a larger user of electricity, they need a larger system to accommodate it.

1. *Granting the Variance would not be contrary to the public interest.*
2. *If the Variance were granted, the spirit of the Ordinance would be observed.*

Ms. Ulin stated that the proposed use will not adversely affect surrounding properties or the public interest. She continued that it is currently proposed on an undeveloped area at the rear corner of the cemetery, and it is out of sight of most gravesites. The proposed location brings it further out of visibility from the remainder of the property. Multiple uses and high intensity uses surround this portion of the cemetery, including residential, municipal, commercial, and institutional land uses. These include the Parkwood Apartments, the cemetery maintenance building, the First Baptist Church, and the medical facility across the way. The proposed system is screened from these neighboring properties with a mature line of trees existing to the north, and a substantial buffer and carports screen it from the Parkwood Apartments, the only neighboring residential use. The visibility of the solar energy system will be minimal. The only abutter that will have visibility of the system is the cemetery property. They (ReVision) have been working with Andy Bohannon, Deputy City Manager, on this project, and he has been very helpful. He has submitted a letter of support for the location and the Parks and Recreation Department's support for the project not having a negative impact to the cemetery property and the City property.

Ms. Ulin continued that similar to permitted uses in the Conservation District, solar is a passive use. It does not produce any smoke, fumes, or noticeable levels of noise, and it will not increase traffic. The land beneath the solar panels remains pervious and vegetated with grass, so it will not have stormwater impacts. The use does not threaten public health, safety, or welfare. Solar energy provides a benefit to public health by providing renewable energy, which is a goal of the Keene Master Plan and is encouraged for local businesses and nonprofits.

Ms. Ulin continued that due to the mixed uses in the neighborhood, the limited visibility of the solar energy system, and its passive nature, they believe the presence of the system does not alter the essential character of the neighborhood. They suggest that it does not violate the Zoning Ordinance's objectives of the Conservation District. From Section 7.3.1 of the LDC, the Conservation District's purpose is "*to provide for lands which have been identified as necessary to preserve as open space because of their critical or delicate environmental nature.*" This portion of the property is not critical or sensitive in nature. There are no wetlands, wildlife habitat, floodplains or other surface waters, or steep slopes in this portion of the property, nor are there historical or cultural resources. The Applicant does not propose major changes, grading, or tree removal. For these reasons, they believe the solar array will not violate the basic Zoning objectives and it satisfies the first and second criteria.

3. *Granting the Variance would do substantial justice.*

Ms. Ulin stated that granting this Variance allows Cedarcrest to utilize an undeveloped portion of land in a manner consistent with the spirit of the Ordinance and compatible with the many surrounding land uses. Denying the Variance does not serve the public interest, as it prevents Cedarcrest from moving forward with a renewable energy project that meets the City's goals and meets Cedarcrest's goals for powering their facility with more renewable energy.

4. *If the Variance were granted, the values of the surrounding properties would not be diminished.*

Ms. Ulin stated that compared to the existing high intensity uses, solar is a passive, quiet use. She continued that the project would be in an area that has limited visibility from properties; it will not provide a negative visual impact. It is located in a mixed-use neighborhood that accommodates several land uses, some are high intensity, such as the high density apartments and the medical facility. The solar array will be fully screened from neighboring properties to the north and south by the existing vegetation. The visual impact on the cemetery will be minimal due to the array's placement at the very rear corner and is a very small portion of the overall 46-acre parcel.

Ms. Ulin continued that given the passive nature of the solar energy system and its limited impact on the adjacent properties, the value of those surrounding properties would not be diminished by the proposed use. The primary abutter is the City, which is the cemetery property. That property is not taxed, and the value therefore might be immaterial. The presence of the solar energy system does not detract from the aesthetics or value of it.

