



**TOWN OF MADISON
ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
PO BOX 248
MADISON, NEW HAMPSHIRE 03849
planning@madison-nh.org
Phone: 603-367-4332 x303 Fax: 603-367-4547**

**ZBA MINUTES
April 16, 2025**

ATTENDANCE: Drew Gentile, Chairman, George Rau, Doug McAllister, Jennifer Skaife and Alternate, Marc Ohlson, Alternate

EXCUSED: Sharon Schilling, Vice Chairman

OTHERS PRESENT: Madison TV, Kasia Scentsas, Kate Young, Land Use Boards Administrator, Attorney Jonathan Springer, Attorney Matthew Johnson, Attorney Timothy Sullivan as well as members of the public

CALL TO ORDER: Chairman Gentile called the meeting to order at 6:05 pm.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE/ROLL CALL: Rau led the Pledge of Allegiance. A roll call was conducted, with four board members present. Schilling was out of town, and Ohlson, as Chairman of the Planning Board, could not participate as a voting member for this case.

Public Hearing: Case #24-08 – Continued from March 19, 2025 and April 16, 2025 - GMR Holdings of NH, LLC

Case #24-08 - Variance request from Jonathan Springer, Esquire of Springer Law Office, authorized agent for GMR Holdings of NH, LLC, to install, operate and maintain a personal wireless service facility Off King Pine Road, Tax Map 249, Lot 1, from the Madison Zoning Ordinance for the following Articles/Sections:

- 1, A variance from Article VI, Section 6.5.A of the Ordinance, which provides that towers shall not exceed ten feet (10') over the average tree canopy height.
2. A variance from Article VI, Section 6.5.E of the Ordinance, which provides that there be a fall zone equal to tower height from all property lines.
3. A variance from Article VI, Section 6.6.M of the Ordinance, which provides that "all ground mounts shall be of a mast type mount."
4. To the extent necessary, a variance from Article VI, Section 6.6.K (2) of the Ordinance, which provides that a telecommunication facility "shall not be visible above the ridge line from public roads."
5. To the extent necessary, a variance from Article VI, Section 6.6.M (1) of the Ordinance, which provides that "any antenna array placed upon...a proposed ground mount...shall have a diameter of no more than four (4) feet exclusive of the diameter of the mount... "

PUBLIC MEETING NOTICE: Notification of the April 16, 2025 meeting was posted on March 27, 2025 at the Madison Post Office, Silver Lake Post Office and upper and lower levels of the Madison Town Hall.

Chairman Gentile stated that Attorney Springer was going to continue explaining the five criteria and after that, then the board will need to conduct their Findings of Fact and he will keep the hearing open but is not looking for public testimony.

Chairman Gentile explained to Attorney Springer that there were only four members tonight and asked if he was agreeable to that. Attorney Springer stated he needed to consult with his client first. His client agreed to proceed with a four-member board.

ELEVATION OF ALTERNATES: Chairman Gentile elevated Skaife to voting member status, bringing the total number of voting members to four for this meeting.

Attorney Springer stated he submitted materials in response to previous questions from the board, including information about generator noise levels and real estate appraisals showing no impact on property values.

Attorney Springer explained that the sound level produced by a typical generator would be 67 decibels at 23 feet away, which is comparable to conversational level. He clarified that multiple generators would not significantly increase the noise level due to the logarithmic nature of decibel measurements.

Regarding property values, Attorney Springer presented detailed appraisals from residential areas in Fryeburg, Maine, and Londonderry, New Hampshire, showing no diminution in value for homes with views of existing cell towers.

Attorney Springer addressed Ivan Pagacik's supplemental report, arguing that it supported their case by showing better coverage and signal strength compared to the Vertex site in Freedom. Attorney Springer stated that the service area in Ivan Pagacik's report does not include the applicants coverage area. Attorney Springer stated that he understands that there is a lot of opposition from the public.

In response to concerns from the public about tower height, Attorney Springer stated that his client has offered to voluntarily reduce the proposed height from 150 feet as noted in the original application, to 130 feet as a condition of approval. He explained that this would still allow for effective coverage while minimizing visual impact. Attorney stated this is a good faith gesture to the town and that they had an excellent balloon test and he does not believe you could see the balloon at 130 feet.

