

Brentwood Board of Adjustment Minutes August 23, 2021

Members present: Chairman Doug Cowie, Ken Christiansen, Steve Hamilton, Andrew Artimovich, Alternate Kathy St. Hilaire, Alternate Daphne Woss, Alternate Frank Albert and Alternate Regan Elliot.

Chairman Cowie opened the public hearing at 7:00 pm.

Motion made by Hamilton, 2nd by Christiansen, to give St. Hilaire voting rights. Cowie, Artimovich, Hamilton and Christiansen were all in favor. Motion carried.

7:00 pm: Continued hearing: Applicant/Owner: Michael Kirby & Teresa Forsyth/Kirby, request a variance from Article III, Section 300.002.006.005A-Lot Area Requirements; frontage of 50' on a lot of record where 200' is required, in order to construct a single-family home. Referenced by tax map 210.024.000; Scrabble Road, Brentwood, NH 03833 in the residential/agricultural zone.

Present: Applicant Michael Kirby; Resident Paul Kirby. No abutters were present. Residents Bruce Stevens and Doug Finan were present.

Michael Kirby reiterated to the Board that he is seeking relief for frontage. He was here in November (2020) and abutters were in favor of his proposal of a single-family home on his 12+ acre parcel, no negative impact to the neighbors or to property values. He's used the property for 30 years for livestock, equine, boarding, training, etc. Kirby is hoping the ZBA would entertain that a private way is suitable. Kirby said he went to the Planning Board with engineer, Bruce Scammon, with plans for a private way but were then contacted that it couldn't be private. We asked for the Town Attorney to weigh in and paid for that. He received no real answer or clarification on how the Town could legally proceed. Scammon worked on a plan to accomplish frontage and a private way is the best option for his family and the Town.

Christiansen asked Kirby if he rejected the hammerhead. Kirby replied after speaking with the Fire Department and reaching out to Chris at TEC, he decided that his resources would be better spent the way he wants them and not giving up a piece of his property to create frontage. He wants a private way like Lausier Lane which has 4 houses on 600' of frontage. The minimum is 200' and there was a situation with the radius on a curve. His property has the same curvature. The Fire Department can easily turn around there currently without backing out onto Scrabble Road. Kirby would like the relief.

Christiansen said so do you object to the Town standards, a Town maintained road? Kirby replied he has no need for a Town maintained road. Christiansen said you're looking for a variance, but you can make the road meet the Town standards and have the Town maintain it.

St. Hilaire said so if the Town wants a road built to Town standards, it's also the width, depth, etc. Did the Planning Board give him the option to build it to Town standards? Lausier Lane is not a Town road, it's a driveway that Mr. Lausier put in. There are two houses and then Mike Deschambeault's house has frontage on Prescott Road. St. Hilaire would call Lausier's a shared driveway. Resident Stevens added it could be a right to pass situation. And yes, the Planning Board gave Mr. Kirby options; create enough of a Town road to obtain the frontage. His engineer (Scammon) was to contact the Town's engineer, TEC, but he wasn't aware of any communication.

Hamilton asked why he couldn't do a shared driveway from his existing lot with his house to the 12+ parcel out back. St. Hilaire said he has to have 200' of frontage, it's that simple. Hamilton said can't we just say this is a hardship and let him build a house out there. Stevens replied the legal hardship needs to be demonstrated. Hamilton said there are houses in Town without 200' of frontage. Resident Stevens replied those were lots of record prior to zoning but since zoning's enactment, 200' of frontage is required. There are other parcels like this (*with 50' of frontage*) in Town.

St. Hilaire responded that Mr. Kirby bought this knowing it was a non-buildable lot. The lot was created with a subdivision back in the 1980's and it would be on the deed and is on this plan, that it's a non-buildable lot. Mr. Kirby purchased this in 1992 and the subdivision had been done in 1984, 8 years prior. Bob Sanborn did this subdivision, and

Brentwood Board of Adjustment Minutes August 23, 2021

they maintained a 50' ROW because that is what the Town required for a public road, for a possible future subdivision there for 2 or 3 house lots. St. Hilaire is not a fan of the 200' of frontage either but this Board has to work with the rules that they have. He knew what he bought.