5. *Unnecessary Hardship*

A. *Owing to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area, denial of the variance would result in unnecessary hardship because*

i. *No fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property because:*

Ms. Ulin stated that this is a unique property with several conditions that support the finding of an unnecessary hardship. First, the property is in the Conservation District, which has only three permitted uses by right, cemetery, conservation area, and telecommunications facility by special exception. However, this portion of the cemetery is not viable for use as cemetery because of the underground utilities. It is also unsuitable as a conservation area because it lacks the sensitive, natural features found in other properties more suited to be considered conservation. This is an open field that is mowed and maintained. The only reasonable permitted use for this area would be telecommunications facility, which has a greater visual impact on the surrounding properties

than a ground-mounted solar array. This portion of the property is also unique because it is flat, clear of trees and vegetation, and already contains some naturally existing visual buffer.

Ms. Ulin continued that if literally enforced, this land would be practically unusable due to the limited uses allowed in the Conservation District and due to the special conditions of the parcel. This result would not have a fair and substantial relationship with the purpose of Article 7.3.5, which is related to the use of the Conservation District. This is primarily because its intention is to protect open spaces that have a critical or delicate environmental nature, which does not apply here. Therefore, strictly applying those permitted uses of the property will not further the intention of the Zoning and there is not a substantial relationship between the Ordinance provision and its application to this property.

and

ii. The proposed use is a reasonable one.

Ms. Ulin stated that the proposed use is reasonable because solar energy is a passive use, similar to the existing passive uses that are allowed, and it will not adversely affect the cemetery property or the surrounding properties with no environmental or cultural features in this area that are sensitive. The site is proximate to intense residential and commercial development, which makes it less suitable for conservation and protection. A solar energy system is a reasonable way to use this undeveloped portion of land with minimal impact on the site and adjacent lands.

Ms. Ulin continued that they note that a small portion of the property is being used by the Parks and Recreation Department as community garden plots. However, the proposed location for solar system allows that use to continue to the southeast, and it allows the solar proposal to meet the dimensional requirements of the Ordinance and avoids bisecting City lands with a solar use that is less contiguous to the property that it is serving. They suggest that adding solar to this area is a further beneficial use of a portion of the property that cannot be used for burial purposes.

B. Explain how, if the criteria in subparagraph (A) are not established, an unnecessary hardship will be deemed to exist if, and only if, owing to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area, the property cannot be reasonably used in strict conformance with the ordinance, and a variance is therefore necessary to enable a reasonable use of it.

Ms. Ulin stated that they have established the criteria in subparagraph A. However, because of the special conditions of the property, which include the underground utilities, the Conservation District requirements and the lack of sensitive features, a denial of the Variance would render the property unusable for the purposes for which it is zoned. Therefore, a Variance is necessary to make reasonable use of it.

Mr. Clough asked if the Board had questions for the Applicant.

Mr. Hoppock stated that he did not hear Ms. Ulin mention anything about glare, but he remembers that it came up when the Board last heard a case similar to this. He continued that he heard that the panels themselves are made in a way that does not emit glare.

Ms. Ulin replied that it is correct. She continued that solar panels are designed to absorb the sunlight rather than reflect it, having an anti-reflective surface. ReVision Energy has documentation from the manufacturer that shows the reflectivity, which is very minimal – less than the reflectivity of standing water or window glare. The solar panels reflect less than 2% of incoming sunlight received. In general, glare is a concern more for air traffic. The panels are tilted, so the reflection is generally upwards and above most residential or commercial uses. Visual buffers exist on the south side of the panels, screening the apartments. They do not believe glare is a significant issue here.

Mr. Schrantz stated that regarding the parcel, last time, the Applicant looked for a Variance for setbacks. He continued that he wonders why they are not doing that this time. If they are only achieving 67% of their goal, he wonders why they would not look for a Variance and try to use the entire site if it meets all the criteria Ms. Ulin is speaking to.

Ms. Ulin replied that they designed the system to fit within Cedarcrest's existing service size. She continued that they would need costly facility upgrades to expand the system any further. They deemed it appropriate to build a system that would meet the dimensional requirements, because it would be difficult to justify a dimensional Variance when they are drawing in the new property lines by choice.