Attorney Springer meticulously addressed the five variance criteria, offering comprehensive explanations for each:

1. **Spirit of the Ordinance:** Attorney Springer articulated that the variances' approval aligns with the overarching objectives of the zoning ordinance. He reasoned that the visual impact would be negligible, ensuring the area's aesthetic and environmental concerns remain unaltered. Furthermore, historical or cultural resources would remain unaffected, maintaining the integrity and character of the region. His discussion emphasized preservation of the environment, reflecting the ordinance's core intent.
2. **Public Interest:** According to Attorney Springer, rejecting the variances fails to serve public interests, as the proposed telecommunication facility is designed to fill a critical coverage gap. The installation is poised to enhance connectivity while imposing minimal visual disruption. He underscored the community benefits that improved service offers, including enhanced communications for residents, businesses, and emergency services, potentially outweighing any adverse perceptions.
3. **Substantial Justice:** Attorney Springer posited that a fundamental principle of justice in variances is that the individual's loss should not surpass the public gain. Denying the variances would disproportionately disadvantage his client without offering a commensurate public benefit. He argued that realizing this project balances private hardships with communal advantages, furthering both private and general welfare.
4. **Hardship:** For the hardship argument, Attorney Springer referenced the legal precedent set in the Daniels case, advocating for a broader interpretation of hardship. He delineated the unique conditions of the property — notably its central location within the coverage gap and the advantageous

topography. This specificity makes the site uniquely suited for telecommunications infrastructure. He stressed that no viable alternatives exist, and the blend of geographical features and gap location necessitates the proposed site for effective and meaningful service expansion.

5. **Property Values:** Attorney Springer asserted that the introduction of the telecommunication facility would not negatively impact surrounding property values. Bolstered by reassuring reports from real estate experts, these investigations indicated a stable market unaffected by the presence of similar installations in comparable areas. He reinforced that nuisance factors, such as noise or aesthetic intrusion, were minimal and managed, ensuring sustained property value trends in the vicinity.

Attorney Springer asked “what was the basis of the public’s objection to the cell tower?” He then stated that most people present tonight have a cell phone that is drawing coverage.

Skaife asked if the tower could go an additional 20 feet above the 130 feet making it a total of 150 feet? Attorney Springer stated that there is state law in place and they could go to 150 feet.

McAllister stated they should use a camouflage pole and this should have been in the proposed application. Attorney Springer stated these are not a good idea, as well as they are ugly.

Chairman Gentile asked if the public wished to respond, clearly advising them to not repeat previous testimony.

Ellen MacDonald – 8 Crooked Pine Road (previously sworn in) – She stated that buyers are less interested in buying property near a cell phone tower and that property values will drop also, her friend, who is a realtor, told her it would not be good.

Andrew Berdell – 92 Fox Road (previously sworn in) – He stated the proposed Freedom cell tower will give coverage up to King Pine. He further stated that there would be a 10% property loss and they should listen to the people.

Colton Dow, Eaton Resident/Abutter (previously sworn in) – He stated the tower at 130 feet was visible from the lake when the balloon test was done in February. He further stated that the proposed Vertex tower for Freedom covers more of Route 153 and that the Freedom tower has no homes near it and it is not visible from the lake and that the King Pine location is not a unique location and there are probably better locations. He further stated that the service area is not laid out on either of the maps and it is hard to see what the actual service area is for King Pine.

Chairman Gentile stated he would like to begin collecting the Finding of Facts but does not want to close the public hearing.

Chairman Gentile stated that he has received reports and that the coverage report was examined by Ivan Pagacik and confirmed GMR’s report and comparison report, the required FAA report and that the tower unlit, meets navigational requirements and further, that the town requested verification of FCC guidelines which were supposedly met, but this is not stated in the report. Chairman Gentile stated that the report shows calculation of RF Radiation levels of permitted exposure levels and 14% of permitted exposure level at max power. Chairman Gentile stated that the board must hold to FCC guidelines which is 14% of permitted exposure level.

He further stated that we have studies and information from realtors as well as the document from the University of Southern Alabama providing information on property values.

Rau asked what is the impact of radiation regarding wildlife and birds. Chairman Gentile stated the board received information that there is a negative impact on osprey.

Key issues that came under scrutiny included the alleged coverage area the tower might provide, specifically scrutinizing how well the proposed location at King Pine would serve the desired coverage needs. Many voiced concerns about whether this site was genuinely the only viable option to meet the coverage requirements or if there were alternate locations that might hold potential. The discussions were especially relevant given the existence of parallel tower proposals in the surrounding area, such as a planned tower in Freedom. The proximity of these proposals led to comparisons and questions regarding the suitability of King Pine as the optimal site.

