



Town of East Greenwich

Zoning Board

125 Main Street
PO Box 111
East Greenwich, RI 02818
Phone (401) 886-8600
www.eastgreenwichri.com

ZONING BOARD OF REVIEW MINUTES - DRAFT

Tuesday, March 28, 2023 Meeting @ 7:00 pm

HYBRID IN-PERSON AND REMOTE VIA ZOOM

125 Main Street, Town Council Chambers

Present: Melody Alger, Jody Sceery, Barry Golden, Richard Land, Chairman; Christopher Mulhearn, Vice Chairman; David Collier (Alternate) and Robert Brooks (Alternate).

Absent: All members of the board were present

Staff: Al Ranaldi, Planning Director; Christina Marseglia, Planning Analyst; and Mike Ursillo, Legal Counsel.

Note: These minutes are supplemented by the Zoning Board Agenda, Staff Report, Zoning Board Application Package Materials, and Video and Audio Recordings. These materials can either be accessed on the Town's website or by contacting the Planning Department.

Mr. Land, Chair of the Board, called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM and introduced the members and staff present. He then read the Board's procedures into the record. Each person addressing the Board will first state his or her name and address for the record. The applicant and his or her legal representative will present the case and witnesses may be called to testify. Such testimony must be relevant to the application. Expert witnesses will be sworn in and there will be no prejudgment as to the expertise of any witness. Pictures, diagrams and other documents given to the Board as evidence will be appropriately marked as exhibits and will be retained by the Board for the record. Upon completion of the applicant's presentation all other persons wishing to offer evidence in favor of the application may then do so one at a time. Following that all persons wishing to offer evidence against the application may then do so one at a time. It is asked that comments are confined to the zoning matter being heard and that repetitive remarks are avoided. Cross examination or rebuttal may be allowed if the Board feels it would be appropriate and useful. All questions from the floor will be directed through the Chair only. After all relevant facts have been heard the Chair will call for a motion; the Board will then discuss the motion and the Chair will call for a

vote. During the discussion among voting Board members, the Board will not accept any new and further testimony unless it is specifically requested by a Board member. The Board will make every attempt this evening to render a decision. The written decision will be recorded in the Town Clerk's Office as soon as possible following the approval of the minutes of the meeting.

Zoning Board of Review Hearings – 7:00 PM

1. **Nicholas Sangster** for property located at 16 Misty Oak Drive; Map 054 A.P. 011 Lot 381 (Zoned Residential, R-10). The Applicant requires Dimensional Variance from Table-2 Dimensional Regulations of Chapter 260 of the Town Code, Zoning Ordinance. The Sections sets forth the dimensional setbacks and height limits that are required for a lot. The Applicant is proposing an accessory structure for the purposes of boarding a k-9 unit at the above referenced location.

PROPOSAL: The Applicant is seeking relief to install a covered metal enclosure to board a state issued K-9 unit approximately 5' from the side-yard lot line. The dog pen was originally installed in the proposed location in late 2022, but received a Municipal Code Violation in January 2023 as Zoning Official has determined that it is an accessory structure that must meet side-yard setback requirements. The Applicant has since moved the dog pen out of the side-yard setback, but is seeking relief to relocate the dog pen back to its original location on an existing concrete pad.

Section 260-8 (F) states:

“Accessory structures, swimming pools and/ or tennis courts shall only be permitted in rear yards in the building envelope and shall not fall within any required side or front setbacks. Such structures may be no closer than 10 feet from the rear lot line in the R-30, F-1 and F-2 Zones, and no closer than five feet in the R-20, R-10, R-6 and W Zones.”

The structure is proposed in rear of the dwelling, but is located with the required 15' side-yard setback. Therefore, a 10' side-yard setback is required.

RELIEF REQUESTED: A 10' Side-yard Setback Variance from Table-2 Dimensional Regulations of Chapter 260 of the Town Code, Zoning Ordinance. The required side-yard setback in the zone is 15'. The applicant is proposing an accessory structure to be approximately 5' from the northern side yard lot line.