Hamilton's agreed but mentioned the houses on Fralic's old property next to the DeYoung's and the Ladd's property on Rte. 107, they jam those houses in there, play games with driveway configurations to get it through. The developer comes in and the Planning Board bends over backwards but a guy that has lived here for 30 years with 14 acres and just wants to put in one house in the back and if the other 10 people with lots like this want to put houses in the back, that's fine. Hamilton is all for the rules and was on the Planning Board, but in his opinion, they are giving this guy a hardship he doesn't deserve.

Cowie's opinion was that most of the developments that go through, don't have 200' of frontage, behind Phil Cody's place. They aren't 2 acre lots, some with less than 50' of frontage and long driveways. The standards change when someone comes in for subdivision, and they put in some conservation but there's no conservation easement on it and it can't be taxed as house lots. Earlier in the hearing process, he had said this is a guy trying to make a decent place for himself with the proper restrictions on it, limit it to one single-family dwelling, no subdivisions allowed unless they put a Town road in, no harm to anyone.

St. Hilaire responded if those subdivisions that went in don't have 200' of frontage, there are rules in the book for the reasons why. If they don't have 2 acres, there are rules in the book for why. She would love to see the 200' of frontage change. Hamilton said this is the avenue to give relief. As long as the Fire Department is okay, why not let him do a driveway and put a house back there. There are other houses in Town harder to get to. St. Hilaire agreed that there's no harm in it but it's not what the law says. My job here is to make sure we give them what they need by following the book. The Planning Board has given him an out, but he doesn't like it. He has an out, why are we talking about this? He can go back to the Planning Board, build enough of a road. Hamilton said the Planning Board's out is unnecessary. Artimovich disagreed saying it's an unbuildable lot. Cowie said only on paper is it unbuildable. Artimovich said so not knowing what the Planning Board did at that time, was this created for open space back then and why it's non-buildable? St. Hilaire said it only has 50' of frontage, that's why it's not buildable. Kirby said the plan says open space or agricultural.

St. Hilaire read note 5 on the Sanborn's subdivision plan (D-12604). *"Lot 1 may be used only as open space, woodlot, agricultural, and similar uses. No residence may be built on this lot until (a) all state and town requirements are met for a septic system. (b) A road is developed providing access to the lot which meets minimum lot frontage requirement under the Brentwood zoning ordinance."* That is what is on the plan done in the 80's, but Mr. Mitchell responded by saying the ZBA cannot act on that plan note. Kirby did not receive the email as the last he heard; it was attorney client privilege. Bickum had sent an update to Kirby with the correspondence that afternoon; Kirby wasn't aware of it. St. Hilaire said we have it now and read the email correspondence from legal counsel: *The ZBA only has jurisdiction to hear administrative appeals from decisions of the Planning Board when those decisions involve the interpretation or application of a provision of the town's zoning ordinance. That's it. The Planning Board's decision to exercise its discretion to impose this restriction cannot be reviewed by the ZBA.* St. Hilaire said the ZBA cannot act on plan notes, our hands are tied.

St. Hilaire suggested creating a zoning amendment and change the minimum lot frontage. Hamilton asked why can't we just disregard counsel's opinion and give him the relief, what are the consequences. St. Hilaire replied lawsuits. Artimovich said there are five facts we need to find. St. Hilaire said if someone else came in with a lot with less than 200' of frontage, they would be upset if the ZBA said no.

Stevens clarified for the record on Cowie's assertion on the Mill Pond cluster development, all those lots meet the regulations 100%. If the ZBA would like to continue this hearing to next month, the Town Planner can come in with the plans for those recorded subdivisions and they can be explained. Back in the 80's when there was more agriculture, some people, my family included, wanted to give me a house lot, subdivided a 5-acre field and put a note on the plan, yes you can have a house lot and the remaining acres will remain unbuildable until such time, as the plan says, build a road to Town specs. Kirby doesn't have to build 200' of roadway, he has some extra frontage on the lots that exist, coupled with a

Brentwood Board of Adjustment Minutes August 23, 2021

short stub road meeting Town specifications, which gives him the frontage to allow him to legally build a house out there. To break the Town law of 200' of frontage...that can be changed at Town meeting with a zoning change. He had full knowledge, along with myself and others in Town to know that you had a bite of the apple, and were allowed to do what you wanted with the big lot as long as you understood that if you wanted to develop the second lot, you put a road in. The Planning Board has given him an option so that he doesn't need to go to the ZBA. Build a road long enough to acquire the 200' of frontage.

