

# Burlington Development Review Board

149 Church Street, City Hall  
Burlington, VT 05401  
[www.burlingtonvt.gov/PZ/DRB](http://www.burlingtonvt.gov/PZ/DRB)  
Phone: (802) 865-7188  
Fax: (802) 865-7195

Austin Hart  
Michael Long  
Jonathan Stevens  
Brad Rabinowitz  
Missa Aloisi  
Israel Smith  
A. J. LaRosa  
Alexandra Zipparo (Alt.)  
Vacant (Alt.)



## BURLINGTON DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD Tuesday July 15 2014, 5:00 p.m. Contois Auditorium, City Hall, 149 Church Street, Burlington, VT MINUTES

**Present:** Jonathan Stevens (Vice Chair), Brad Rabinowitz, Ali Zipparo, A.J. LaRosa, Israel Smith, Michael Long, Missa Aloisi,  
**Staff:** Mary O'Neil, Scott Gustin, Ken Lerner, Nic Anderson  
**Absent:** Austin Hart (chair),

### I. Agenda

No changes.

### II. Communications

Five communications. Accepted by board.

### III. Minutes

One set from July 1 for review and approval.

### IV. Public Hearing

#### 1. 14-0748AP: 124 SPRUCE STREET (RL, Ward 6) Laurel Broughton

Appeal of Notice of Violation regarding fence. (Project Manager: Jeanne Francis/Ken Lerner)

Appellant L Broughton and Surveyor Terry Harris present. Submitted communications to board. Applicants sworn in.

K. Lerner gave summary of application and Notice of Violation.

J. Stevens have no jurisdiction to approve a property line. Believe that adverse possession requires a court order. DRB not body to adjudicate where property line is. Is applicant here to decide that?

L. Broughton – No. Read statement that was submitted. Detailed history of properties. Noted errors in submitted survey. Noted consistency with previous decisions. Not appropriate location.

J. Stevens asking for dismissal or suspended NOV?

L. Broughton – Yes. Need NOV suspended.

B. Rabinowitz asked how long needed?

L. Broughton - Would take at least a month to complete survey and then how long the court takes.

AJ LaRosa asked about photos. On photo 4, how many feet above railroad ties are trees?

L. Broughton – Railroad ties are approx 6-7 ft from old fence location.

M. Long – So we potentially have two surveys that are against each other?

T. Harris – May not be inaccurate. Need more time to complete research. There appear to be a number of issues on the original survey which need further review.

M. Long – So at some point, there would be an authoritative demarcation of the boundary?

T. Harris – If discrepancy there could be resolution by neighbors or litigated.

B. Rabinowitz asked about timeframes between NOV issuance and today. Asked why there is a big time gap.

J. Stevens swore in other persons.

Thomas Melovo and Zoe Barracano

T. Denovo? Noted timeframes. Survey submitted to City in October. Has been no discussions on agreements. Detailed adverse possession point. Has been no negotiations.

Z. Barracano – Today is first time that they have hear about an easement.

T. Denovo – Agrees with J. Francis comments. Fence installed intentionally while neighbors were away. Gave until May to remove but that has not happened. No evidence that current survey is incorrect. Submitted letter summarizing comments and documenting attendance.

M. Long asked about location. Asked when fence was installed.

T. Denovo – Brand new fence. Noted survey from 1894 in Land Records.

T. Barracano – Marker could have been moved. Neighbor has installed on property and removed plantings.

T. Denovo – Per condition 15 of the permit conditions, the permit is automatically void.

Kevin Henry, Attorney for L. Broughton. Sworn in. Addressed timing issue. Not clear in record. Noted letter from January from City Attorneys decision. Appealed that letter to the Planning and Zoning office. Found out from Attorneys office that the letter was not appealable. Waited until May for the Notice of Violation, which was then subsequently appealed. Were working toward additional survey. Certainly not the case that there was no negotiation.

L. Broughton – Contests the fence and location. Clearly maintained up to the stockade fence that was falling down. In some cases maintained beyond, onto the adjacent property. Noted on photographs. Considered that their yard extended to dilapidated fence which was removed.

M. Aloisi would like clarification on the photos and where they have been taken from and looking towards.

J. Stevens asked for submission of plan to show which photographs.

AJ LaRosa asked about location of new fence relative to old fence. Further away from house?

L. Broughton – Yes. Noted on photograph 6. Noted photograph 10 looking south east. Had tree removed as previous owner believed it was on her land. Stump is directly on the line with the current fence.

