

**MINUTES OF THE  
BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MEETING  
EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
MUNICIPAL COMPLEX, 1 JUNKINS AVENUE  
PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE**

**7:00 P.M.**

**FEBRUARY 27, 2018**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chairman David Rheume, Vice Chairman Jeremiah Johnson, Patrick Moretti, Arthur Parrott, Jim Lee, Peter McDonell, Christopher Mulligan, Alternate John Formella

**MEMBERS EXCUSED:** None

**ALSO PRESENT:** Peter Stith, Planning Department

---

Chairman Rheume noted that there were two petitions that were requested to be postponed.

*It was moved, seconded, and **passed** to take the two petitions out of order to postpone them.*

Chairman Rheume read Case 2-10, 201 Kearsage Way, into the record.

*Mr. Moretti moved to **postpone** the petition to the March 20, 2018 meeting, and Mr. Lee seconded.*

Mr. Moretti stated that it was the applicant's first request for postponement and he didn't believe it would be a problem for the Board because the applicant had the right to ask for a postponement and re-evaluation. Mr. Lee concurred with Mr. Moretti and had nothing to add.

*The motion **passed** by unanimous vote, 7-0.*

Chairman Rheume then read Case 2-11, 64 Mt. Vernon Street, into the record.

*Mr. McDonell moved to **postpone** the petition to the March 20, 2018 meeting. Mr. Lee seconded.*

Mr. McDonell said the Board generally allowed postponements unless there was a compelling reason not to. Mr. Lee concurred with Mr. McDonell and had nothing to add.

*The motion **passed** by unanimous vote, 7-0.*

Vice-Chair Johnson and Mr. Mulligan recused themselves from the vote, and Alternate Mr. Formella assumed a voting seat.

7) Case 2-7

Petitioner: Michael De La Cruz  
Property: 75 Congress Street (63 Congress Street)  
Assessor Plan: Map 117, Lot 5  
Zoning District: Character District 5  
Description: Construct 15 residential units without required parking.  
Requests: Variances and/or Special Exceptions necessary to grant the required relief from the Zoning Ordinance including:  
1. A Variance from Section 10.1112.30 to allow no off-street parking spaces to be provided where off-street parking spaces are required.

**SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION**

Attorney Peter Loughlin was present to speak to the petition on behalf of the applicant. He introduced the applicant Michael de la Cruz. Attorney Loughlin reviewed the history of the Franklin Building in detail. He noted that the 20-ft third floor would be converted into an additional floor. He reviewed the criteria and said they would be met.

Chairman Rheaume asked why the building was built with 20-ft third-floor ceiling heights, noting that it was unusual. Attorney Loughlin said the building used to be a venue for various events for groups of 500 people or more, and that it also housed a theater.

In response to Mr. Parrott’s questions, Mr. de la Cruz stated that there was no current residential use in the building and explained that there would be four floors and what they would be. He said the majority of the apartments would be located on the fourth floor and a few on the third floor, but no residential on the first and second floors. Mr. Lee asked whether all fifteen apartments would have access to the rooftop decking. Mr. de la Cruz explained in detail how and why the five units had roof decks and the other units had recessed decks. Mr. Lee asked about umbrellas, patio furniture, and lights on the decks. Mr. de la Cruz said there would be no umbrellas or lights and that any patio furniture would be hidden.

David Nord said he met the previous owners, the Goodwin family, in the mid-70s, and visited the building at that time. He said that great sensitivity had been used to bring the building up to its present historic state and hoped the Board would approve it.

**SPEAKING IN OPPOSITION TO THE PETITION**

Chair noted that the Board received a letter in opposition from Thomas Nies of Portsmouth.

**SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION**

No one rose to speak and Chairman Rheaume closed the public hearing.