Hamilton asked how Lausier got a driveway with 3-4 houses. Stevens replied that isn't true. The Lausier Lane lots stand alone as they have required frontage. Kirby said the road numbers on Lausier Lane are 91, 95, 97 and 99. There is an unbuildable lot out back. 75' of frontage in 2001 was allowed due to the radius and curvature and he has the same. The zoning laws have changed since then but my property is a lot of record before that and now it's only 25' of relief with the same curvature of the road. These are ways the ZBA can grant him relief. Building a road to Town specs and then giving up ownership of it, expecting it to be plowed and maintained after 3 years of ownership is not the avenue he wants to go down.

Resident Paul Kirby said my brother doesn't mind putting in a 60' length of road that's wide enough, paved with gravel, sub-base for the road to be up to Town standards, but he doesn't think it's in the Town's best interest and doesn't want to give up ownership of the road. He doesn't want the Town to own it or maintain it and the Town is not going to want to plow a 50' long road.

St. Hilaire wasn't sure if the Town needed to take ownership of it as the Town used to have private roads. With a private road, you can't prevent someone coming to Town meeting and requesting the Town take ownership of the road. Her question to the Planning Board was do all roads built to Town standards have to become public roads? Stevens said yes. Frontage should be on a Town approved road. The frontage has to be on a Town road, something the BOS would accept. Stevens didn't think there were any private roads in Town in the last 40 years because the ordinance doesn't allow it.

Paul Kirby had a map that he proposed had a number of private roads on it. St. Hilaire looked at the map and clarified that Idyllwood Drive off of North Road is not a private road, it was for three years while it was under construction before the Town took it over. Homestead Lane, Sherry Circle, all private while they were under construction with the intent that they would become public roads back and became public in 2002 or 2003. Spruce Ridge Drive, 20-lot subdivision in 2008 or 2010 and has been accepted as a public road. When all the building is done on these roads, the Town takes over maintenance and ownership after the 3rd winter.

St. Hilaire said Lausier Lane is a sign that he put up. It's not a road. Those houses all have house numbers and addresses on Prescott Road. Kirby pointed out the lot that had 75' of frontage. St. Hilaire said that's the curvature of the road that Stevens could address. Stevens said the Town Planner can come to the next ZBA meeting and answer questions and correct the assertions that are incorrect about Planning Board deals. The Planning Board has given you a path for a buildable lot and you have chosen not to contact TEC. Kirby said he reached out to TEC and the Fire Chief. Kirby read the Fire Chief's email from 8-23-2021 (on file). *"Here are my thoughts on the issue. I have no problem with a single-family home on this property as long as the driveway is 14' wide and the driveway should not look like a snake and is capable of supporting a fully loaded fire truck. I feel that there should be some sort of stipulation that this is for a single-family home only as there is potential for more than one home."* Chief Joe Bird.

Stevens said the Fire Chief can have input on your subdivision but doesn't understand why Kirby is here because he has an avenue to make use of his property, this is an emotional appeal to the Town. Kirby said it's less emotional and more of a reasonable request. Bickum said she had received a call from Chris Raymond with TEC saying that Mr. Kirby had approached him directly with plans that Kirby submitted to him, which was not what the Planning Board had proposed. The Planning Board had asked Kirby to have his engineer, Bruce Scammon, contact TEC and the two engineers were to work out the hammerhead or similar type of road configuration to obtain the frontage. Mr. Kirby went directly to the Town's engineer. Kirby replied this was when he was entertaining a private road and would have gone further had that still been the case. He doesn't want to spend his resources on a plan he's not going to be happy with. Originally a private

**Brentwood Board of Adjustment
Minutes August 23, 2021**

road was entertained and Scammon started working on plans and mid-stream an email was sent saying the private road was probably not going to work, after Kirby had contracted someone to draw it up.

Stevens said Scammon did come in with a couple of plan options and after it was discussed with the Town Planner, our hands were tied and had to go the public road route and you can still do that. TEC can work with your engineer, through the proper channels. There is an option without ZBA changing the rules. The zoning can be changed with an amendment to change the frontage and the Planning Board can bring that forward. Kirby said that's a great suggestion and wants time to review the documentation from the Town's Attorney unless the ZBA wants to grant him relief. *St. Hilaire made a copy of the email correspondence from the Town's legal counsel and handed it to Michael Kirby.*

Paul Kirby didn't understand why the Town would want to maintain a small 50' long road. He's doing a lot line adjustment; he owns both properties and the lot line adjustment provides frontage for both lots. The only difference is that they're saying it has to be a Town road. The relief he is seeking, is for him to do the LLA and allow him to have a private road, maintained and plowed by him. The two houses are for his family. The house out back is for him, for his retirement. Allow him to make this a private road that he maintains. Kirby said he has no problem putting a road in to Town specs, even though he's not sure why, but he would maintain it and own it.