M. Aloisi – Noted survey submitted tonight.

L. Broughton – Robenstein survey that has notations by Mr. Harris.

Member of public sworn in. Laura Mascell. Encouraged the board to extend the timeframes to allow the property to be disputed in the appropriate court. Back yard neighbors. For last 8 years, 124 has been meticulously kept up.

T. Denovo – reiterated that boundary dispute is not up to the DRB.

Jeanne Francis – Gave history of dispute and timeframes. Did CO, received complaint and survey, sent warning letter and received response stating they would move the fence, then received response from attorney asking for no NOV to be issued and would be dealt with in Superior Court, Attorney sent letter to explain citys stance, this letter was appealed. Entered agreement to move fence in Spring, got no response, received more complaints so issued NOV based on survey.

J. Stevens asked if survey recorded in land records.

JF – When appealed, appellants stated that documentation would be submitted for DRB. Stands by NOV as it stands.

M. Long – Today we hear there is controversy. Was this known previously.

JF – No.

A. Zipparo asked about competing surveys and what ruling would be?

JF – Would ask City Attorneys office.

A. Zipparo – Was survey filed at same time as complaint?

JF – Yes.

J. Stevens – Public Hearing closed 5.50pm.

**2. 14-1254CU: 934 NORTH AVENUE (RL, Ward 7) 934 North Avenue LLC**

Change use from funeral services to general office. Existing residential apartments to remain. (Project Manager: Scott Gustin)

No public present to speak. Applicants sworn in.

Dan O'Rourke and Michelle Devino?

D. O'Rourke clarified that application was made under attached dwelling and mixed use property.

J. Stevens asked when funeral home was stopped.

MD? – Property owned by father since 1970's, was more an office space than a defined funeral home. Stopped being used about 6-9 months ago. Most of the time there is little amount of staff doing office activities and then short periods of time with a lot of people. Would like to sell.

J. Stevens – Asked staff for comment.

S. Gustin – Noted use table does not permit general offices with funeral homes being a Conditional Use. Can't slice and dice sub uses within a funeral home category and cannot see how it can be approved.

D. O'Rourke – In residential use table, there is a category of Attached Dwelling/Mixed use which is a stand alone use. This is a conditional use in that zone. This is a less impact use. It is in ordinance that is defined and should be used.

J. Stevens asked for clarification.

D. O'Rourke – if there is an existing residential use it may be given conditional use approval to have mixed use.

S. Gustin – Noted provision allows for adding units to an existing commercial space as a mixed use. Doesn't allow any residential unit to add a McDonald's under the mixed use guise.

J. Stevens asked if it was just an office?

MD – No it was retail and other aspects of funerals also. Sure neighbors would like to see just office use.

B. Rabinowitz noted that there could be another residential unit.

S. Gustin – Correct. Could add one unit as a conditional use.

MD – Doesn't make financial sense. Cannot get financing for units of that size. Property is used by other uses such as parking for the Elks Club.

J. Stevens closed Public Hearing 6.03pm

**3. 14-1172NA: 12 WESTON STREET (RL, Ward 1) Owner: Charles and Cynthia Burns/Appellant: Michael Long et al**

Appeal of administrative permit applicability determination to internal reconfiguration of existing units. No change to unit count, number of rooms or habitable space. (Project Manager: Ken Lerner)

Appellant M. Long. Speaking on behalf of a group of appellants. Will hear from City first.

K. Lerner detailed history and justification of determination of non-applicability.

J. Stevens asked about accessory apartments.

K. Lerner have documentation that two units existed in 1969, not accessory apartment.

J. Stevens asked if owner lived on premises?

B. Rabinowitz – not relevant.

J. Stevens can't see where the access is for the second unit. Changing to a duplex will have a lot of complications.

K. Lerner – this is a duplex. Complaint was investigated and was not appealed. Understands there will be more people on site.  
J. Stevens – Was this registered as a rental.  
K. Lerner – Yes.

Public sworn in.

M. Long disagrees with that the ordinance allows higher density. Respond to staff comments. Would like to have final response afterwards also. 12 Weston in 1969 was not a two family dwelling.

J. Stevens asked for elaboration.

M. Long – In 1969 it was a four unit apartment building, not a two family. Duplex or accessory apartment not defined in 1969 but construed that two family dwelling is duplex.