## DECISION OF THE BOARD

*Mr. Parrott moved to **grant** the variance as presented and advertised, and Mr. Moretti seconded.*

Mr. Parrott stated that the building was an extremely important one downtown, not just because it was old but because of its size, design, and history. He said it was also a fascinating building architecturally. He noted that the pediments weren't before the Board for approval, but said he was happy to vote for those in the past and that they would be a wonderful restoration addition. Mr. Parrott said that granting the variance would not alter the essential character of the neighborhood because the work being done was interior work. He said the public's health, safety, and welfare would not be harmed nor would public rights be injured, noting that it was hard to find what public rights would be affected, with all the work being done in the interior, with the exception of the pediments that were not before the Board. He said the project would be a plus for the building and the neighborhood. He said granting the variances would do substantial justice because the benefit to the applicant would be significant and would pose no detriment to the public, with respect to having the interior renovated and put to use as opposed to being vacant. He said the renovation would increase the value of the building and would not affect the value of surrounding properties because the interior would see the renovation, upgrading, and restoration, and the exterior would not. He said he suspected that the value of surrounding properties would only be affected in a positive fashion because more people would be living downtown and doing business in the neighborhood. He said literal enforcement of the ordinance would not result in unnecessary hardship because the building had plenty of special conditions, including its location and the fact that there was no opportunity to create additional parking. He said the issue before the Board was small, an additional five parking spaces beyond what had been previously approved, and that there would be a new parking garage within walking distance. He said the proposal met all the criteria and that the Board should approve it.

Mr. Moretti said he concurred with Mr. Parrott. He noted that part of the hardship was that when the applicant purchased the property, there was a BOA granting in 1984 that had eliminated the required parking. He said that the building would require some type of parking relief and that five parking spaces for apartments as opposed to commercial space that would require more parking intensity was a minimal requirement.

Chairman Rheume said he would support the motion. He said Mr. Moretti made a good point that there were other options for the very tall floor and that it could re-introduce performances in that space that would have a much higher need for parking. He said the plan to re-use the tall space for apartments was a common one in the City and reasonable from that standpoint.

*The motion **passed** by unanimous vote, 6-0.*

---

Vice-Chair Johnson and Mr. Mulligan resumed their voting seats, and Mr. Formella resumed his alternate status.

8) Case 2-8

Petitioners: James W. and Heather L. Davis  
Property: 530 Dennett Street  
Assessor Plan: Map 161, Lot 10-1  
Zoning District: General Residence A  
Description: Construct single family home and garage replacing existing home and garage.  
Requests: Variances and/or Special Exceptions necessary to grant the required relief from the Zoning Ordinance including:

1. A Variance from Section 10.521 to allow a lot area and lot area per dwelling unit of 7,441± s.f. where 7,500 s.f. is required for each;
2. A Variance from Section 10.521 to allow continuous street frontage of 61.09'± where 100' is required;
3. A Variance from Section 10.521 to allow an 8'± left side yard where 10' is required;
4. A Variance from Section 10.321 to allow a nonconforming building or structure to be extended, reconstructed or enlarged without conforming to the requirements of the Ordinance.

### **SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION**

The owner James Davis was present to speak to the petition. He said he had lived in the house for 20 years and that it needed a lot of inside work, so he wanted to demolish it and replace it with something more economical and environmentally friendly. He said that the majority of the abutters approved the changes. He reviewed the criteria and said they would be met.

Mr. McDonell noted that the drawings depicted the garage on the left side and also the right side of the house. Mr. Davis said they would be updated and that the garage would be a mirror image of what was shown on the drawings.

Mr. Davis distributed copies to the Board of the abutters' signatures in approval of the project.

### **SPEAKING IN OPPOSITION TO THE PETITION AND/OR SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION**

No one rose to speak, and Chairman Rheaume closed the public hearing.

### **DECISION OF THE BOARD**

*Mr. McDonell moved to **grant** the variances as presented and advertised, and Mr. Lee seconded.*

Mr. McDonell stated that the request was a reasonable one, a complete tear-down and rebuilt, and thought that the reason was reasonable and the variances required were things that already existed, like the lot area per dwelling area and a left side yard setback that was pretty minimal. He said the street frontage was a bigger request but it was what it had been for a long time. He said granting the variances would not be contrary to the public spirit and would observe the spirit of the Ordinance. He said he didn't see how the replacement of a reasonably-sized dwelling with another one would alter the character of the neighborhood or the public's health, safety, and

welfare. He said granting the variances would do substantial justice because there would be no harm done to the general public that would outweigh the benefit to the applicant. He said the applicant outlined a few reasons for the proposal, including being able to stay in the neighborhood and create more energy efficiency. He said granting the variances would not diminish the value of surrounding properties because the proposed structure would be an upgrade to the existing. He said the property had special conditions that distinguished it from others near it, including a narrow frontage and the house's location on a narrow and deep lot that was different from neighboring properties. He said that the only way to build the house so that it fit required a few variances that he felt were reasonable.