MR. SANGSTER stated that in October, 2022 the previous state police K9 coordinator surveyed the property in anticipation of the arrival of a state issued police K9. After consideration, they determined the best location for the placement of the K9's kennel would be the side yard, closest to the fence, which exits the driveway. He went on to state that the location allows for a quiet and stress-free environment away from stimuli such as the family dog and young children. It also allows the K9 a quick and easy exit to the police cruiser. Mr. Sangster advised that he received a municipal violation in January, 2023 due to the placement of the structure. Shortly after, Mr. Sangster called upon his trainer to provide information regarding working dogs.

Mr. Paisley, the applicant's trainer, was sworn in and stated that he has 11 years of experience with working dogs, particularly outdoor dogs. He said that the dog's safety is important and that keeping the structure on the patio where it is now, where it is closest to the house, is troublesome in the event of a structure fire or something similar. He stated that police dogs spend a lot of time working and when not on duty, it is important to reduce stress as much as possible, which is why the structure is covered with a tarp; it helps eliminate additional visual stimuli.

Mr. Collier inquired as to whether or not the tarp would remain on the structure regardless of where it would be placed, whether or not it would reduce excessive barking, and whether or not the dog tends to use the bathroom within the structure. In which, Mr. Paisley replied that the cover will remain. However, at times portions of the cover may come off or stay on depending on the sun in the summer months. In the winter, the tarp on the side may come off. But, the primary use for the tarp is to reduce stimuli. Visual stimulus can cause a bark. He also mentioned that the dog has a bark collar which has been very effective and hasn't had any issues with the dog barking in the past few months since the bark collar. Mr. Sangster said that the dog does not use the bathroom in the structure, he has one time and he uses the bathroom within the woods.

Ms. Alger asked whether the dog was outside all of the time while the dog is not working and Mr. Sangster replied yes, inside the structure, is an insulated and heated dog house for him which helps protect him from the elements and rain.

With respect to the tarp, Mr. Land asked whether it would remain on the rear side of the structure at all times and Mr. Sangster said yes.

MR. LAND asked whether there was anyone present or online in favor of the application.

None were noted.

MR. LAND asked whether there was anyone present against the application. In which several members of the public raised their hands or stood up.

MR. HAYNSWORTH of 122 Grand View Road was sworn in and provided the board with (3) Exhibits.

Mr. Land stated that for the record, there are three documents being submitted by Mr. Haynsworth. The first document is a top down view with boxes on it, the second is a rendering and drawing of the property, and the third is a list of bullet points.

Mr. Haynsworth went on to express that the animal, cage and slab are the property of the Rhode Island State Police and that the zoning violation was cited as dimensional but there should be an additional variance required as to use. Mr. Haynsworth stated the disturbance started in early November, 2022 where there was loud constant barking at all hours of the day/ night. He said that despite reaching out to all levels of the East Greenwich Town Government and RI State Police the barking continued unabated for about 10 weeks. He commented that in January, 2023, the lieutenant/colonel came and spoke to them about the issue at hand and while he did intervene and the intervention did diminish the barking, it did not eliminate it. Mr. Haynsworth stated, as to the repositioning of the dog pen within 5' from the property line, we are worried about the excrement and smell. Lastly, the well-being of the dog and neighborhood welfare was an additional concern.

DR. JOHN ISAAC of 135 Grand View Road was sworn in and stated that letter requesting a variance attracted his attention as it stated that Mr. Sangster worries about the safety of his children, wife and family dog. He mentioned that he is a surgeon and on one or more occasions he been asked to repair injuries from dog bites. Dr. Isaac expressed his concerns of a dangerous animal in the residential neighborhood.

Mr. Land asked Dr. Isaac whether he has spoken to the applicant regarding his concerns and he replied that he has not.

