

FINAL

**CITY OF LEBANON
ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
Minutes, February 20, 2018
City Hall—Council Chambers
7:00 p.m.**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair William Koppenheffer, Vice Chair Jennifer Mercer, Dan Nash, Alan Patterson Sr., Travis Griffin, Jason Crowley (alternate),

MEMBER ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Zoning Administrator Tim Corwin

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chair Koppenheffer.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: January 16, 2018

Changes: Page 3, line 30, add a space after “exception”; page 3, line 44, remove the duplicated “New Hampshire”.

Alan Patterson moved to approve the minutes of the Lebanon Zoning Board of Adjustment meeting of January 16, 2018 as amended. Seconded by Dan Nash.

****The motion passed 4-0. Vice Chair Mercer abstained.***

III. PUBLIC HEARING (CONTINUED)

- A. Quail I, L.P., 69 Lily Lane (8-2-200), zoned R-3—Request for Special Exceptions pursuant to Article III, Section 310.2 of the Zoning Ordinance for the construction of a 40-unit senior housing complex, and Article VI, Section 603 to permit a greater dwelling unit density than is permissible in the R-3 District. #ZB2017-34-SE**

The public hearing was closed in January and was reopened for the February meeting. John Giebink, Charles Brush, and Tom Getz represented the applicant. Mr. Giebink said that as discussed in the December meeting, Quail Hollow is an important resource for the community, especially low to moderate income seniors. The land is already fully developed with roads, utilities, and services and there is no better place to build 40 additional units of senior housing. By 2035, seniors will account for 33% of the population in New Hampshire. The senior population in 2010 of 178,000 will nearly double to 323,000 by 2025. NH Housing has identified senior housing as a difficult need to fill in rural areas. Access to centralized services is an issue. Quail Hollow has an extensive core of central services in 12,000 square feet that provides essential services to seniors. The addition of 40 more units will greatly benefit the seniors that

are on the waiting list. There is an extensive waiting list for Quail Hollow and Twin Pines Housing trust. Mr. Giebink noted that they were asked at previous meetings to bring additional information which he believes they have done. He said that the Department of Transportation has reviewed and issued driveway permits. There were questions regarding the sewer which need to be resolved. They met with the City Engineer, and it was acknowledged that there is an inter-municipal agreement with Hanover and she would contact them regarding capacity, but that contact normally takes place during the planning phase. The Fire Chief has been contacted and stated that the calls to Quail Hollow are lower than Woodlands and Harvest Hill. The Fire Chief said the increase in calls, estimated at 20 per year, could potentially cost approximately .08 FTE, or roughly \$8,000. Mr. Giebink said the Fire Chief said there was no other place in Lebanon that the Fire Department would rather have senior housing like this. The other open questions was related to a previous drainage issue from 2006 in the Cottage area, which was caused by excessive rain and silt, and it was resolved within two weeks, without recurrence. The grading plan was also presented which shows a cross-section of the proposed development.

Chair Koppenheffer asked if there were questions from the Board. Mr. Nash asked why the grading plan was not submitted with the packet because he could not evaluate it on the screen. Mr. Giebink said that they had been emailed in and he brought extra copies but Mr. Nash said it was not reasonable to submit extra materials after the packet had been submitted. Mr. Patterson said that in past cases the Board had decided not to set a precedent and for the sake of continuity he would not support accepting material after the fact. Mr. Nash said that from the material presented, it appears that one contour does go over the property line and it says 'approximate' when there should be a valid site plan. Mr. Giebink said that the word 'approximate' should have been removed by Pathways. Mr. Nash expressed concern that making a cut into the slope would create a hazard or nuisance and was looking for a geo-technical evaluation. Mr. Nash would like testimony from an engineer that the 28' ft. cut into the bank can be done without creating a hazard or nuisance in order to be satisfied. Mr. Giebink said he would be happy to come back with that. Mr. Nash noted that the applicant did get the driveway permit, the drainage is adequate, the Fire Chief was consulted, and the City Engineer has been contacted regarding the sewer. Mr. Nash said his only remaining concern is the slope and that if the engineer that was in attendance was prepared to testify, he would be satisfied with his professional opinion. Mr. Giebink said that they have soil data from other sites that is not with them tonight, and it was his understanding that the Board was looking only for cross-sections. Vice Chair Mercer asked if there are any other orientations for the property. Mr. Giebink confirmed that other orientations had been considered but that the proposed location was the best due to the proximity to central services, including access to walkways that are at grade level. Vice Chair Mercer asked if there was any intention to build to the north, to which Mr. Giebink responded that there was not. Mr. Patterson expressed concern over the impact to the Fire Department. Based on the estimate by the Fire Chief, the estimated impact is \$8,000. Mr. Giebink said the Fire Chief did not expect a significant change in call volume. Mr. Patterson said the letter from the Fire Chief attributed a 65% increase in total calls to the Quail Hollow development. Mr. Giebink said the number of units added is more than 65% so the ratio of calls to units was actually more favorable. Mr. Griffin said that in a letter to the Fire Chief, it was stated that 110 units were added, but in the letter to the Zoning Board, it was a 72% increase; he would like clarification on which numbers are correct. Mr. Getz and Mr. Giebink added comments on the number of units, 118 units plus some Cottage units under construction at the time. Mr. Griffin said that numbers that were given