J. Stevens asked how it was determined it was a 4 unit.

M. Long – With affidavit from appeal. Rented as 4 unit until 1977 until family occupied the first three units and floors and kept 4<sup>th</sup> unit as rental on top floor which remained as rental unit. Never been dispute that there has been 2 units as third floor accessory apartment and main residential unit. Detailed non-conformities. Never been a non-conformity due to a change of ordinance. Previous ordinance language not relevant. Under current ordinance, it precisely fits accessory apartment regulations. A two unit structure is not necessarily a duplex. Under current ordinance it fits with definition of accessory apartment. Read definition of duplex. Not every two unit structure is a duplex. Staff disregarded this definition. This is how the property has been used for 37 years. Noted new owners own duplex next door which has had a number of previous violations with regards to noise, parking, lot coverage. A change of use affects peoples lives. Read and elaborated on portion of ordinance regarding intent for Burlington. Burdened by old ordinance. Owners can choose to live on site as owner occupied property. Zoning ordinance is applicable and standard permit process should be done.

J. Stevens – ZA has made determination that duplex is grandfathered.

M. Long – Can only be grandfathered if not allowed by ordinance. Nothing to grandfather.

K. Lerner – This use existed.

M. Long – Single family house and accessory apartment existed. Should be held to current standard.

A. Zipparo asked staff it was to be a single family with accessory apartment?

K. Lerner – Code Enforcement determined that the property was a duplex. That was not appealed. Interior work does not require a permit.

J. Stevens asked when accessory units were introduced in Code.

K. Lerner – Late 80's. Can be provided if required.

M. Long – Determination made by code disregarded definition of duplex. Every two unit is not a duplex. If looked closely at that, they could have made a different determination. Has functioned as single family with accessory apartment for many many years. Code office misunderstood the nature of the complaint. Never dispute about it being two units. Concern was changing from accessory apartment to full blown duplex.

AJ asked if room count has changed.

K. Lerner – That is his understanding. Should ask applicants.

M. Long – Changing from single family house with accessory apartment to duplex which is a huge change. Doesn't know if any new rooms has been made. Noted building permit description and approval that continued to be used for construction.

B. Rabinowitz asked about vacating unit if they did not own and live on the property.

M. Long – Previous discussions about the ordinance dealt with other applications.

Ordinance has evolved and fits the accessory apartment definition. Big deal living in neighborhoods. History should not be free pass to degrade neighborhood. Concerned about management of the neighboring property and how this property will be managed.

J. Stevens asked if different criteria applies for accessory apartment and would a permit be needed.

K. Lerner – Yes a permit would be required and there are different standards. Detailed standards.

Judy Rosenstreich. Filed complaint. Read statement in communications packet. Construction continued while Code Enforcement complaint was being investigated. Didn't appeal Code decision as she wasn't able to appeal it. Was not given chance to provide 'evidence to the contrary'. Significant procedural flaw in that one party was not allowed opportunity to respond. Flawed investigation and decision should be invalidated. Continued reading written statement.

A. Zipparo asked about appeal possibility. What were the other factors that precluded appeal?

J. Ros...could not afford and did not have the resources or time to research and undertake an appeal.

A. Zipparo asked how long they had to appeal?

J. Ros – 15 days from the decision. Was not appealed because there was concurrence.

IS – Curious about basement. Asked if previously not living space?

J. Ros – Mrs Gadue was not living in basement. Disappointed City did not go and inspect. Wasn't solid information as to what was going on in the house.

Norm Williams. Concerned about use of property and also of use of non-applicabilities, proper notice and appeal fee being so high. No debate about being an accessory apartment and that to make it a duplex they could go through process and no debate that they don't have the lot size or parking. Question of if basement is being used. Question if unit floor space is getting bigger and as such is a change. Could have been made duplex in 1969 so is it true that it can be done 40 years later? Not a good way to read zoning ordinance. If it could have been then, it should not be now if it hadn't been done in the past.

J. Stevens asked about accessory apartment. Asked why it should not be declared an accessory apartment?

N. Williams – Agrees mother in law apartment needs a separate entrance but doesn't think that an accessory apartment needs to be. Doesn't meet requirements for a duplex now. Doesn't matter what it could have been in the past, it matters what it is now.

J. Stevens asked if making floor area over 30% now changes it to a duplex?

N. Williams – Yes, as well as persons. Determination by Code Enforcement is not binding.

K. Lerner – Z Card posted on property is notification. Files do not have permits prior to 1973 so have to rely on such evidence as affidavits.