St. Hilaire said you are currently here for the frontage. Asking for this to be a private road is a different request and would have to be re-noticed. He could piggy-back it with this hearing, but it would be a new ZBA variance request, reduction in frontage and asking for a variance that it be a private road. To discuss a private road or a lot line adjustment for a non-conforming lot, is another hearing that would require noticing, a new application. Stevens said there should be a meeting of a finding of facts with the Town Planner due to assertions here tonight. The Kirby's said not by them. Stevens said but assertions as part of the testimony tonight. Kirby said and to clarify Lausier Lane; their mailboxes say Lausier. Artimovich said the tax map shows that it's not a real road, it's a private driveway. The tax maps show the lots, and that one dirt "road" connects to three different properties. They got a street sign off e-Bay and call this Lausier Lane; their name is Lausier. St. Hilaire said their name is on the mailbox, but the legal address is 95 Prescott Road.

Alternate Woss asked so Kirby is asking for frontage, and has been given an option but he doesn't want to do it? Kirby said giving a piece of his property to the Town is not an option he's interested in.

Cowie said so we can adjourn the meeting without finding, continue the hearing and work with the Planning Board to obtain enough roadway to make the frontage issue go away but don't give the Town the land the road is on and keep it and maintain it. St. Hilaire and Bickum confirmed that it's a new application. It can be combined but it's a new application. Kirby would like to continue this until he can get more information from the Town Planner and read what the Attorney had to say. Stevens said the Town Planner is available on Wednesdays and he can come to the ZBA meeting next month if the ZBA agrees.

Artimovich commented that Kirby may have better luck petitioning this Board to install a non-town road to Town specs than getting relief from the 200'. Hamilton agreed. Kirby said if the meeting is continued and the Town Planner can come, that will help him make a decision as to proceed, either piggy-back it or a different avenue. Bickum reiterated that the Town Planner is in on Wednesday if Kirby wants to talk to him. Kirby said he would.

Motion made by Christiansen, 2nd by Hamilton, to continue the hearing for Michael Kirby for a variance seeking relief for the frontage to **September 27th, 2021, at 7:00 pm** at the Town Office. Cowie, Christiansen, Hamilton, St. Hilaire, and Artimovich were all in favor. Motion carried.

7:00 pm: Variance Application: Applicant: Skaff Cryogenics, division of Chart D&S; Owner: now or formerly, Prefontaine Properties, Inc. Applicant requests a variance from Article IV, Section 400.001 Height Regulations, to permit the construction of a high bay expansion building approximately 60' x 65' or 3,900 sq. ft. with a maximum height of 75 ft. Property is located at 48 Pine Road/Industrial Drive, Brentwood, NH 03833 in the commercial/industrial zone, referenced by tax map 205.002.000.

Brentwood Board of Adjustment Minutes August 23, 2021

Present: Jay Gosselin Facilities Director of Chart D&S; Jim Bouchard, Senior Project Manager of Quantum Construction Consultants, LLC on behalf of the applicant, Skaff Cryogenics, Samuel Cheney, Project Engineer of Quantum Construction Consultants, LLC; Aaron Plante of RH White.

Abutters Present: Michael Leonard of 60 Deer Hill Rd., Nancy & Denver Boyd of 55 Deer Hill Rd., Donald & Tara Pollard of 75 Deer Hill Rd; Fremont Bickford of 52 Deer Hill Rd. and residents Bruce Stevens and Doug Finan.

Steve Hamilton recused himself. Motion made by Christiansen, 2nd by St. Hilaire, to give Alternate Daphne Woss voting rights. Cowie, Christiansen, Artimovich and St. Hilaire were all in favor. Motion carried.