to the Fire Chief by the applicants were understated and therefore incorrect, which the applicants agree to be true.

Chair Koppenheffer opened the public hearing.

Mary Mills from the Cottages at Quail Hollow said they had not been notified of the last meeting, while a number of residents had been bused in to say how much they liked the apartments. She expressed concerns over density, especially with major storms increasing. There are a large number of people over 55 years of age that may need to be evacuated in case of emergency and it is a poor idea to add more people to the community. Having been in a disaster herself, she is concerned that services at Quail Hollow would be severely stretched in an emergency. She suggested having a trial evacuation to see what would happen. Ms. Mills asked that the Zoning Board keep this in mind when considering whether to allow more and more people to move into a small area.

Cora Koop, widow of C. Everett Koop, also stated concerns with having an increased density at Quail Hollow, considering that there is so little egress. There is a gate that is usually closed, and it is a narrow lane. Ms. Koop said her concerns over egress were present before purchasing her home and should there be a disaster, it would be difficult to evacuate the residents. She is asking that the Board not grant permission to build anything new until further egress is provided.

David Nelson, a five year resident of River House, presented on behalf of Robert Camarra, a former state trooper, who submitted a letter to the Board but was unable to join the meeting due to health reasons. The content of Mr. Camarra's letter and attachments are available in the packet that was distributed to the Board. Mr. Nelson does not want to be so close to other buildings and residents. He pays market value for a one-bedroom apartment and chose this location for his wife, who needs to be close to Dartmouth-Hitchcock Medical Center and to have an elevator. Mr. Nelson notes that the narrow streets and traffic is an issue that would not be solved with the proposed parking. The sidewalks have cracks and heaves that are a hazard to people with walkers. He also noted that although there is some benefit to low income seniors, many of the residents at Quail Hollow are paying market rate.

Sally Page, a resident of Quail Hollow for 10 years, said the gate has not worked properly for 10 years. The 1997 application and notice of decision stated that it was contingent upon two points of egress and that it be approved by the transportation board. She read a letter that she wrote the editor of the *Valley News*:

“To the Editor,

I live in West Lebanon at Quail Hollow, and have concerns about the announced plans for expansion. A November 15th Valley News article headlined “**Lebanon Quail Hollow to Expand**” implied a done deal. I hope not! The density here is problematic as it is, and I can't fathom another building with 40 more units. The developer says it will fit on the back parking area which is gravel and not need much site work. I think not.

Have you visited Quail Hollow recently? Take a drive through the complex. I hope the zoning board has done a site visit as the graphics and site plans don't show a true picture of how it is, or would be. The proposed building, if they can fit it on the gravel parking area, will be very close

to the neighboring Building One and eliminate a lot of parking as well as privacy and view for many residents.

We have been told that the proposed building would not have subsidized units. That is too bad. Affordable or subsidized housing is a huge need for seniors. The “services” at Quail don't make “aging in place” any easier as all services are optional and have additional costs.

Especially disheartening is that there is no longer an on site Early Response system for the apartments. They covered 24/7 after hours. Knowing that someone was on call to help with problems and check buildings for security was reassuring to residents and those residents who were early responders benefited by getting credit for hours worked.

I trust that the city of Lebanon is cognizant of citizen's needs as well as the developer's and will take our concerns to heart.