Chairman Gentile went over Attorney Springer's email dated April 14, 2025 regarding C2 Systems Report which is the Calculated Radio Frequency Emissions Report dated February 3, 2025 and that this report has been reviewed by Ivan Pagacik.

Mary Lou Dow, Eaton Resident/Abutter (previously sworn in) – She questioned what mileage the monopole is going to cover? Attorney Springer stated that in the C2 Systems Report that 700 MHz covers 1.9 miles, and that 1900 MHz on Rt. 153 covers 6 miles and .8 miles on East Madison Road. Attorney Springer stated there is a hole between the ridgelines and that the gap will not get covered from the Ridgeline to the East and West. Dow stated that the coverage is not enough. Attorney Springer stated the topo maps show the gap.

Victor Drouin, applicant who has been previously sworn in stated that, the frequency is what is transmitted at AM/FM and that 3G, 4G and 5G are not defined by frequency. He further explained that 1G would cover seven to eight miles and to get quality of service and speed driven by frequency, 700 MHz is considered c-band which is 5G and 700-800 MHz is what is used in 1G.

Peter Dow, Easton Resident/Abutter (previously sworn in) – He stated there is a legal duty to explore other sites by NH law and telecommunications and this is a terrible site for a cell tower.

Mary Lou Dow, Eaton Resident/Abutter (previously sworn in) – She stated that Eaton does not have a police department and that she lives on Route 153 and they have not seen a crash in 22 years and that there are enough houses along Route 153 if there was an issue to call for help and that this cell tower is not a necessity. She then asked Attorney Springer when the cell tower becomes obsolete what happens to it then, does it become a wildlife sanctuary.

Leslie Pritchard – 2009 East Madison Road (previously sworn in) – She stated she is concerned about the tower and that property values will go down.

Colton Dow, Eaton Resident/Abutter (previously sworn in) – He stated that it is hard to find evidence and it is difficult to provide proof that the tower changes property values and that comps are different but he did say that realtors have said that the cell tower would reduce customer base and would lower the demand.

Chairman Gentile stated again, that he wants to keep the public hearing open. He further explained to the board that he had drafted some Preliminary Notes on Findings of Fact for discussion and editing pertaining to the TCA of 1996 Umbrella, considerations with respect to RF radiation safety, considerations with respect to coverage, considerations with respect to property values and aesthetics and he read these 19 bullet points to the board. In addition to the 19 bullet points, another point, 20, was added which is "decibel levels with use of generator not significant – not verified.

Attorney Springer rebutted stating that he has never seen any letters the board received from Robert Berg, Esquire who represents Colton Dow and he wants copies of all letters that Attorney Berg has submitted to the board. Attorney Springer also stated that he disagrees with Dr. Kent Chamberlin's study and he also has not seen the University of Southern Alabama's study which he also wants copies of.

John McDonald – 8 Crooked Pine Road (previously sworn in) He stated that the monopole tower is visible.

Chairman Gentile stated that if this case is granted, it will need to go to the Planning Board and if the Zoning Board denies the request, then a new location will need to be researched. Chairman Gentile also stated for the record, by NH law, the Zoning Board of Adjustment can have a Planning Board member on their board, but on this case, Ohlson, Planning Board Chairman is recused.

In an overview considerable attention was directed towards examining the tower’s visual impact. Concerns were chiefly centered on how the structure might protrude above local ridgetops, potentially affecting the scenic views and overall aesthetic harmony with the environment. The discussions brought in various expert opinions, notably those from the town’s independent consultant, to provide further understanding and evaluations regarding these visual assessments.

The noise impact associated with the tower operations, particularly from generators, was another focal point of the public’s inquiries. Members of the community were keen to understand the implications of noise levels on the local environment and residents. This concern led to an exploration of additional submissions that addressed the decibel levels produced by the tower's generators and their compliance with the town's noise regulations.

Significant debates also transpired concerning property values. The discourse thoroughly examined the credibility, sufficiency, and availability of data indicating whether nearby cell towers could potentially lead to a reduction in property values. This topic was pivotal as it concerned both the present and future economic implications for property owners in proximity to the proposed tower site.

After comprehensive deliberations, the board reached a consensus to continue the case to May 21, 2025. This continuation was deemed essential to allow sufficient time for a meticulous analysis of all the materials that had been previously submitted. Additionally, it provided an opportunity to incorporate any further pertinent data or expert opinions that might help solidify an informed decision-making process. Ultimately, the board aimed to ensure that every aspect of the proposal was evaluated thoroughly and judiciously before rendering a decision.