J. Stevens asked JF about determination of duplex and if it was intentional to rule out accessory apartment.

JF - Determination was based on complaint. Work being conducted was based on minimum housing compliance.

J. Stevens asked if there was a determination on if it was an accessory apartment.

JF – No, that was the Zoning Administrators decision. My decision was based on construction.

Ashley Bond – 51 Henry St. Adjacent to 18-20 Weston. Encourage diversity in neighborhood. Supports statements made by neighbors. Noted how property was managed with previous third floor tenant. Parking is being completely overlooked.

B. Rabinowitz – We have a narrow window on looking at determination. Parking not relevant now.

AB – Disingenuous that it can function as a duplex. Half a parking space and no backyard. Contesting statement made by Mrs Gadue. Zoning analysis was short sighted and flawed.

J. Stevens asked if there is a parking problem?

AB – 8 cars in parking lot of 18-20 Weston. 12 has no parking and using next door will impact her and her fence on the shared border.

Caryn Long – 55 Henry St. Know Gadue family. Did use basement, 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> floors for family and third floor apartment. Basement was hangout family room for kids and access from garage. Third floor was an accessory apartment. Understands why Judy Rosenstriche could not handle the appeal at the time.

J. Stevens asked for third floor access.

CL – Fire escape access. Doesn't know if used other access points. Read written statement.

J. Stevens – Stopped comments as they specifically related to maintenance and not to 12 Weston.

CL – Is an accessory apartment with single family owner occupied home. Still wants to know why there has been work done without permits and why there is no enforcement. Would like it investigated. This same thing happened at 114 North Willard street without them knowing and it was missed and appeal period was over. People involved should be notified.

Alex Frank – 56 Henry – Supports infill but should be done in the right locations. Should have further review by the City. June 16<sup>th</sup> Electrical Permit suggests there could be three units.

JF – Added that office has been reviewing it as two units and has done rental registration for two units. Normally for accessory apartments, they are not registered separately. A number of years.

A. Zipparo asked if changes to railings need zoning permit.

K. Lerner if external, it depends on the zoning district.

JF – Did send informative letter to Mrs Gadue at the time, to get feedback on the complaint.

K. Lerner – Has additional documentation in file.

Candice Page – Lives on Henry Street. Context has role to play. Defined appurtenant. Reality is that this was accessory apartment and the question on is if it can be made into a duplex. Competing legal arguments. Important decision for neighborhood. Asked for equal consideration from both arguments. Mixed neighborhood for homes and rentals. Parking is problem in neighborhood. Doesn't feel heard by Planning and Zoning and DRB.

Property owner takes table. Sworn in. Brian Hehir, Chuck and Cindy Burns, Property owners. Directs to Jeanne Francis' opinion that property a duplex since 1969. Bottom paragraph, appeal rights spelled out. This decision is now decided as not appealed. We can't take it up here tonight, folks. Chair asked about access to the building. Access on the rear to access first floor, second floor, third floor. Separate leases, separate utilities, separate kitchens. When I did a title search, code enforcement visited them. Code enforcement had treated this property as a duplex for at least 20 years. Late 1980s, early 1990s.

Jonathan Stevens – there are 2 leases now?

Brian Hehir – no, there will be 2 leases.

Jonathan – not owner occupied?

Brian Hehir, no, it previously was owner occupied. Mrs. Gadue is not here to testify on her own. Grandfathering DOES apply here. By way of tax bills, lister's cards and public works review, it has been treated as a duplex. The basement will not be occupied as a bedroom. It was previously finished. Increasing living space? It can't happen without enlarging the footprint, which isn't happening. It was a duplex with low intensity use. The city determined it was a duplex, that determination was not appealed, and therefore cannot be discussed here.

Chuck Burns – I relied on the decision of Ken and Jeanne when I purchased the property. When the determination was not appealed, I went forward and purchased the property. We did not do any work on the property prior to owning it. The previous owner had some code issues; smoke detectors, hand rails, lead paint, inoperable windows that had to be addressed. That is what her grandson was in there doing. Once we owned the property, I had an electrician open up a permit. New meters, exterior lighting, house meter pack. Each tenant will have their own meter. We got a building permit from Ned Holt – he inspected the property. We did exactly what the permit called for. Closed the permit. We were told by the zoning office that we could move ahead with building permits when the Green Z went up. We went ahead with exterior painting. I have intentions for electrical work. The interior – painting, sanding softwood floors. We have removed some carpeting to expose wood floors, new appliances.