Enough is enough!
Sally Page”

Ellen Cutts, a 13-year resident at Quail Hollow, said the road with the gate was not built according to specifications that would allow it to be a usable road. She would like to ask that the road be developed for public use.

Charlie Brush, owner of Quail Hollow, said he would ask the residents who believe that there has been a misrepresentation to contact him directly so he can provide facts.

Mr. Giebink said the gate and the dimensions of the road were mandated by the Planning Board. Quail Hollow had originally proposed wider roads but were told to make the roads ‘cozier’. He also noted that there is a wide range of affordability at Quail Hollow. They have offered to allow current residents to move to another building or unit if they don't want to live in the units that they're in. Vice Chair Mercer asked whether the offer to move to another apartment would be done for the same amount of rent as they are currently paying. Mr. Giebink said that it would depend on which apartment they chose to move into. Vice Chair Mercer asked about subsidizing for new units. Mr. Giebink said that there is no more funding available for subsidized housing in New Hampshire. Mr. Patterson asked for clarification on how residents would be able to move if there was no vacancy. Mr. Giebink clarified that there is zero vacancy and a long waiting list. They are expecting that the planning and building process will take approximately two years. Existing residents would be put at the top of the list for relocation as units become available. The average turnover is 30 units a year, or 60 units in two years. Vice Chair Mercer asked whether the applicants had reached out to individuals with concerns, rather than extending offers to the residents as a group. Mr. Giebink said he has not, because they are not sure that they are going to be allowed to build but that is something that they can look at later. Mr. Getz said there were two meetings which were attended by 80-100 residents wherein options were discussed. There were approximately 20 residents that they met with one-on-one. Mr. Nelson said that he had asked to move to the Ridge, but there would be a \$1,000 administrative cost to move. Mr. Brush said that he had moved residents to the Ridge at their cost, and now that they're completed, there are fair housing laws which have to be followed. Ms. Page said many people were not made aware of the meetings that the applicants are speaking of.

Hearing no further public comment, Chair Koppenheffer closed the public hearing.

Chair Koppenheffer clarified the open items. Mr. Nash would like more information regarding the excavation in the hillside by the proposed building, that it can be constructed and maintained without hazard. Vice Chair Mercer brought up the subject of a site visit and wanted additional clarity on why the area to the north is not suitable for building and asked if this is a final site plan. Mr. Giebink said that this is a final site plan. He also said there is no access to the building on the north side because they are all apartments. Residents would not be able to get into the main building and access services. Chair Koppenheffer said a Board site visit would be a public meeting and would be difficult logistically. If the Board is interested in seeing the site, they can go privately. Mr. Giebink asked if they could be notified of a visit, but Tim Corwin said Board members should not engage in discussion with the applicant outside of the public meeting.

Alan Patterson moved to continue this hearing to March 19, 2018 at 7:00 p.m. at Council Chambers, City Hall. Seconded by Travis Griffin.

***The motion passed 5-0.**

IV. PUBLIC HEARING

- A. **PORTER'S FINEST/ COTTAGE HILL ORCHARDS (applicant) & PORTER FAMILY REVOCABLE TRUST (property owner), 53 STEVENS ROAD (Tax Map 52, Lot 16-100), zoned RL-2--** Request for a Variance from Article III, Section 313.3 of the Zoning Ordinance to permit a greenhouse to be located approximately 27 ft. from the side lot line where a minimum of 35 ft. is required; (b) a Variance from Article III, 313.3 to permit a chicken coop/produce stand approximately 10 ft. from the front lot line where a minimum of 40 ft. is required; and (c) a Special Exception pursuant to Article III, Section 313.2 to allow a produce stand. #ZB2017-37-SEVAR

Chair Koppenheffer recused himself. Vice Chair Mercer activated Jason Crowley, alternate.

Carl Porter and Maghan Porter, trustees of the Porter Family Revocable Trust and owners of Porter's Finest and Cottage Hill Orchards, appeared. The applicants would like to move their henhouse to the front yard of their property owing to the lack of safe access to the henhouse year round. The applicants have been adding fill to their property since 2015 in order to create a flat area that would be suitable for placing a henhouse. Currently the henhouse is safely accessed by a barn access road that is next to the driveway to the house. To walk to the henhouse directly, there is a very steep hill that is difficult to navigate due to the steep topography. With regard to the greenhouse, it would be sited within 27 feet of the side yard. In 2014 the ditch between the applicant's property and the neighboring property was redone. The greenhouse would be placed on the southwestern area of the lawn and would end approximately 18 feet to the south. This is the last piece of flat land on the property that would allow the access needed to electricity and water to make the greenhouse operational. The greenhouse would help the business by reducing costs associated with buying plants and may help generate some plant sales.