Mr. Schrantz stated that the abutter on the south side is the City. He continued that he went to the area this weekend to check it out, and saw trees right on the property line, which looked like they are part of the City land. He wonders how that impacts the solar array in the future. Pine trees grow quickly and create challenges for solar arrays. His question is whether (neither Cedarcrest nor ReVision) owns those trees, whether they would have to ask the City to cut them down at some point, and whether that impacts their land. Ms. Ulin talked about value and non-taxable parcels, but he is curious about how that might impact that property in the long term.

Ms. Ulin replied that they have modeled the existing vegetation surrounding the proposed solar array, as part of ReVision's production modeling and design and where they chose to place it. She continued that they would not expect to ask the City for any vegetation management on their property in the years to come.

Mr. Schrantz stated that Ms. Ulin spoke about this portion of the property not having any conservation value, no habitat, and no steep slopes. He asked if studies were done to validate habitat, wetlands, and so on and so forth, by either the City or ReVision, or if that is anecdotal information.

Ms. Ulin replied that ReVision used several GIS resources to screen the project, including the NH Fish and Game Department's Wildlife Habitat Program and Wildlife Corridors, and they submitted a data check with the NH Heritage Bureau to screen for rare plants or rare animal communities. Those are the resources they used to determine that it was a viable location from that perspective. There are wetlands elsewhere on the property, but this particular corner has been maintained and disturbed and has had garden plots on it. Therefore, there is no habitat that would be affected by the array.

Mr. Clough asked if the Board had any further questions. Hearing none, he asked for public comment in opposition to or in favor of the project.

Mr. Clements stated that he will read the letter of support into the record, dated February 13, 2025, from Andy Bohannon, Deputy City Manager:

"This letter is to serve as a letter of support for the requested variance for the installation of a medium-scale solar energy system on approximately 1.6 acres of undeveloped land in the Conservation District located in Monadnock View Cemetery. The City Manager has been authorized by the City Council to execute an agreement for the land sale, and the project is consistent with the efforts of the Comprehensive Master Plan and Energy and Climate Committee's renewable energy initiatives.

This project has been in development for several years after the City began working with ReVision Energy to identify parcels within the City that could support medium to large scale projects. Monadnock View Cemetery presented a prime opportunity to not only meet that need but provide support to a local non-profit organization as an energy off taker. As the project developed, the City determined that a relocation of the project and land purchase would provide the best path forward for everyone involved in the project. Cedarcrest operates as a specialized pediatric medical facility and school which has limited space to provide solar power, and with this proposal, it meets our community goals to provide more sustainable energy and reduce our carbon footprint by 2030.

The City supports the request for a use variance, without installation of an additional visual buffer, due to the nature of the location. Currently located in the northwest corner of Monadnock View Cemetery, the parcel is not in view of the public way and is buffered to the south by large pines and carports from Parkwood Apartments. To the north is a vegetated buffer along the property line of the First Baptist Church. To the east is the cemetery operations building and row of trees buffering Section N of the cemetery. The remaining open 1.5-acre field will be converted into new community garden plots supported by the Parks and Recreation Department.

The solar location provides continued passive use, no different than the current use as garden plots, and will allow the City to redevelop and create a stronger community garden program. This project provides a win-win for the community in many ways, and we hope that you find the

spirit of this variance in alignment with our current zoning practices and the Comprehensive Master Plan.”

Mr. Hoppock stated that in the application, the Applicant identifies the unique characteristics of the property as the limitations of zoning. In other words, there are three uses permitted: conservation, telecommunications, and cemetery. He continued that, however, he thinks the criterion speaks to the characteristics of the property, not of the zoning regulation.

Ms. Ulin replied that she understood it to be the specific application of the Ordinance provision to this property, which they determined to be not a fair and substantial relationship, due to the conditions of the property; primarily, the property not having the critical and sensitive features that are proposed to be features of conservation lands that would be protected by the District.