MR. THOMAS CUNNINGHAM of 125 Grand View Road was sworn in and stated that his house is located approximately 50 yards from where the initial dog cage was placed and asked that the board deny the request for a dimensional variance as they have endured weeks of the dog barking and that his neighbors have repeatedly have filed complaints with the state police department about the dog barking at all hours of the night. He also commented, that Mr. Sangster said he was concerned about the well-being of his family and that the kennel is owned by state police. He requested that the

board also deny the use of the property as a kennel for the dog. He expressed his concerns that Mr. Sangster will move the cage closer to the abutting properties and may remove the barking collar resulting in additional complaints to the RI State Police. He stated that if the variance is allowed and if the use of the kennel is allowed, what will the residents be able to do if the dog continues to bark.

Mr. Collier asked Mr. Cunningham whether the barking has diminished since the use of the collar. In which Mr. Cunningham has replied, that the barking has improved but not gone away and that there have been times where he was in the yard raking and the dog would bark for 20 minutes during the day but it has not occurred since having the barking collar on the dog.

Ms. Sceery asked Mr. Cunningham whether he has spoken to the applicant personally about the matter. He replied, no.

MS. ALLISON SANGSTER in favor of the application, was sworn in and stated that she babysits at 16 Misty Oak Drive quite often. She addresses the abutters and asked how they are able to determine which dog in the neighborhood is barking as there are hundreds of dogs within the neighborhood barking all day. She also commented that the K9 has been trained and knows his commands.

Mr. Land stated that the board is there to evaluate everyone's testimony, will take her questions/ concerns into consideration and the intention was to bring the applicant back up so the board could continue with additional questions.

MS. KAYLA SANGSTER in favor of the application, was sworn in and stated that none of her neighbors have approached them regarding the barking. She stated that she has a toddler and an infant at home and they have sound machines in their bedroom and their children's bedrooms. Ms. Sangster stated her husband works night shift and she has worked the night shift so she understands what it is like to try and sleep during the day and deal with the noise in the neighborhood. She also expressed that the dog is very well trained and while he is in the kennel, the kennel is locked. Ms. Sangster also stated that having the kennel so close to the may trigger the dog to be on guard and that placing the dog further away could assist in helping the dog relax. She stated they will address the barking, will not take the barking collar off and do not want to be a nuisance to the neighbors.

MS. BARBARA RICKERT in favor of the application of 92 Laurel Hill Road, was sworn in and stated that she has been a resident for 21 years and walks the neighborhood several times a week. Ms. Rickert stated that she walks Misty Oak Drive and Grand View Road has not had any issue or has heard a bark from the Sangster's

residence. She asked that the board consider the working K9 dog and the value of having the dog in the neighborhood once fully trained.

MR. LAND asked Mr. Sangster to come back to the podium to answer additional questions from the board.

MS. ALGER stated that the pen seems to be transportable and it is the slab that is considered to be the permanent fixture and asked the planning department to clarify.

MR. RANALDI stated that the zoning official considered the structure to be the accessory.

MS. ALGER asked the applicant what would happen to the slab if the dog doesn't work out, the dog passes away, or you decide to move. Mr. Sangster stated that the slab could be easily destroyed but his intentions for the future is to be a K9 handler after the first K9 passes.

MR. GOLDEN asked whether the dog works specific hours and whether it will vary one day to the next. He also commented that there have been complaints about the dog barking at 4 a.m. and asked whether it was prior to the bark collar. Mr. Sangster replied that the dog's shifts will vary from week to week and that on day shifts the dog will work 13 hours a day and on night shift he will work 11 hours a day. He also stated that since the bark collar has been implemented, there have been no complaints to RI State Police. He also mentioned that the RI State Police documents the complaints through an offense report.

Mr. Golden asked whether the training is handled off site or at the residence. Mr. Sangster replies that it is done off site. However, he works obedience with him in the backyard and plays ball with him. Mr. Golden went on to ask the applicant whether there is any obedience training, in terms of barking. Mr. Sangster replied, no.