Mr. Lee said he concurred with Mr. McDonell and felt that replacing the existing house would make it more in keeping with the area and would be a big asset.

*The motion **passed** by unanimous vote, 7-0.*

#### 9) Case 2-9

Petitioners: Michael G. and Annette A. Kane  
 Property: 242 State Street  
 Assessor Plan: Map 107, Lot 70-6  
 Zoning District: Character District 4  
 Description: Lighted projection of a logo onto sidewalk.  
 Requests: Variances and/or Special Exceptions necessary to grant the required relief from the Zoning Ordinance including:

1. A Variance Section 10.1234 to allow a sign that is not specifically permitted in a sign district;
2. A Variance from Section 10.1263.10 to allow a light source for external illumination of a sign to be visible three feet above grade at the lot line with the lighting not confined to the area of the sign;
3. A Variance from Section 10.1263.30 to allow a sign or its illuminator to interfere with pedestrian or vehicular traffic;
4. A Variance from Section 10.1262 to allow a sign to be illuminated between 11:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m. without the operation of a use or activity that is open to customers or the public, and more than one hour after activity ceases.

#### **SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION**

Chairman Lyle Fulkerson and Vice-President Chad Hancock of Kane Insurance Agency were present on behalf of the applicant to speak to the petition. Mr. Fulkerson reviewed the reasons for the requested variances, noting that the light fixture would be mounted internally so that only the logo would be seen on the sidewalk. He reviewed the criteria and said they would be met.

Mr. Johnson asked whether the applicant had been before the Historic District Commission (HDC) or received feedback on how the proposal would be received. Mr. Hancock said they had not but had seen similar logo signs in the City and thought the issue would have already been addressed by the Boards.

In response to Mr. Lee's questions, Mr. Hancock said there were a few similar perpendicular signs in town. Mr. Stith noted that there were also a few businesses that had logo signs and that the City was in the process of notifying them that they required variances. Mr. McDonell asked whether the sign that stuck out perpendicular from the building was lit at night. Mr. Fulkerson said it had an external light like most of the buildings on State Street and there would be no issue with people trying to find the building.

In response to Chairman Rheume's questions, Mr. Hancock said they had not gotten any permits from the City but had intended to get a permit for the external mount but then decided to mount the light in the interior. He said it was installed but not in use.

### **SPEAKING IN OPPOSITION TO THE PETITION AND/OR SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION**

No one rose to speak, and Chairman Rheume closed the public hearing.

### **DECISION OF THE BOARD**

Chairman Rheume noted that there would be approvals required from the HDC and City Council. The Board discussed the petition. Mr. Lee said he thought that the City Council had to address the sign ordinance for a logo sign. Mr. Parrott said it was a serious policy issue that had to be established and put into the ordinance and that there couldn't be a variance for something that didn't exist. He said the Board didn't know how big the sign was proposed to be on the street, let alone any guidelines in the ordinance that they could go by. He said it wasn't a trivial issue because one could go down the street and imagine having those signs wall-to-street in front of every business and it would be a significant change. Mr. Moretti said the logo signs were becoming more common in other cities. He said he had seen a few and noticed that there was a flash of light when people walked through them, which he thought needed to be addressed. He felt that the Board couldn't address the proposal until the City Council did because it was beyond their scope and too much was being asked for.

Chairman Rheume said he appreciated the applicant's willingness to come before the Board but felt they had run into something beyond the Board. He said sign technology was changing rapidly and that other applicants had gotten away with things, but the City had clamped down. He said the proposed signage was a new technology that the City had to deal with and that it had to go before the Planning Board and the City Council. He also noted that the applicant asked for a lot of relief but that there was no hardship. He said there were issues with the appropriateness of the logo sign as well as its size, lumens, and other characteristics, and that the only unique thing about the applicant's sign from other downtown businesses was that the lighting mechanism was inside the building. However he felt that there wasn't enough for the Board to be proactive about and hoped the City would decide what to do with that type of signage.