Jim Bouchard gave an overview of the proposal. Skaff is seeking a variance from article 400.001 on page 28 of the zoning ordinance for a new high bay expansion at the existing facility. The proposed building is a maximum height of 75' located on the back side of the existing building on Industrial Drive. Skaff is part of Chart, and they rehab and refurbish cryogenic tanks used for the storage of gasses and liquified gasses. Tanks come on site to be refurbished and the existing building only gives them 20' of height inside to operate. Any tank over 20' high is done outside in the elements. Purpose of this addition is to provide a safe, year-round work environment to work on the tanks; new gas lines, hatches etc.

Bouchard reviewed the five variance criteria (on file).

1. Granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest: The proposed structure is located within an active industrial park and at a location of approximately 1500 lineal feet from Pine Road so as not to be of high visibility and is not to be a multi-story habitable structure; no offices or floors, just a large open area where a number of 45' high tanks can stand up vertically and employees can work within a protected environment.

2. If the variance were granted, the spirit of the ordinance would be observed because the building is not highly visible from Pine Rd. The footprint of the high bay building is 3,900 sq. ft, 60' x 65' with a low bay connector to the existing building.

3. Granting the variance would do substantial justice because Skaff would be provided with a safe controlled environment for the handling, erection and rehabilitation of the cryogenic tanks. Currently, they have to erect the tanks outside on shims for leveling of the tanks as the existing building has less than 24-ft. interior height and cannot accommodate the tall tanks. The work environment and stability of the tanks is therefore weather dependent.

4. If the variance were granted, the values of the surrounding properties would not be diminished: This is the last building in an industrial park. Public service owns an area with overhead electrical transmission lines to the north of the parcel; and it's protected from view from the west by the wooded boundary line, some screening.

5. Unnecessary Hardship: The provision of the ordinance is probably to prevent the development of 70' high occupied multi-storied office buildings, which in the case of an incident could have an evacuation problem. The height restriction of 35-foot height is common. The use is to have a controlled and enclosed environment. The building height requested of 75' as the tanks are 40-45', the overhead crane is 55' (hook height) and overhead safety clearance of 5' above the crane to the bottom of the structure (steel girders) results in a building height of 72-75'.

A no build doesn't help, and they would still have to work outside in the elements. Going into the ground 40' isn't an option with trying to connect the two buildings; fall hazards. The literal application of the ordinance in this case would restrict Skaff from the ability to undertake the rehabilitation of tall tanks within a safe, enclosed, weather protected facility that cannot be provided within a building of less than 35-foot height per the ordinance. Chart Industries throughout the U.S. have high bay expansions to work on these tanks. Skaff has been on site for over 20 years and Chart Industries has acquired Skaff. Granting the variance would allow them to maintain their scheduling and work inside on the tanks.

Brentwood Board of Adjustment Minutes August 23, 2021

Artimovich said the ordinance is clear, 35' and 40% in there for HVAC, 49', so this is almost 26' over what the ordinance provides for. The Fire Department may not have the capability for a 75' high technical rescue and is concerned with safety. Bouchard responded that the building will be sprinklered. There is no mezzanine and employees are on the ground level, with the exception of occasionally having to do any crane maintenance, which isn't routine.

Christiansen has no objections. St. Hilaire asked if they would ever need to come back to the ZBA and make this taller. Gosselin from Chart Industries replied no, it wouldn't need to go any higher. St. Hilaire said some variances have been granted on structures down there; a 70' tower for M&T and one at 55'. It's an industrial/commercial area and encouraged the zoning be amended in this area to alleviate ZBA on certain restrictions and has no issues with the proposal. Christiansen added that if granted, this would have to go the Planning Board anyway. Woss agreed with both Artimovich and St. Hilaire.

Abutter Denver Boyd commented if the building is under 50' that's one thing but 75', everyone over here is going to see that because the trees are short. Their house is 7 years old, and they built there because there wouldn't be any higher buildings than what's already there. Boyd was also concerned with this decreasing property values in the area. Abutter Pollard asked if the tanks could be horizontal vs. vertical; is it a financial decision. Gosselin replied it's a safety issue. They plumb on the ground and the only time they are on the lift is to hook it to the crane. You are up and down a 12' ladder all day long. Rinsing the tanks out, liquid nitrogen, you can't drain them when they are horizontal. T. Pollard added that they have been here for 19 years and in the winter can see all of the industrial park and is concerned with seeing this and is concerned that there is no other option on the table. Abutter Fremont was concerned about the Town having to pay 750K to a million dollars for a new ladder truck to rescue someone up there. Resident Stevens said the 35' ordinance is over 30+ years old and back then, the Fire Department didn't have trucks for anything higher and it was done from a public safety standpoint. If this proposal goes to the Planning Board, the building will have to comply with NFPA standards. Abutter Leonard said this is directly across from him and he doesn't want to look at it every day. This rendering shows it from Pine Road, not from Deer Hill Rd.