MR. COLLIER asked the applicant whether the dog has ever gotten away from him or gotten away. Mr. Sangster replied, no.

MR. LAND asked the applicant to clarify the language in his letter submitted with the application about the safety of his family with the dog. Mr. Sangster stated that the K9 has been certified through MA State Police and Patrol, most notably an aggression control which he passed successfully. He stated that any responsible pet owner should be concerned with their children going up to any dog, even if it is their own. Mr. Land asked whether the applicant has any concerns about the dog escaping from the kennel. Mr. Sangster replied no, it's locked at all times with a key lock. Mr. Land also asked the

applicant whether he has concerns about his family dog being with his family. Mr. Sangster replied, that he does not leave his children alone with his family dog either.

MR. LAND asked the town solicitor, Mike Ursillo about an issued being raised by an abutter regarding a use variance, in terms of occupations. Mr. Land stated that there are no requirements under East Greenwich zoning laws that someone who is handling a work animal get a special use variance because it is not a kennel, because the dog resides there. Mike Ursillo responded, exactly.

MR. PAISLEY stated that one of the safety concerns with having the dog pen directly outside the door, is that his Mr. Sangster's toddler can fit his hands through the holes of the pen and with it being further from the home, there's a less likely chance of the toddler running right up to the cage to do so.

MR. LAND asked if the fence surrounding his yard was 6ft along with the metal fence in the front of the driveway. Mr. Sangster replied that both are 6ft and that the metal gate has a key lock with a handle. He also stated that is always locked and he enters the back yard through the inside of the residence. He stated the lock on the gate will lock when it is closed shut and if you open it from the back.

MR. COLLIER asked the applicant whether the dog is on a leash when it is removed from the cruiser to the backyard. Mr. Sangster replied that there is always positive control on the K9 and there is an electronic collar in the event of an emergency.

Mr. Collier also asked whether the applicant can foresee a time whether he decides he will not use a bark collar. Mr. Sangster replied, no.

MS. SCEERY asked whether the applicant will remove the bark collar when the dog gets older and doesn't bark anymore. The applicant stated, theoretically yes.

MR. LAND commented that there are two other areas of possibility where the kennel could be relocated without needing a variance and asked the applicant to talk about the alternatives.

Mr. Sangster replied that the spot indicated in the exhibit would be less than ideal as it would be located in the center of the lawn and would not lessen the stimuli. The other location indicated in the exhibit is within a dense section of trees which could pose a safety concern in the event a tree falls and lands on the dog.

MR. LAND asked whether anyone from the public lives at 132 Grand View Road. One of the members of the public replied that they know who lives there.

MS. RUTH HAYNSWORTH was sworn in and stated that the person who lives there is ill. Mr. Land stated that he was asking the question because she is immediately next door and the kennel would actually be right behind her house and if she were here, he would have some questions for her.

MS. NINA ENDICOTT of 112 Grand View Road was sworn in and whether there was a working resolution without granting a variance to alleviate stress and that the barking is a disturbance in the middle of the night and that this type of dog can clear a 6ft fence. Mr. Land explained that there was already a discussion of moving the pen to another area of the yard but it appears that the two locations would not be a desirable location for several reasons that the applicant has specified. Mr. Land also stated that with respect to the point of a dog clearing a 6ft fence, it is recognized and the applicant has testified that the dog is never off lead or not with the applicant. He mentioned that the applicant stated he may play catch with the dog but that the applicant is with him at all times and the dog is never outside alone in the kennel in anyway. Mr. Land also went on to state that there was testimony from the applicant and from the objectors that the barking has either gone away completely or diminished to a non-obnoxious level based upon the use of a bark collar which the applicant has indicated would be in continuous use. Ms. Endicott asked the board to consider a 4th alternative. Mr. Land stated that no use variance is necessary or required but with respect to the location of the pen, if the applicant is open to it, the application can be continued to discuss the possibility of an alternative with the neighbors.