*Mr. Parrott moved to **deny** the petition and Mr. McDonell seconded.*

Mr. Parrott stated that all five criteria had to be satisfied to get a pass. He said the applicant had to meet the requirement of having something that distinguished his property from other nearby properties that were similar, but that there was nothing unique about the property and that it was one in a series along the street, so there was no hardship and no basis to grant the requested variance. As for not being contrary to the public interest, he said the idea of having a Board of Adjustment was to grant relief from an arbitrary or unreasonable requirement as it applied to a particular property, but in the applicant's case, there was no requirement. He said that particular type of sign was not listed in the ordinance, so there were no requirements to adjust or get relief from. He said that, procedurally, the variance was contrary to the public interest because the Board was being asked to do something well beyond their scope. He said he based his motion to deny on Criteria 1 and 5 and that there was no need to discuss the rest of the criteria because the applicant had to meet all five criteria.

Mr. McDonell said he concurred with Mr. Parrott and didn't see any special conditions of the property that distinguished it. As far as the variance not being contrary to the public interest, he said the proposal seemed minor but would potentially alter the essential character of the neighborhood. He said the similar logo signs seen around town changed things a bit and made it look unusual. He said another reason to deny the petition was that it wasn't something in the Board's purview.

Chairman Rheume said he would support the motion, noting that sometimes the Board granted variances to something that didn't exist but was a unique case. He said the applicant's case was not unique but was simply the first of its kind that was a trend for the future. He noted that the Board was judicial and not legislative and that the Planning Board would have to decide what was right for the City.

*The motion to deny passed by unanimous vote, 7-0.*

#### 10) Case 2-10

Petitioner: Richard Fusegni  
 Property: 201 Kearsarge Way  
 Assessor Plan: Map 218, Lot 5  
 Zoning District: Single Residence B

Description: Subdivide one lot into two.

Requests: Variances and/or Special Exception necessary to grant the required relief from the Zoning Ordinance including:

1. A Variance from Section 10.521 to allow a lot area and lot area per dwelling unit of 7,834± s.f. where 15,000 s.f. is required;
2. A Variance from Section 10.521 to allow 97.52'± of continuous street frontage where 100' is required.

#### **DECISION OF THE BOARD**

*Mr. Moretti moved to postpone the petition to the March 20, 2018 meeting, and Mr. Lee seconded. The motion passed by unanimous vote, 7-0.*

---

11) Case 2-11

Petitioner: Cyrus Lawrence Gardner Beer  
Property: 64 Mt. Vernon Street  
Assessor Plan: Map 110, Lot 30  
Zoning District: General Residential  
Description: Chicken coop with six chickens (hens).  
Requests: Variances and/or Special Exceptions necessary to grant the required relief from the Zoning Ordinance including:  
1. A Variance from Section 10.440, Use #17.20 to allow the keeping of farm animals where the use is not allowed.  
2. A Variance from Section 10.573.10 to allow an accessory structure 3'± from the rear property line where 5' is required.

### DECISION OF THE BOARD

*Mr. McDonell moved to **postpone** the petition to the March 20, 2018 meeting. Mr. Lee seconded. The motion **passed** by unanimous vote, 7-0.*

---

Mr. Mulligan recused himself from the vote and Mr. Formella assumed his voting seat.

12) Case 2-12

Petitioners: Vaughan Street Hotel LLC and 299 Vaughan Street LLC c/o Cathartes Private Investments  
Property: 225 and 299 Vaughan Street  
Assessor Plan: Map 123, Lot 15 and Map 124, Lots 10 and 11  
Zoning District: Character District 5  
Description: Allow specific vehicle circulation patterns in off-street parking areas.  
Requests: Variances and/or Special Exceptions necessary to grant the required relief from the Zoning Ordinance including:  
1. A Variance from Section 10.1114.32 to allow vehicles to enter and leave a parking space by passing over another parking space or requiring the moving of another vehicle.

### SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Attorney Loughlin was present to speak to the petition on behalf of the applicant. He introduced Jeff Johnston and Peter Weeks. Attorney Loughlin reviewed the reason for the variance request, noting that they wanted approval for six spaces on the first level and 26 on the second level, for a total of 34 tandem spaces. He reviewed the criteria and said they would be met.

Chairman Rheume asked whether the second-floor parking would be entirely valet parking, and Attorney Loughlin agreed. Chairman Rheume said there was a notice indicating a proposed storage area that would take up 14 valet parking spots and asked whether parking would be lost



during the winter. Mr. Johnston said the snow would be hauled offsite and noted that there was less demand for parking during the winter.