St. Hilaire said if this were granted, it has to meet the Fire Departments NFPA requirements and approval so we're only talking about the height. Leonard said it's double the requirement. St. Hilaire said it's already been done there. Resident Finan asked how many tanks are worked on currently and how would this increase that? Gosselin said they currently have 4 bays with trailers, this would allow 8 bays, 7 for trailers and one for storage. Stevens added Skaff has been exemplary, neat, clean and no violations. The elevation would be visible for the neighbors and that is understood.

Board discussed the 5 variance criteria.

1. *The variance is not contrary to the public interest. yes*
2. *The spirit of the variance is observed. yes*
3. *Substantial justice is done. yes*
4. *The valued of the surrounding properties are not diminished. yes*
5. *Literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in an unnecessary hardship. yes*

Motion made by Christiansen, 2nd by St. Hilaire, to grant the variance for Skaff/Chart Industries for relief on the height regulation 400.001 to allow a 75' maximum height building. Cowie, Christiansen and St. Hilaire were in favor. Artimovich and Woss were opposed. Motion passes with 3 in favor and 2 opposed. The chairman signed the notice of decision and copies were handed to Jay Gosselin and Jim Bouchard.

7:00 pm: Special Exception Application: Applicant: Wayne Manufacturing Industries, a.k.a. Advanced Custom Cabinets; Owner: WAD Property Mgmt., LLC. Applicant requests a special exception from Article VI, 600.002 expansion of non-conforming use and Article VIII, Section 800.013.002.001, 800.013.002.002 special exceptions, and specifically Section 800.013.002.003 p. 102, light industrial use within the residential/agricultural zone, to build and use a building approximately 50' x 100' for light industrial use. Property is located at 13 Prescott Road, Brentwood, NH 03833 in the residential/agricultural zone, referenced by tax map 210.055.000.

**Brentwood Board of Adjustment
Minutes August 23, 2021**

Present: Applicant Wayne Donohue of Wayne Manufacturing a.k.a Advanced Custom Cabinets. No abutters were present.

Motion made by St. Hilaire, 2nd by Christiansen, to have Woss step down and reinstate Hamilton for the remainder of the meeting. Cowie, St. Hilaire, Artimovich and Christiansen were all in favor. Motion carried.

Donohue handed out copies of plans and photos of where the proposed building would be on the property. He also brought in a larger copy of the plans for review. Donohue said back in 2015, they did get the approval (*special exception*) to build it but because of funding, it didn't happen and then they ran out of time so he's back requesting the same thing. In essence, the company is Advanced Custom Cabinets. It's been there about 50 years and we're requesting permission to put a building out back due to lack of space. This proposed building is designed at 50' x 100', single story building, lower in height than what's existing, located out back behind the existing building, within the setbacks.

Christiansen asked if it was the same proposal from 2015 so would there be an objection? Stevens said his approvals lapsed; the special exception expired with 2 years. Cowie said if this is approved, it's subject to Planning Board review.

Motion made by Christiansen, 2nd by Artimovich, to grant a special exception to allow the expansion, subject to Planning Board review and the continued light industrial use within the residential zone. Cowie, Christiansen, Artimovich, Hamilton and St. Hilaire were all in favor. Motion carried.

Board Business:

Approval of minutes – May 24, 2021 -Motion made by St. Hilaire, 2nd by Hamilton, to approve the minutes from May 24th, 2021, as presented. Cowie, Christiansen, Hamilton and St. Hilaire were all in favor with Artimovich abstaining. Motion carried.

Motion made by St. Hilaire, 2nd by Christiansen, to have Town Planner, Glenn Greenwood, attend the September 27th, ZBA Kirby hearing. Cowie, Christiansen, Hamilton, Artimovich and St. Hilaire were all in favor. Motion carried.

Motion made by Hamilton, 2nd by Christiansen, to adjourn at approximately 8:45 pm. Cowie, Christiansen, Hamilton, Artimovich and St. Hilaire were all in favor. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrea Bickum
Administrative Assistant,
Brentwood Zoning Board of Adjustment