Attorney Springer stated he would email Young his agreement to continue the case to May 21, 2025 as tonight’s hearing concluded the 90-day rule.

Chairman Gentile stated that the board will need to decide at the May 21, 2025 hearing whether all five variances that GMR is asking for are required. Chairman Gentile further stated the board will have the discussion and vote in May and there will be no public hearing.

Mary Lou Dow, Easton Resident/Abutter (previously sworn in) – She asked why did the applicant come tonight with the reduced footage from 150 feet to 130 feet? She further asked what is the tree height and could Attorney Springer provide a measurement of the trees. Chairman Gentile asked that Attorney Springer provide the data that 130 feet meets the requirement.

Motion by Gentile, seconded by McAllister to continue Case #24-08 to May 21, 2025 at 6:00 pm at the Madison Elementary School Gynmasium. The motion was voted on and passed by a vote of **4-0**.

Case #25-01 – Variance Request from Peter Dow, Agent for Purity Spring Resort:

Chairman Gentile asked Young, Land Use Boards Administrator to read aloud **Case #25-01** as well as the posting notification.

Young, Land Use Boards Administrator read **Case #25-01** aloud as well as the posting notification:

Case #25-01 – Variance from Peter Dow, Agent for Purity Spring Resort, 2119 East Madison Road, Tax Map 249, Lot 1 to request a variance to allow an addition of showers and stairs which would be less than 75 feet from the center of East Madison Road which is in violation of 1.3(B)(1) and Article V, Section 5.9(A).

PUBLIC MEETING NOTICE: Notification of this public meeting was posted in the Town Hall upper and lower levels and Madison and Silver Lake Post Offices on March 12, 2025 and notifications were mailed out March 10, 2025 Certified Mail Return Receipt Requested and posted in the Conway Daily Sun on March 13, 2025.

Chairman Gentile elevated Ohlson from Alternate status to full voting status for this case making the total members for voting status now a five-member board.

Conflict of Interest: Chairman Gentile polled the board for any Conflict of Interest and the members agreed there was none.

Waiver Request: Chairman Gentile stated there was no Certified Plot Plan submitted and he polled the board and asked if they felt there were any issues of not having a Certified Plot Plan.

Discussion: Skaife stated it was hard to identify the project as it was hand drawn. Shackford, DPW Director also stated he did not understand the drawings. Chairman Gentile stated the board can come back to the waiver as sometimes, the board can work through a case without a Certified Plot Plan.

Regional Impact: Chairman Gentile polled the board and the members agreed there was none.

Chairman Gentile swore in Peter Dow, Agent for the applicant, Purity Spring Resort and Josh Shackford, Madison DPW Director.

Chairman Gentile asked the board if they felt a Certified Plot Plan was required. He further stated that the board needs something for the record that shows something was done.

Dow explained to the board and Shackford the hand drawings. After a thorough discussion, the board agreed to accept a waiver for this requirement. However, this acceptance was conditional upon the Agent, Dow, provide legible plot plans, showing both existing conditions and the proposed changes.

Motion by Gentile, seconded by McAllister to accept the Waiver Request with a condition that legible plot plans are submitted showing the existing and proposed project. The motion was voted and passed with a vote of **5-0**.

Dow explained to the board the proposed modifications and stated his case as follows:

1. **Demolition and Extension:** The project involves demolishing an existing garage. The plan includes extending the structure further.
2. **Relocation of Garage Door:** There is a planned relocation of the garage door, which will now be positioned on the driveway side, away from the street.
3. **Addition of Fire Escape:** A covered fire escape is slated for installation, which will serve the rental units located above, enhancing occupant safety.

Chairman Gentile stated the 15' to East Madison Road is a non-conforming distance. Dow stated the building is not getting closer and is less non-confirming. Shackford stated he has no issue with the distance of the building to the road as it is less non-conforming.