Vice Chair Mercer asked for questions or comments from the Board. Mr. Patterson asked for clarification regarding logging that had been done to the north. Mr. Porter said his uncle owns that property and in 2015, according to forestry management, it was due for a cutting. Mr. Griffin asked for clarification regarding the history of chickens on the property. Mr. Porter confirmed that he lived in the house since 2012 and that he has not had chickens in the coop, and it is currently empty. Mr. Porter's grandfather was the last one to have chickens, and the last rooster was there in the 1990s. The coop and the barn were built in the 1980s and was owned by Mr. Porter's grandfather as part of a larger dairy farm. Upon his retirement, he subdivided the property and gave pieces to various family members. Mr. Griffin asked how Mr. Porter's grandfather accessed the coop, and Mr. Porter said that he used the barn road, which no longer exists and is underneath the fill that has been brought in. Mr. Griffin asked for clarification on the topography related to the road and Mr. Porter said that the top part is flat, owing to the fill, but that the edges are very steep and do not allow safe access down the side. Mr. Crowley asked about the nearest neighbors and whether roosters could create a disturbance. Mr. Porter said roosters are allowed now according to the RL-2 zoning and that he is asking only to move the henhouse and allow it to be safely accessible. Mr. Porter also noted that the main purpose of the henhouse is to have eggs, so there would be limited roosters. Vice Chair Mercer asked whether there is any power to the henhouse now. Mr. Porter confirmed that the henhouse is currently without power and would remain unpowered after it was moved; water would be brought by hand to the henhouse. Mr. Nash asked if there would be water and electric for the greenhouse, which Mr. Porter confirmed would be run through an above-ground pipe. There was general discussion regarding the topography of the lot which includes slopes in excess of 25 percent. There were no other questions from the Board.

Vice Chair Mercer opened the hearing to public comment. There were no comments from the public. She closed the public hearing.

DELIBERATION/DECISION

Mr. Patterson is familiar with the area and agrees that topography is an issue and the access road is a considerable inconvenience for accessing the henhouse. Mr. Patterson also noted that the closest neighbor is 400 feet away, and legally a hunter could discharge a firearm and create a noise disturbance that would be equal to a rooster. Mr. Griffin said the application states that the property is not in a wetlands, but the wetlands overlay shows that to be inaccurate, which Mr. Griffin would like noted. Vice Chair Mercer said that her experience with chicken coops would support the applicant's concerns.

Dan Nash moved that, on February 20th 2018, at a duly-noticed meeting of the Lebanon Zoning Board of Adjustment, there appeared Carl Porter and Maghan Porter on behalf of Porter's Finest/Cottage Hill Orchards (applicant) & Porter Family Revocable Trust (property owner) regarding 53 Stevens Road (Tax Map 52, Lot 16-100), zoned RL-2. The applicant requests (a) a Variance from Article III, §313.3 of the Zoning Ordinance to permit a greenhouse to be located approximately 27 ft. from the side lot line where a minimum of 35 ft. is required; (b) a Variance from Article III, §313.3 to permit a chicken coop/produce stand approximately 10ft. from the front lot line where a minimum of 40 ft. is required; and (c) a Special Exception pursuant to Article III, §313.2 to allow a produce stand. #ZB2017-37-SEVAR

I. FINDINGS OF FACT

Based on testimony given, application materials presented, and supporting documents submitted, the Lebanon Zoning Board of Adjustment makes the following findings of fact:

1. The applicant proposes to construct a 12 ft. by 18 ft. greenhouse to be located approximately 27 ft. from the side lot line where a minimum of 35 ft. is required. A Variance is required to locate a greenhouse within the minimum required 35 ft. side yard. The approximate location of the greenhouse is depicted in the application materials.
2. The applicant also proposes to relocate and enlarge an existing chicken coop from its current location to the front of the property. A Variance is required to locate the chicken coop within 10 ft. of the front lot line where a minimum of 40 ft. is required. The approximate location of the chicken coop is depicted in the application materials.
3. Finally, the applicant proposes to construct a produce stand onto the side of the chicken coop. "Produce stand" is a use permitted by Special Exception in the RL-2 District, and is defined in Appendix A of the Zoning Ordinance as "Sale of flowers, garden supplies, or agricultural produce designed to serve the highway customers".
4. The applicant has submitted testimony addressing the §801.2 Variance criteria and the §801.3 Special Exception criteria in an application received by the Planning Department on November 21, 2017.
5. No members of the public spoke for or against the application.

II. CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

A. Greenhouse Variance

As a result of the above findings of fact and based on testimony given, application materials presented, and supporting documents submitted, the Board concludes the following with respect to the Variance criteria set forth in §801.2 of the Zoning Ordinance:

1. The variance will not be contrary to the public interest. (§801.2.A.1)
2. The spirit of the ordinance is observed. (§801.2.A.2)
3. Substantial justice is done. (§801.2.A.3)
4. The values of surrounding properties are not diminished. (§801.2.A.4)
5. Literal enforcement of the provisions of the ordinance would result in an unnecessary hardship. Owing to the following special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area (§801.2.A.5.a):
 - i. There is not a fair and substantial relationship between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property. (§801.2.A.5.a.i)
 - ii. The proposed use is a reasonable one. (§801.2.A.5.a.ii)

B. Chicken Coop Variance

As a result of the above findings of fact and based on testimony given, application materials presented, and supporting documents submitted, the Board concludes the following with respect to the Variance criteria set forth in §801.2 of the Zoning Ordinance:

1. *The variance will not be contrary to the public interest. (§801.2.A.1)*
2. *The spirit of the ordinance is observed. (§801.2.A.2)*
3. *Substantial justice is done.(§801.2.A.3)*
4. *The values of surrounding properties are not diminished. (§801.2.A.4)*
5. *Literal enforcement of the provisions of the ordinance would result in an unnecessary hardship. Owing to the following special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area (§801.2.A.5.a):*
 - j. *There is not a fair and substantial relationship between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property. (§801.2.A.5.a.i)*
 - iii. *The proposed use is a reasonable one. (§801.2.A.5.a.ii)*

C. Produce Stand Special Exception

As a result of the above findings of fact and based on testimony given, application materials presented, and supporting documents submitted, the Board concludes the following with respect to the Special Exception criteria set forth in §801.3 of the Zoning Ordinance:

1. *The Special Exception is specifically authorized by §313.2 of the Zoning Ordinance. (§801.3A)*
2. *There are no special conditions*
3. *There are no existing violations of the Zoning Ordinance on the property that the granting of the Special Exception would not remedy. (§801.3.C) Staff is not aware of any Zoning Ordinance violations on the property.*
4. *The character of the area will not be adversely affected (§801.3.D)*
5. *No hazard or nuisance will be created (§801.3.E)*
6. *The capacity of existing or planned community facilities and services (including streets and highways) will not be adversely impacted. (§801.3.F)*
7. *The granting of the Special Exception will not result in undue municipal expense. (§801.3.G)*
8. *The proposed Special Exception will be developed in a manner compatible with the spirit and intent of the ordinance. (§801.3.H)*
9. *The general welfare of the City will be protected. (§801.3.I)*

III. DECISION

Now therefore be it resolved, the Lebanon Zoning Board of Adjustment, on this 20th day of February, 2018, hereby GRANTS the request of the applicants for (a) a Variance from Article III, §313.3 to permit a greenhouse to be located approximately 27 ft. from the side lot line; (b) a Variance from Article III, §313.3 to permit a chicken coop/produce stand approximately 10ft. from the front lot line; and (c) a Special Exception pursuant to Article III, §313.2 to allow a produce stand at 53 Stevens Road (Tax Map 52, Lot 16-100), as set forth above and per testimony, plans, and materials submitted, and per the following conditions:

1. *The applicant shall obtain a building permit for all proposed work.*
2. *The applicant shall obtain a site plan review from the Planning Board prior to operation of the produce stand.*

Seconded by Alan Patterson.

*Vote to approve: 5-0. Motion approved

Chair Koppenheffer rejoined the meeting.