Mr. Clough asked for further questions or public comments. Hearing none, he closed the public hearing and asked the Board to deliberate.

1. *Granting the Variance would not be contrary to the public interest.*

Mr. Hoppock stated that he does not see anything here that presents a problem where this Variance is contrary to the public interest. He continued that the opposite is true, as the Applicant is using land that cannot be used for any other purpose in the zoning district. They are proposing to apply solar panels to it, which meets the Comprehensive Master Plan goals of energy independence. That is in favor of the public interest. The standard is for (a Variance) to “not be contrary” to the public interest, and that is met. He thinks it goes beyond that, and although the Applicant does not need to prove that he thinks it is worth mentioning. This criterion is satisfied.

Mr. Guyot stated that he would support that there is nothing contrary to the public interest here. He continued that in fact, the (Variance) enhances the public interest because the other use, if not solar, would be telecommunications infrastructure, which is allowed but not as favorable. Certainly, it is not as favorable visually, as the Applicant pointed out.

Mr. Clough stated that he agrees with both of those.

2. *If the Variance were granted, the spirit of the Ordinance would be observed.*

Mr. Hoppock stated that this proposal does not alter the essential character of the neighborhood in any fashion or to any degree. He continued that it (the location) is so secluded that no one will see it. It poses no threat to public health, safety, or welfare. As Mr. Guyot mentioned, putting a telecommunications facility there could have the opposite effect, as it would affect the essential character of the neighborhood and be an eyesore there. Solar panels do not have that (concern). Thus, he thinks the two questions of the second criterion are satisfied. There is no alteration to the neighborhood and no risk to the health, safety, or welfare of the area. This criterion is met. Mr. Clough stated that he sees and nods in agreement.

3. *Granting the Variance would do substantial justice.*

Mr. Hoppock stated that here the issue is that any loss to the individual that is not outweighed by a gain to the public is an injustice. He continued that if this project were approved, 67% of the Applicant's electrical needs will be met by this operation, and without that, the Applicant would have a significantly higher electrical cost. Therefore, the loss to Cedarcrest would be significant, without any corresponding gain to the public. In his view, that is an injustice, and granting this Variance would do substantial justice because it would allow Cedarcrest to use that electricity on land that is otherwise unusable. The loss to the individual would be significant without a gain to the general public, which would be corrected by granting the Variance. The third criterion is met.

Mr. Clough stated that he agrees. He continued that the big issue here is balancing it out, and there is no public gain to be had by denying this Variance.

4. *If the Variance were granted, the values of the surrounding properties would not be diminished.*

Mr. Hoppock stated that with this criterion, he looks for whether there is any evidence or a commonsense reason why an application, if granted, would diminish property values. He continued that here, there is none. Again, the location is relatively secluded. There are tree barriers; a lot of space, as the photos in the agenda packet indicate; and no noise, glare, or anything else that would impact the values of surrounding properties, whether the properties are taxable or not. He does not see anything that would have a negative effect. This criterion is satisfied.

Mr. Clough replied yes and compared to the previous time the ZBA heard of the City's plan for a much larger array in that same space and had to seek Variances for setbacks, this is sited in such a way that it is even less likely to cause any sort of issues with any neighbors. He continued that the Applicant specifically set is so they would not even have to come to the ZBA with any other setback Variances. It would be very bizarre to find some way that this would adversely affect any other property values.

5. *Unnecessary Hardship*

A. *Owing to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area, denial of the variance would result in unnecessary hardship because*

i. *No fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property because:*

Mr. Hoppock stated that he agrees with Ms. Ulin's remarks in answer to his question about the other parcels. He continued that the cemetery piece being parceled out for this use is not appropriate for cemetery use because of the underground utilities, which is a unique

characteristic of that piece. It cannot be used for cemetery or conservation. It could be used as a telecommunications facility, but no one really wants that there.