Chairman Gentile stated the board should start to compile the Findings of Fact which they did as follows:

Findings of Fact:

1. The existing structure has a garage with its door opening toward East Madison Rd and is 15 feet from the center of East Madison Rd, making the edge of the road approximately 3 feet from the current building and garage opening.
2. The building predates the establishment of the zoning ordinance in 1987 and so is a pre-existing, nonconforming use allowed to continue.
3. The existing garage portion of the structure is being removed and replaced with a new garage with the door facing the driveway so that it no longer opens onto East Madison Rd.
4. The garage wall will extend along East Madison Rd., in the same plane as the existing structure so that the expansion of the garage remains less than the current setback requirement or 75 feet from the center of the road. Because of the slight curve of the road, the setback distance on the replaced section of the garage wall will be at a slightly increasing distance from East Madison Rd.
5. Testimony from Josh Shackford, Director of DPW, is that the overall effect is an improvement because the door would no longer open onto East Madison Rd and the new part of the structure, though still much less than the current setback requirement, will be slightly less non-conforming.

Motion by McAllister, seconded by Rau to close the Public Hearing. The motion was voted on and passed **5-0**.

Chairman Gentile asked the board if they thought there were any reasons to deny the request and if not, he asked for a motion but then realized the board needs to evaluate the five criteria for a variance as follows:

Findings on the five conditions for a variance:

1. The variance will not be contrary to the public interest
2. The spirit of the ordinance will be observed (answers for both 1 and 2 together):

For the variance to be contrary to the public interest, and for it to violate the spirit of the ordinance, it must unduly and to a marked degree violate the basic objectives of the zoning ordinance. To determine this, does the variance alter the essential character of the neighborhood or threaten the health, safety, or general welfare of the public?

- The change will have no effect on the character of the neighborhood which is a rural camp.
- There will be a significant improvement in safety for the campers who will no longer need to access the garage from the narrow three-foot margin directly along East Madison Road.

3. Substantial justice is done because:

Any loss to the individual which is not outweighed by a gain to the public is an injustice.

- Because moving the location of the garage door to the driveway side of the building will reduce risk to campers, staff and drivers by moving activity away from the narrow 3-foot margin between the existing garage door and East Madison Road.

4. The values of surrounding properties are not diminished because

- There is no evidence that an improvement to the existing building will depress property values in this rural area.

5. Literal enforcement would result in unnecessary hardship because owing to the special conditions of the property (1):

There is no fair and substantial relationship between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property because:

- The unique condition of this property is the 3-foot distance between the existing building and the edge of East Madison Rd, which was advantageous in a previous age, but now presents a potential traffic safety hazard with a door opening to the road side of the garage.
- Making the entire building conforming would entail significant cost for the owner when a significant improvement in safety can be achieved with this change.

The proposed use is a reasonable one because:

- Because it makes the continued use of the structure for its current camp purposes safer at a reasonable cost to the owner.

(2) If the criteria in subparagraph (1) are not established, an unnecessary hardship will be deemed to exist if, and only if, owing to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area, the property cannot be reasonably used in strict conformance with the ordinance, and a variance is therefore necessary to enable a reasonable use of it.

Motion by Gentile, seconded by McAllister to grant the variance request because it significantly improves the safety for drivers and campers.

The motion was amended to now read:

Motion by Gentile, seconded by McAllister to grant the variance request because it significantly improves the safety for drivers and campers and that the agent submit legible drawings. The motion was voted on and passed with a vote of **5-0**.

Gentile read aloud the provisions of the 30-day appeal period. Gentile closed **Case #25-01**.

Public Meetings:

Case #23-13 – Request for Re-Hearing of the Zoning Board of Adjustment’s February 19, 2025 Decision - is requested by Matt Johnson, Esquire, Devine, Millimet & Branch, P.A., Agent for Chad and Brittany Ardizzoni and Aaron and Tiffany Clymer, 13 Lucerne Drive, Tax Map 103, Lot 060 to determine whether or not to limit them to 61 short term rental days a year.

Case #23-15 – Request for Re-Hearing of the Zoning Board of Adjustment’s February 19, 2025 Decision - is requested by Matt Johnson, Esquire, Devine, Millimet & Branch, P.A., Agent for Keith and Alison Kellerman, 21 Haven Road, Tax Map 128, Lot 021 to determine whether or not to limit them to 69 short term rental days a year.

Case #23-18 – Request for Re-Hearing of the Zoning Board of Adjustment’s February 19, 2025 Decision - is requested by Matt Johnson, Esquire, Devine, Millimet & Branch, P.A., Agent for Matthew Petti and Jennifer Swift, 70 Skyline Way, Tax Map 205 Lot 048 to determine whether or not to limit them to 181 short term rental days a year.