MR. LAND acknowledged that in situations like this when neighbors seem at odds, the board can offer to continue the matter in order to allow parties to have a short conversation and reconvene or continue to the following month if more time is needed. The applicant and neighbors stepped into the hall to see if they could come to a resolution.

After a short break, the meeting reconvened and Mr. Land asked whether the applicant had any luck working something out with the neighbors. In which the applicant had responded that he had luck with the neighbor at 125 Grand View Road.

MS. PATRICIA CARNE of 15 Locust Drive, was sworn in and asked what the working life of the dog is and once the dog retires from duty, will the officer acquire a new working dog while the other is still living.

MR. LAND reiterated that the board is not evaluating whether or not the dog can or cannot be located at the residence. There is no use variance required.

MR. SANGSTER deferred the question to his trainer, Mr. Paisley.

Mr. Paisley stated that generally most police dogs will stop working around 12-13 years old. However, it varies depending on the dog. He also went on to state that that the dog will remain with the handler after it was retired unless the handler decided that he no longer wanted the dog. At that point, RI State Police would take responsibility for it or adopt it out. He also stated that generally, the handler would not acquire a 2nd police dog while still in possession of the K9.

MR. HAYNSWORTH asked if the applicant would have come before the board to request a variance before he had installed the slab and cage, would he have needed to put the pen 15ft away from the property line.

MR. LAND assured Mr. Haynsworth that the applicant has applied for a variance and that the board is not considering that the applicant has already installed the concrete slab. The relief being requested is to put the cage back on the slab and use it with the proper variance. He acknowledged that the applicant has already installed it and has been violated for it but the application would be the same as if he hadn't already put the slab there because he is requesting relief from the zoning variance to put the cage there.

MR. LAND asks for a motion on the application and reminded the board members that after a motion is made, it cannot be discussed any further.

MS. SCEERY made a motion to approve the application as submitted.

MR. GOLDEN seconded the motion.

MR. LAND respectfully suggested that the motion be modified/amendments to incorporate the following conditions:

1. That the use of the dog collar be required as long as the dog is barking
2. The applicant will need to plant foliage between the enclosure and fence
3. The applicant must maintain locks on cage and exterior fence whenever he is not handling the dog

MS. SCEERY adopted Mr. Land's modifications/amendments to the motion.

MR. LAND asked the applicant to state what the neighbor at 125 Grand View Road and him had worked out. Mr. Sangster stated that he had given the neighbor his personal cell phone number, in the event that there is an issue with the dog.

MS. ALGER stated that in listening to the testimony she is sympathetic to the neighbors, particularly to the barking issue. However, that is not what this meeting is

about today. If the cage were to be moved over 15ft, that it would probably have a minimal impact in terms of barking and what has appeared to work is the barking collar. She went on to comment that with the added condition she will be voting in favor of the application.

MR. LAND stated that the application as completed meets the standards of relief for a dimensional variance. Those standards being: the hardship from which the applicant seeks relief is due to the unique characteristics of the subject land and not the general characteristics of the surrounding area; the hardship is not the result of any prior action by the applicant and does not result primarily from the desire for greater financial gain; granting the request will not alter the general character of the surrounding area or impair the purpose or intent of the Zoning Ordinance or Comprehensive Plan; the relief to be granted is the least relief necessary; the hardship suffered by the owner if the variance is not granted shall amount to more than a mere inconvenience.

On a vote, the application as presented was approved unanimously.

VOTE: Mr. Land: YES, Mr. Golden: YES, Ms. Alger: YES, Ms. Sceery: YES, and Mr. Mulhearn: YES (5 – 0 in favor of the motion).