Mr. Moretti asked whether there would be event parking for tradeshow, weddings and so on. Mr. Johnston said they had a traffic study done that concluded that event parking wouldn't be a problem, and he noted that a lot of the guests would already be parked at the hotel.

### **SPEAKING IN OPPOSITION TO THE PETITION AND/OR SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION**

No one rose to speak, and Chairman Rheame closed the public hearing.

### **DECISION OF THE BOARD**

*Mr. Moretti moved to **grant** the variance as presented and advertised, and Vice-Chair Johnson seconded.*

Mr. Moretti stated that it would be valet parking, not public parking, and that driving over one position to get to another position wouldn't be like a regular parking zone. He said that granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest because the parking lot would be inside a closed building and not seen by the public unless they used it or walked by. It would observe the spirit of the Ordinance because it was a minor request for something the applicant would have full control of and came close to meeting the criteria anyway. He said granting the variance would do substantial justice because the property currently had a parking lot on it and the hotel would require a lot more parking. He said the applicant had done everything they could to get the parking as close to the line. He said granting the variance would not diminish the value of surrounding properties because most of the buildings had been built recently or were in the process of being built and the building was a modern one with modern amenities. As for the unnecessary hardship criteria, he said there were 34 spaces out of 115 that the applicant was requesting to drive over, and that the valet parking addressed that issue.

Vice-Chair Johnson concurred with Mr. Moretti. He said that another convincing hardship was the well-known high-water table in that area. He said there were vertical limitations and that the project could only go so high, based on current ordinances, logistics, and cost factors. He said the tandem parking was a good compromise to be able to fit the requirement amount of parking spaces in the limited parking lot area and felt that the applicant did a good job of balancing the tandem and non-tandem parking spots as well as meeting the HDC's aesthetic criteria.

*The motion **passed** by unanimous vote, 7-0.*

---

Mr. Mulligan resumed his voting seat, and Mr. Formella returned to alternate status.

#### 13) Case 2-13

Petitioners: Eric A. and Jean C. Spear, owners and Brendan Cooney and Megan Tehan, applicants

Property: 57 Mt. Vernon Street  
Assessor Plan: Map 111, Lot 31  
Zoning District: General Residence B  
Description: Create a lot by subdivision containing an existing dwelling.  
Requests: Variances and/or Special Exceptions necessary to grant the required relief from the Zoning Ordinance including variances from Section 10.521 to allow the following:

1. A lot area and lot area per dwelling unit of 3,647± s.f. where 5,000 s.f. is required for each;
2. Continuous street frontage of 45.41'± where 80' is required;
3. A 2.2'± left side yard where 10' is required;
4. A 15.8'± rear yard where 25' is required.

### **SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION**

The owner Eric Spear was present to speak to the petition on behalf of the applicants. He said he owned the entire lot, which consisted of two single-family residences, and that the tenants who rented the house on one of the two lots wanted to purchase the house, so he had to divide the single lot. He reviewed the criteria and said they would be met.

Chairman Rheume noted that Mr. Spear said both buildings had been around for a long time, but that the staff report indicated that the proposed new lot was created in 2004. Mr. Spear said the house was renovated in 2004 but had existed for decades. In response to further questions from Chairman Rheume, Mr. Spear said that the house he lived in on the other lot was replaced in 1962 and that the property had been one large contiguous property for a long time. He said that basically the back end would be squared off.

### **SPEAKING IN OPPOSITION TO THE PETITION AND/OR SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION**

No one rose to speak, and Chairman Rheume closed the public hearing.

### **DECISION OF THE BOARD**

Vice-Chair Johnson said it was similar to another petition in terms of setbacks, density, and required relief that the Board previously denied, but he noted that the other petition had deficient numbers and was in a different zone. Chairman Rheume agreed and said the other petition was difficult because it was a condominium situation with different units. It was further discussed. Chairman Rheume said he felt that there were enough differences between the petitions and enough room for the two homes to be separated.

Mr. McDonnell said the right-yard setback in the smaller parcel was 10 feet from the corner of the existing house, and the house would be extended back so that it looked like the right sideline of the house and the right sideline of the property wouldn't be parallel and would be less than 10 feet. Mr. Spear said it would be dealt with through the Planning Board if it became an issue. Chairman Rheume agreed.