Case #23-19 – Request for Re-Hearing of the Zoning Board of Adjustment’s February 19, 2025 Denial of an Appeal from an Administrative Decision is requested by Matt Johnson, Esquire, Devine, Millimet & Branch, P.A., Agent for Brian Burns, 1 Oak Ridge Road, Tax Map 109, Lot 087 to determine whether or not his circumstance allows for short term rentals relating to a denial from Robert Boyd, Code Enforcement Officer dated August 30, 2023 as to Article IV, Section 4.6A of the Town of Madison Zoning Ordinance.

Chairman Gentile discussed the requests for rehearing all cases as noted above. These cases involve previous decisions made by the board and that the applicants are seeking the board to review these decisions. During the discussion, the board considered the reasons for the requests, which had been submitted for each case. The primary reason to grant the re-hearings for these cases, is to ensure that the board's rationale and decision-making process are thoroughly and clearly documented. The decision to rehear these cases does not indicate any predetermined outcomes but demonstrates the board's commitment to transparency and due diligence. The board found it necessary to create a comprehensive record that includes enhanced justifications for their past judgments, recognizing that a well-documented process is vital for the integrity of their decisions. Consequently, the board agreed to proceed with re-hearings for each of these cases, intending to articulate and document their reasoning with enhanced clarity.

Motion by McAllister, seconded by Skaife to rehear **Case #23-13, #23-15, #23-18 and #23-19.**

Roll Call Vote: Gentile; Aye; Rau, Aye; Skaife, Aye, McAllister; Nay

The motion passed with a vote of 3-1.

Young, Land Use Boards Administrator stated she would inform Attorney Johnson of the outcome and forward the decisions to him.

Chairman Gentile stated to the board that he would not be attending the June 18th Zoning Board of Adjustment meeting due to another commitment.

Chairman Gentile and the board, wanted to publicly thank Jake Martin and Bill Dempster for their service on the board and that their expertise will be greatly missed.

Chairman Gentile stated he was going to try to put a “shout out” on Facebook looking for people interested on serving on the Zoning Board. He further stated that the board can have five regular members and five alternates.

Administration – Discussion About Revising Rules of Procedure:

Chairman Gentile stated that there are two items in the Zoning Board’s Rules of Procedure that need to be addressed. The board deliberated extensively on two proposed changes to the current Rules of Procedure to ensure better clarity, coherence, and alignment with modern practices:

1. Allowing Appeals to Be Filed Electronically:

- The board considered an update to the procedure for filing appeals. This proposed amendment would enable appeals to be submitted electronically. The intention behind this change is to streamline the process, making it more accessible and efficient for appellants. Under the revised rule, a motion for rehearing can be filed through electronic means, such as email, followed by a requirement to submit an original hard copy with a wet signature at a later stage. This adjustment aligns the board's procedures with current court practices that accommodate electronic filings.

1. Reversing the Order of Items N and O in Section 4:

- The board discussed an adjustment to Section 4 that pertains to the sequence of events during public hearings. The proposal suggests swapping the order of items identified as N and O for enhanced procedural logic. Presently, item N directs the chairman to close the public hearing unless there is a request for continuation. The new arrangement would position the current item O, which includes the chairman's summary of the facts and claims with opportunities for corrections from the floor, ahead of the hearing's closure. This revision is intended to ensure thorough public engagement and feedback before the formal closing of the hearing. The corrected sequence promotes attentive listening and responsive adjustments during deliberations.

During the meeting, these proposed updates were read and recorded as the first of three necessary readings required for adoption into the official Rules of Procedure. This process ensures transparency, allows for additional input, and facilitates any necessary revisions before finalization. In conclusion, the board emphasized the importance of these procedural adjustments to reinforce the board's commitment to efficiency, accessibility, and rigorous documentation.

Chairman Gentile stated that appointments of Chairman and Vice Chairman should wait until the May meeting when Schilling is present.

Approval of Minutes - February 19, 2025: **Motion** by McAllister, seconded by Rau to approve the February 19, 2025 minutes as amended due to typographical errors. The motion was voted on and passed with a vote of **4-0** with Ohlson abstaining as he was not present at the March 19, 2025 meeting.

Young had nothing to report to the board.

ADJOURNMENT: **Motion** by Gentile, seconded by McAllister to adjourn the meeting at 9:15 pm. The motion was voted on and passed with a vote of **5-0**.

The next Public Hearing of the Zoning Board of Adjustment will be held on May 21 , 2025 at the Madison Elementary School Gymnasium at 6:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Katharine Young
Land Use Boards Administrator