2. **Gerald Paul Zarrella, Jr.** for property located at 815 South Road; Map 010 A.P. 018 Lot 017 (Zoned Farming, F-1). The Applicant requires Dimensional Variance from Table-2 Dimensional Regulations of Chapter 260 of the Town Code, Zoning Ordinance. The Sections sets forth the dimensional setbacks and height limits that are required for a lot. The Applicant is proposing to construct an accessory structure and a swimming pool at the above referenced location.

PROPOSAL: The Applicant is proposing to construct an accessory structure and a swimming pool at the above referenced location.

RELIEF REQUESTED: A 15.5' Left Side-yard Setback Variance, a 9' Right Side-yard Setback Variance, and a 15.4' Rear-yard Setback Variance. The applicant is also requesting a 13' Height Variance from Table-2 Dimensional Regulations of Chapter 260 of the Town Code, Zoning Ordinance.

The required Side-yard Setback in the zone is 30' (14.5' and 21' requested), the Rear-yard Setback is 45' (29.5' requested), and the maximum height allowed in the zone for an accessory structure is 15' (28' proposed).

MR. ZARRELLA was sworn in and stated that the property was owned by his family for several generations and several years ago it was subdivided, part of that subdivision was the creation of several acres of open space. He went on to state that his home is on a lot that is surrounded by open space on 3 sides and on the 4th side, he has received a letter of support from the neighbor which was presented to the board.

MR. LAND marked the exhibit from neighbor, Steven Karapatakis at 851 South Road as Exhibit 1.

MR. ZARRELLA stated that beyond the open space, to the south there is a parcel of land that was recently acquired by the town to be deeded as open space, which is 55 acres and to the north is Briggs and Boesch Farm consisting of 100 acres of open space. Mr. Zarrella said that the parcel of land he lives on slopes 15ft from west to east, there is an on-site waste water treatment system, a well, and a geo-thermal system. He commented that the variances he is requesting is because of the unique topography and site conditions.

MR. LAND asked the board if they had any questions for the applicant.

MR. LAND stated that the applicant was looking for relief from the setbacks, but there is a very large patio that pushes the pool and cabana out. He asked the applicant if there is anything he can do to reduce the amount of impact on the setback. Mr. Zarrella stated he may be able to reduce the setback by relocating the geothermal system that sits below the patio.

MS. SCEERY asked whether the applicant could pull the existing deck back, pull the patio back, and pull everything towards the house more. Mr. Zarrella stated that anything was possible.

MS. ALGER asked the applicant whether they had seen the staff recommendation in regard to the 10ft height and if he would like to comment on that. Mr. Zarrella stated that he had no problem with that.

MS. SCEERY asked the applicant to confirm that the cabana would not be used as a dwelling unit. Mr. Zarrella confirmed that it would not be used as a dwelling unit.

MR. LAND asked if there were any members of the public who would like to speak in favor of the application.

None noted.

MR. LAND asked if there were any members of the public who would like to speak against the application.

MR. RICHARD BACIK of 10 Boesch Farm was sworn in and stated that he and his neighbors are part of an HOA with six families in the cul-de-sac in which they all own 1/6th of the free space that the applicant is referring to. He asked that the board continue to the matter as they did not receive formal notice of the meeting.

MR. ZARRELLA provided certified mailing receipts showing that there were only (5) abutting properties.

MR. LAND allowed a short recess in light of the information received.

After a short break, the meeting reconvened and Mr. Land asked whether there has been any resolution in terms of the notice issue.

MR. RANALDI stated that the resident at 10 Boesch Farm Road was part of the 200ft abutters radius. Theoretically, they would have received notice. Mr. Zarrella stated that he does have the receipts showing that the resident at 10 Boesch Farm were noticed. Mr. Land asked whether there was any clarification on where open space owners should have been noticed. Mr. Ranaldi stated that the open space parcel is being identified on the abutter's list as the town hall post office box.