*Mr. Mulligan moved to **grant** the variances as presented and advertised, and Mr. Lee seconded.* Mr. Mulligan stated that the status quo on the ground was not changing, but what was changing was an imaginary boundary line between the two homes to create two parcels. He said the variances were just to reflect the existing condition of the property once that imaginary line became permanent. He said granting the variances would not be contrary to the public interest and would observe the spirit of the Ordinance. He said it would not change the essential character of the neighborhood because there would still be two single-family dwellings in the same location. He said granting the variances would do substantial justice because the loss to the applicant if denied would outweigh any gain to the general public. He noted that the conditions already existed on the ground and that the lot line between the two existing lots was being established. He said that granting the variances would not diminish the value of surrounding properties because similar existing conditions had been around for a long time, with no discernable effect on surrounding properties. He said that literal enforcement would result in unnecessary hardship and that the property had special conditions, including two single-family residences on a single lot on a dead-end street, with very few affected neighbors, so there would be no fair and substantial relationship between the purpose of the setback and the lot area ordinances and their relationships to the properties.

Mr. Lee concurred with Mr. Mulligan and had nothing to add.

*The motion **passed** by unanimous vote, 7-0.*

#### 14) Case 2-14

Petitioners: Charles L. Fleck, Jr., owner and Sarah Fleck and Charles L. Fleck, Jr., applicants  
 Property: 39 Sagamore Avenue  
 Assessor Plan: Map 222, Lot 31  
 Zoning District: General Residence A  
 Description: Replace a free-standing shed with an attached garage.  
 Requests: Variances and/or Special Exceptions necessary to grant the required relief from the Zoning Ordinance including:

1. A Variance from Section 10.521 to allow a 6'± right side yard where 10' is required.
2. A Variance from Section 10.321 to allow a nonconforming building or structure to be extended, reconstructed or enlarged without conforming to the requirements of the Ordinance.

#### **SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION**

The project contractor Dan Poland was present on behalf of the applicant to speak to the petition. He said the owners needed a garage because the dilapidated shed didn't accommodate a vehicle. He reviewed the criteria and said they would be met. He noted that the owners also wanted to create an office area on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor of the garage but not a secondary dwelling.

In response to the Commissioners' questions, Mr. Poland said there wouldn't be sufficient room under the existing conditions for a vehicle to turn into the garage, and that there would be no access from the garage to the breezeway, so people would have to use an exterior door. He said he didn't know whether the owners had reached out to the abutters.

**SPEAKING IN OPPOSITION TO THE PETITION AND/OR  
SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION**

No one rose to speak, and Chairman Rheume closed the public hearing.

**DECISION OF THE BOARD**

*Mr. Lee moved to **grant** the variances as presented and advertised, and Mr. Moretti seconded.*

Mr. Lee said that enlarging the garage would not alter the essential characteristics of the neighborhood or the public's health, safety, or welfare, nor be contrary to the public interest. He said the spirit of the Ordinance would be observed. He said that granting the variances would do substantial justice by allowing the applicant to have an excellent garage to park in, and that it would not diminish the value of surrounding properties. He said the special conditions included that the applicant was locked into putting the garage in line with the existing driveway.

Mr. Moretti concurred with Mr. Lee, adding that it was a moderate justification for the garage and would not affect the air, light, or distance to any of the other houses. He noted that the project was pretty sparse when compared to the neighborhood lots.

Chairman Rheume said he would support the motion. He said that it was small by modern standards and that the only real impact was the slight elevation to accommodate the additional space above the actual parking area, but it seemed to allow ample room on either side of the lot and wouldn't affect the neighbors. He said there weren't a lot of other options for the applicant to fit a decent garage on the very narrow lot,

*The motion was **approved** by unanimous vote, 7-0.*

---

Chairman Rheume noted that it might be Mr. Moretti's last night as a Board member. He thanked Mr. Moretti for having provided great insight on many projects.

---

**IV. ADJOURNMENT**

*It was moved, seconded, and **passed** by unanimous vote to adjourn the meeting at 9:05 p.m.*

Respectfully submitted,  
Joann Breault

BOA Recording Secretary