- B. **ANNE & BRUCE JAMES, 82 HARDY HILL ROAD (Tax Map 80, Lot 23), zoned RL-2--** Request for a Variance from Article III, Section 313.3 of the Zoning Ordinance to permit an addition to an existing outbuilding to be located approximately 25 ft. from the side lot line where a minimum of 35 ft. is required. #ZB2018-01-VAR

Applicants Bruce James and Anne James, accompanied by Wendy Williamson from Domus Builders, appeared before the Board. Mr. James stated that this would be a simple addition extending out approximately 10 feet, the entire length of the barn. The barn is currently 14' x 28' and sits 35' from the property line. Mr. James stated that he believes the addition meets the criteria of the City for granting a variance and that the addition will be aesthetically pleasing. Mr. James has spoken with the neighbors and has included a letter of support from them in the package that was submitted to the Board. There will be no plumbing, the current septic is located to the south, and the well is located approximately 20' to the southeast. A variance is being requested because the addition would cause the barn to sit only 25' feet from the property line rather than the 35' required. The addition would also allow the applicants to protect a small tractor and utility trailer while being aesthetically more pleasing than leaving them outside.

Chair Koppenheffer asked for questions or comments from the Board. Vice Chair Mercer commented that the application was thorough. There were no other questions from the Board.

Chair Koppenheffer opened the hearing to public comment. There were no comments from the public. He closed the public hearing.

DELIBERATION/DECISION

Mr. Nash commented on the tapered shape of the lot. He said the request is not excessive, and the reason for the request for a variance is due to the shape of the lot in relation to the placement of the garage. Mr. Patterson agreed that the request is reasonable and that the placement of the garage does not allow other practical options.

Travis Griffin moved that, on February 20th 2018, at a duly-noticed meeting of the Lebanon Zoning Board of Adjustment there appeared Bruce James, Anne James, and Wendy Williamson, regarding 82 Hardy Hill Road (Tax Map 80, Lot 23), zoned RL-2. The applicants request a Variance from Article III, Section 313.3 of the Zoning Ordinance to permit an addition to an existing outbuilding to be located approximately 25 ft. from the side lot line where a minimum of 35 ft. is required. #ZB2018-01-VAR

I. FINDINGS OF FACT

Based on testimony given, application materials presented, and supporting documents submitted, the Lebanon Zoning Board of Adjustment makes the following findings of fact:

1. The property is improved with a one-family dwelling and a detached outbuilding, both of which conform to the minimum yard requirements of the RL-2 District.
2. The applicant proposes to construct a 10 ft. by 28 ft. addition onto the outbuilding in order to accommodate accessory storage for the principal residential use.
3. The proposed addition will be located approximately 25 ft. from the side lot line shared with 6 Whipple Road (Tax Map 80, Lot 22). Because a minimum side yard of 35 ft. is mandated in the RL-2 District, the construction of the addition requires a Variance.
4. The applicants submitted testimony addressing the §801.2 Variance criteria in an application dated February 1, 2018.
5. No members of the public spoke for or against the application.

II. CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

As a result of the above findings of fact and based on testimony given, application materials presented, and supporting documents submitted, the Board concludes the following with respect to the Variance criteria set forth in §801.2 of the Zoning Ordinance:

1. The variance will not be contrary to the public interest. (§801.2.A.1)
2. The spirit of the ordinance is observed. (§801.2.A.2)
3. Substantial justice is done. (§801.2.A.3)
4. The values of surrounding properties are not diminished. (§801.2.A.4)
5. Literal enforcement of the provisions of the ordinance would result in an unnecessary hardship. Owing to the following special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area (§801.2.A.5.a): The lot has a tapered shape that does not allow the setback distance to be met.
 - i. There is not a fair in substantial relationship between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property. (§801.2.A.5.a.i)
 - ii. The proposed use is a reasonable one. (§801.2.A.5.a.ii)

III. DECISION

Now therefore be it resolved, the Lebanon Zoning Board of Adjustment, on this 20th day of February, 2018, hereby GRANTS the requested relief, subject to testimony, plans, and materials submitted, and per the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall obtain a building permit prior to construction of the addition.

Seconded by Jennifer Mercer.

**Vote to approve: 5-0. Motion approved

V. STAFF COMMENTS: None

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Dan Nash moved for adjournment. Seconded by Alan Patterson.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:27 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Brandy Sailers-Dow
Recording Secretary