A.J. LaRosa – Are you changing the number of bedrooms?

Chuck Burns – the third floor unit was a combination living room/kitchen. That would become a bedroom. Including the second floor, that would be a unit. There is a kitchen on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor. Betty rented the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor in the summer because she has a camp on the lake. We had intentions to remodel that kitchen on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor, but when this appeal came in, we stopped. Yes, it will add more bedrooms.

Jonathan – how many bedrooms in each unit.

Burns – three bedroom unit, upstairs a four bedroom unit.

LaRosa – how was it previously -?

Burns – An eight bedroom house.

Michael Long – The owner says there will be an increase in the number of bedrooms...

Brad Rabinowitz – the testimony was that there were 8 bedrooms, to be converted to 7.

Michael Long – the lawyer tried to make a big point about it being a duplex. Jeanne Francis gave testimony that the issue of it being an accessory unit was NOT CONSIDERED. So did Mr. Lerner. Indisputably, it was a single family house with an accessory unit. No non-conformity was ever created. The testimony about separate units is irrelevant. What is being appealed here is the decision of June 3<sup>rd</sup> by the administrative officer that the zoning ordinance did not apply for work (Non-applicability.) We hold that the zoning ordinance applies fully and that the regular permitting process should apply for this very substantive use of a single family house to a duplex as proposed. The use of the property currently and the amount of work that has gone on without permits should be investigated further. It seems like the kitchen on the first floor has already been removed. If that is true, the work has been done while the appeal period was still running and while appeal was made; and that has eliminated the accessory apartment and has continued blithely without zoning approval. A serious violation of the ordinance, and should have consequences to follow.

Israel Smith – We heard from the property owner that the previous owner had rented out other floors.

Michael – Up to 1969. After that, I understood that only the third floor was rented, and the record demonstrates that.

Jonathan – closes Public Hearing at 7:51 pm.

## V. Sketch Plan Review

### 1. 14-1206SP: 380 COLCHESTER AVENUE (RL, Ward 1) Nathaniel M. Hayward

Sketch plan review for proposed three lot subdivision. (Project Manager: Scott Gustin) Kevin Worden, Nate Hayward present.

Overview presented. 3 lot subdivision. House was moved here in the 1970s from Riverside Avenue. Large lot. Similar subdivision done on Colchester Avenue recently. Presents photos. Lots will be at least 60' wide. Similar development pattern. "Ravine Area" behind lots. Make existing duplex a triplex, a conditional use. Would request a combined preliminary and final plat review. Existing curb cut, u – shaped drive. We would look to re-use those curb cuts; review with DPW for site distances. Those curb cuts ramp up – we would look to level, ramp up. Adding an addition to the existing house. Relieve the over burden of that steep slope, reduce instability. Move parking.

Site plan layout intended to allow for parking behind and below structures; not visible from the streetscape. No elevations yet.

We have not shown building envelopes – just setbacks. Most of lot 3 is unbuildable. Very constrained building envelope.

Jonathan – How many curb cuts will there be?

Kevin – there are 2 existing curb cuts – there will be 2 – one shared with lot 2 and 1. Not continue through. The northerly curb cut will be a shared drive with access to lot one and lot three. Below the addition.

Jonathan – my concern is traffic safety. I am trying to picture exactly where it is on that stretch. You are reconfiguring the angle from Colchester Avenue, to improve site lines?

Kevin – the southerly one will be more perpendicular to the road. Cars will be facing forward, not backward when entering Colchester Avenue. Site distances will be better with removal of some of the vegetation.

Michael – slope of the drives will change, not the location?

Kevin – yes.

Brad – Lot 3 has the steep slope?

Kevin – Yes.

Brad – disappointing that the center lot become asphalt bound. Not a very good aesthetic in the RL zone. Two single family houses, as you show, will be really restricted.

Kevin – Rather than sloping up, we will be leveling, sloping down. Grades will be 5-7' lower than existing grade. Removing 5-7 contour lines back there. We will show that on a complete application. Level area will be enlarged.

Brad – and paved.

Kevin – the parking drive out front will be removed and returned to lawn. By using 2 driveways rather than 3 driveways, integral parking. Less parking than three distinct parking areas.

Brad – we challenge you to create more useable ground area.

[laughter]

Ken – there is a supplemental communication.

Kevin – Something we should see, Ken?