Mr. Hoppock continued that another unique feature is a lot size on the small side, a building on the large side in relation to the smaller lot size, and the underground utilities on the other piece that is coming in. Cedarcrest will obtain that parcel of land; it will be their own land at some point, and they will be able to use it in a reasonable fashion. This is a reasonable fashion. The unique features are the small lot size and a larger building that cannot accommodate the solar panels. With the new 1.5 acres of land coming in, they will be able to do that. These characteristics are unique to this property and the 1.5-acre parcel. When you consider those unique features, applying the terms of the Ordinance to this piece of property does not make sense in terms of what the Applicant wants to use it for. Denying the Variance would create unnecessary hardship, and he does not think that is appropriate. Criterion 5.A.i is met.

Mr. Guyot stated that he wholeheartedly agrees with Mr. Hoppock's observations and commentary. Mr. Clough replied yes, and actually, when the City first came to the ZBA (with a solar project in this location), the City would have had to run the power out to Maple Ave. and it would have been awkward. He continued that this solution is much more elegant, running the power right to a user, right there. He remembers that how the City was going to try and run power was one of the most awkward aspects of (the previous project proposed), and that is gone now with this solution, and it is because of the uniqueness of the placement. Thus, he agrees (the criterion is met).

ii. The proposed use is a reasonable one.

Mr. Hoppock stated that he agrees, given what the ZBA heard tonight in terms of how the Applicant will use that large section of land that is basically unusable, by putting it to good use and saving some electricity.

Mr. Clough asked if there were any further comments. Hearing none, he asked for a motion.

Mr. Hoppock made a motion to approve without conditions ZBA-2025-01, for Petitioner Cedarcrest Inc., for property located at 91 Maple Ave., Tax Map #227-018-000. The request is for a variance to permit the installation of a medium scale solar energy system in the Conservation District, which without the variance would be contrary to Article 7.3.5 and Table 8-1 of the Zoning Regulations. Mr. Guyot seconded the motion.

1. Granting the Variance would not be contrary to the public interest.

Met with a vote of 4-0.

2. If the Variance were granted, the spirit of the Ordinance would be observed.

Met with a vote of 4-0.

3. *Granting the Variance would do substantial justice.*

Met with a vote of 4-0.

4. *If the Variance were granted, the values of the surrounding properties would not be diminished.*

Met with a vote of 4-0.

5. *Unnecessary Hardship*

A. *Owing to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area, denial of the variance would result in unnecessary hardship because*

i. *No fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property*

Met with a vote of 4-0.

and

ii. *The proposed use is a reasonable one.*

Met with a vote of 4-0.

The motion to approve ZBA-2025-01 passed with a vote of 4-0.

VI) New Business – Adoption of the 2025 calendar year meeting schedule

Mr. Clough asked if everyone has looked at the proposed 2025 meeting schedule. He continued that the (meeting that would have been on) Labor Day is on Tuesday (instead). All the other dates are on the first Monday. He asked if that is correct. Mr. Clements replied yes, the September 2 meeting is a Tuesday.

Mr. Clough noted that Mr. Burke has rejoined the meeting. He asked for a motion regarding the meeting schedule.

Mr. Hoppock made a motion to accept the 2025 calendar year meeting schedule. Mr. Guyot seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

VII) Communications and Miscellaneous

Mr. Clough stated that he would like to thank Mr. Hoppock for all his dedication to this Board. He continued that he feels much more comfortable being able to (chair) this Board after having observed Mr. Hoppock for a number of years. Jane Taylor is not present tonight, but he also extends a big thank you to her. She has brought some real insight into many ZBA hearings.

Mr. Hoppock replied that he enjoyed every minute of his time on the ZBA.

VIII) Non-public Session (if required)

IX) Adjournment

There being no further business, Chair Clough adjourned the meeting at 7:21 PM.

Respectfully submitted by,
Britta Reida, Minute Taker

Reviewed and edited by,
Corinne Marcou, Board Clerk