MR. ZARRELLA stated that the subdivision Mr. Bacik speaks of is a cluster subdivision and the open space is deeded to the town. However, there was a 6-lot subdivision who formed an association and they maintain that open space.

MR. LAND stated that he does have the certified mail receipt showing the delivery to 10 Boesch Farm. Mr. Bacik stated he did not receive the notice.

MR. URSILLO asked whose name is the open space in, is it in the name of the town or the home owner's association. If it is the name of the home owner's association then they should have been provided with notice. There seems to be a difference of opinion as to own's that parcel. Is it the town of east Greenwich or is it owned by the homeowner's association or does the homeowner's association simply have right to maintain it as opposed to an ownership? The legal requirement is that the notice go to the owner of the property not to whomever may maintain it. Mr. Land stated that if there are 6 parcels in the subdivision and each of them in their deed say have an undivided 1/6th interest in the open space, then they would be entitled to notice.

MR. EDMOND LOISELLE of 15 Boesch Farm Road, was sworn in and stated that he purchased the lot from Mr. Zarrella's father in 2005, prior to the existence of the homeowner's association. He commented that it was contentious with the town at the time, that the field remain open. Mr. Zarrella's original plan was for 8 houses. However, the town would only allow 6. He stated that it was complicated in the delivery of the deeds and each owner owned about 1/6th. Mr. Land stated that for full disclosure Mr. Loisel is his brother's and mother's accountant but not his accountant and it does not impact his ability to rule on the matter. Mr. Land asked Mr. Loisel is he was testifying that his deed specifically states that he was deeded a 1/6th interest. Mr. Loisel stated that to his knowledge, the open space is 1/6th owned by the 6 residents of Huguenot Farms HOA. Mr. Land asked staff if they would be able to pull up a deed for Mr. Loisel and if it does state that he owns 1/6th of the land, by default he should get notice. He also stated, that the alternative is to continue the meeting the following month and give formal notice.

MR. ZARRELLA asked the board if the objection was procedural or...Mr. Land stated that at the moment they have only heard the jurisdictional/ procedural objection and that he does not want to assume that they have other objections. Mr. Bacik's only comment was that he just learned of this and would like an opportunity to consider and think about it more than the few hours that he says he has had even though you have shown that he has received notice. He has indicated that he has not seen it. However, we acknowledge that Mr. Loisel did not receive formal notice. Mr. Land asked Mr. Ursillo whether Mr. Zarrella can simply give additional notice to all these landowners and continue the matter until the following month. Mr. Ursillo stated that would be fine, give notice to the additional 6 land owners, notice will need to state that the meeting is continued to April 25th, 2023.

Mr. Land asked for a motion to continue the matter.

Mr. Golden made a motion to continue the matter to April 25, 2023.

Mr. Mulhearn seconded the motion.

On a vote, the application was continued unanimously.

VOTE: Mr. Land: YES, Mr. Golden: YES, Ms. Alger: YES, Ms. Sceery: YES, and Mr. Mulhearn: YES (5 – 0 in favor of the motion).

Mr. Ursillo stated that for the record the notices, will need to be by certified mail, by next week for sure.

Zoning Board of Review Business

1. Minutes: Review/action on the following sets of minutes:

- February 28, 2023

Ms. Sceery made a motion to approve the minutes of February 28, 2023 as presented.

Mr. Golden seconded the motion.

On a vote, the motion to approve minutes was approved unanimously.

VOTE: Mr. Land: YES, Mr. Golden: YES, Ms. Alger: YES, Ms. Sceery: YES, and Mr. Mulhearn: YES (5 – 0 in favor of the motion).

2. Adjournment:

Mr. Land made a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Mr. Golden seconded the motion.

On a vote, the motion to adjourn was approved unanimously.

VOTE: Mr. Land: YES, Mr. Golden: YES, Ms. Alger: YES, Ms. Sceery: YES, and Mr. Mulhearn: YES (5 – 0 in favor of the motion).

Adjourn 9:30 p.m.