Scott Gustin – we just got it today. We will give you a copy.

Jonathan Stevens – closes Sketch Plan Review 8:05 pm.

## VI. Other Business

### 2. 13-1232CA/CU: 31 RIVERMOUNT TERRACE (RL, Ward 7) Gregory A Jenkins

One year review per condition 2 of approval for two bedroom bed and breakfast, one parking space waiver, widen driveway. (Project Manager: Mary O'Neil)

Greg Jenkins, present.

Jonathan – we received a communication that you are not compliant with parking with your permit. Please describe.

Jenkins – for me to be successful, I need to limit the number of cars at my place. That is what I have done. Nobody just shows up. They do an inquiry on Airbnb. I have 2 cats, shared bath. Parking is limited. I inquire how they will be arriving. Could be bicycle, airport. I only have 2 bedrooms, I could have 4 cars. It is not inconceivable. There are three rooms out there. I had Mom and Dad book one room, Johnny in the small room. They come in one care.

Jonathan – You have the ability to do that?

Jenkins – I can turn off “Instant book.” I don't enable instant book. People send me an email. I have a template that I had addressed key questions, and the foremost is “how are you arriving?” In a taxi from the airport, I don't have a parking issue. Key code for garage.

Mary O'Neil – by specific permit conditions, approval was for 2 bedroom bed and breakfast. By conditions, he can have his use monitored by web and advertising. In your supplemental communication, you will see Airbnb advertising, taken today, advertising 3 bedrooms, evening meals, and parking on the street.

Jenkins – My neighbor and his cars, damn historic trolley park in the street. So can I.

Ali Zipparo – How many rooms do you rent out?

Jenkins – I have to control cars. 2 cars tonight. I have superbus from Boston. So what? Even if you put me down for 2 bedrooms, that has no bearing on the number of cars I have. You approved the Hotel Vermont. They don't have the number of parking spaces, especially for employees. I am an employee, I live there. Everybody doesn't drive. We have an airport. I have a lot of business people. They fly in.

Brad – You would be better served by showing us that you rent 2 bedrooms, instead of telling us that, Gee, I can have three bedrooms if I control the cars. You had conditions of approval.

Mary O'Neil – I would suggest that the permit be revoked. He has ignored the conditions of his approval; was originally denied for a three bedroom use. Has ignored his conditions and limitations of approval. Is serving dinner; running a hotel and restaurant in an RL zoning district. Many people gave testimony against permit request for the three bedroom bed and breakfast use. He is not compliant.

Jenkins – controlling the number of cars!

Brad – we have to deliberate. How about complying?

Jenkins – I will come back in 6 months, and I can guarantee only 2 bedrooms, and won't serve dinner.

Michael – That is key. No dinner. No cars on street. Two rooms.

Jenkins – I can do that.

Mr. Larosa - I have used Airbnb. We can check rental schedule. It is possible to see how many rooms are being rented.

Jenkins – I can do it.

Jonathan – There is an explosion in airbnb. It impacts low density residential neighborhoods. It is not his problem to solve.

Jenkins – I would disagree that I do not impact the neighborhood. As a single family home, I have a four bedroom house. That would be four cars leaving in the morning, returning at night.

Jonathan – we will be deliberating Monday.

Neighbor – tough area. Residential. Peter Bahrenberg. I live on 54 Rivermount, across the street. It is a dangerous corner. He has shown no intention of complying with your conditions. He was running when he was denied the first time. He has not complied with the conditions imposed. He asks his customers to park on the street. He has a sign on the door. His bedroom is a 2 bedroom house, not sure what he is renting. I looked at the review. The impact from last month – in their party, there were 8 people the first night, 5 the second night. I don't know how you do that with three bedrooms. There are impacts, not just parking. Perhaps we can't deal with that tonight, but it is exposure. This amounts to a commercial entity.

Jonathan – it is in the works.

Ali – noise level?

Peter Bahrenberg – I have not experienced any noise problems.

Jenkins – The sign just has my phone number on it. I have to have a way to folks contact me.

Jonathan – Is a sign permit required?

Scott Gustin – 2 sq. ft.

Ken Lerner – Signs need a permit.

Public hearing closed 8:20 pm.

## **VII. Adjournment**

Adjourned at 8:21 pm.

Deliberative to be held Monday, July 21<sup>st</sup> at 5:00 pm.

---

A. Hart - Chair, Development Review Board

---

Date

---

Nic Anderson, Zoning Clerk