

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS

MINUTES
THE ZONING BOARD OF REVIEW
OF BRISTOL, RHODE ISLAND

13 JULY 2020
7:00 PM
VIA VIDEO CONFERENCE
BRISTOL, RHODE ISLAND

BEFORE THE TOWN OF BRISTOL ZONING BOARD OF REVIEW:

MR. CHARLIE BURKE, Acting Chairman
MR. DAVID SIMOES
MR. DONALD S. KERN
MR. DEREK N. TIPTON, Alternate
MS. ALAYNE WHITE, Alternate

ALSO PRESENT:

ATTORNEY ANDREW TIETZ, Town Solicitor's Office
MR. EDWARD TANNER, Zoning Enforcement Officer

Susan E. Andrade
91 Sherry Ave.
Bristol, RI 02809
401-253-5570

I N D E X

	Page
1. Motion to appoint an Acting Chairman.....	3
2. Approval of minutes: 21 April, 2020 04 May 2020 12 May 2020 01 JUNE 2020.....	4
New Petitions:	
3. 2020-23 – Petition of James and Paula Ferrato.....	5
4. 2020-24 – Petition of Robert and Debra J. D’Angelo.....	6
5. 2020-25 – Petition of Bank of America.....	18
6. 2020-26 – Petition of Andrew D. Casella.....	21
7. Adjournment.....	23

13 JULY 2020

1. Motion to appoint an Acting Chairman.

Chairman Joseph Asciola was not able to attend the Video Conference, due to technical difficulties. Discussion was held that a Vice Chairman has not been appointed to date and an Acting Chairman could be appointed for this evening's meeting.

X X X X X X

MR. TANNER: Do the Board members approve the appointing of an Acting Chairman?

MR. SIMOES: Yes.

MR. KERN: Approve.

MR. BURKE: Yes.

MS. WHITE: Yes, I approve.

MR. TIPTON: Aye.

X X X X X X

Attorney Tietz called for nominations for an Acting Chairman for this meeting. Mr. Kern nominated Charlie Burke. Ms. White and Mr. Simoes both seconded. There being no other nominations, Mr. Tietz asked that the roll be called

X X X X X X

MR. TANNER: All those in favor of the motion for Mr. Burke to be Acting Chair for this meeting, until Joe Asciola arrives?

MR. SIMOES: Yes.

MR. KERN: Aye.

MR. BURKE: I'll abstain.

MR. TIPTON: Aye.

MS. WHITE: Aye.

13 JULY 2020

X X X X X X

The Video Conference meeting of the Town of Bristol Zoning Board of Review was held and called to order at 7:15 p.m. by Acting Chairman Charlie Burke.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

21 April 2020

04 May 2020

12 May 2020

01 JUNE 2020

MR. BURKE: Our first order of business will be the approval of the April 21, May 4th and May 12th and June 1st meetings minutes.

MR. SIMOES: I'd like to make a motion that we approve the minutes of April 21st, May 4th, May 12th and June 1st, 2020.

MR. KERN: I'll second.

MR. BURKE: All in favor? (Taken by roll call)

MR. SIMOES: Aye.

MS. WHITE: Aye.

MR. TIPTON: Aye.

MR. KERN: Aye.

MR. BURKE: Aye.

X X X X X X

(THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED)

(Minutes were approved)

Mr. Burke explained that there would not be a quorum for File No. 2020-23, until such time as the Chairman attends this meeting. Also, he agreed that the Board should also wait for File No. 2020-24 until such time as the Chairman arrived.

**3. 2020-23
JAMES & PAULA FERRATO**

**23 Noyes Ave.: R-6
Pl. 15 – Lot 63**

Dimensional Variances to construct a 6' x 8' accessory shed structure with less than the required left side yard and less than the required rear yard.

At the end of the meeting, the Board still had no quorum and discussed having the Petition continued to a date certain. Mr. Ferrato asked that the Petition not be postponed until September, as there is no August meeting, as he would like to move forward.

X X X X X X

MR. BURKE: Can we have a motion to continue to next Monday, July 20th at 6:30 p.m.

MR. SIMOES: I make a motion that we continue application no. 2020-23 to July 20th, next Monday, at 6:30 p.m.

MS. WHITE: I'll second.

MR. BURKE: Roll call.

MR. KERN: Aye.

MR. TIPTON: Aye.

MR. BURKE: I am an aye.

X X X X X X

(THE MOTIN WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED)

(Petition continued)

4. 2020-24

ROBERT W. & DEBRA J. D'ANGELO

**Slocum St.: R-10
Pl. 121 – Lot 156**

Dimensional Variance to construct a 30' x 36' single-family dwelling with less than the required front yard.

Mr. Robert and Ms. Debra D'Angelo presented their Petition to the Board. Mr. D'Angelo explained that they presently live on Slocum Street, across the street from this lot in question, the proposed building site. Basically, they were in front of the Board back in October and the Staff report posted with this Petition outlined where they were and where they are now. Basically, due to the conditions abutting the Kickemuit River, they have some challenges with CRMC approvals. So, what they've asked for is to get relief and a variance to come closer to the street. They feel that their request is very much in line with the neighborhood. Quite a few, or maybe most of the properties, not only on Slocum, but even down along the River, have a less than 30-foot setback from the front property line, specifically from the street. In this particular case, they have three specific abutters, the Leachs, which have a vacant parcel to their south. There is Marie Mascena, who has a vacant parcel to their north. And, coincidentally, they both own properties across the street, as well as they do. They're not asking for any relief from their immediate abutters, they're asking for relief from the Town to come closer to the street. They want to be in much compliance as they can with the Zoning applicable to the building lot. The bigger challenge is going to be with Coastal Resources, with the buffers and the setbacks that they require from the wetland edge. They have gone through the expense, they've hired an engineer, they've submitted to Coastal Resource for a

preliminary determination, which in their opinion was a good approach initially. Because, without knowing the actual footprint in the building site, going to home design and going to that extent with a full Ascent application, there's going to be quite a few changes, or they expected quite a few changes. That's why they came to the Town the first time, then they went to CRMC and got a preliminary determination and the result of that was basically not an approval, not a denial, but they're comments were to reduce the footprint of the house and increase the buffer to the River. What they have done is reduced the footprint of the house and are now asking for additional relief from the Town to come closer to the street. The 8-foot setback, actually the street has a little hook to it and the lot has a little angle to it; so you can see that it's the south corner of the lot that they want to be 8 feet off the property pin. But its almost 16+ feet off the berm on the street itself from the hot top. And on the north side, it is about 12 and change to the pin. It's almost 19 ½ feet to the street. They feel that it is very consistent with the setback with a lot of the properties on the street. Specifically, and if you go through the neighborhood down the River, they feel it is consistent. It also provides more than ample parking off the street. Whether they park on the side of the proposed footprint of the house, in front of the proposed footprint, or their intent is most likely the house would most likely be elevated, an elevated design, and they would probably create some parking under the house.

Mr. Burke stated that his recollection from the last application was that they requested a distance of 10 feet from the property line. Mr. D'Angelo stated they did and after some discussion and some comments from neighbors, they got to a 15-foot setback. He believes there was some level of discussion that Coastal Resource might dictate other

than that. He believes that the footprint of the proposed building is close to enough to the street that even with the extreme high tides, which the regular high tides are quite a distance from the footprint of the building site. The extreme moon tides do creep up and maybe would get within 25 to 30 feet of the proposed building site. But in order for any water to come up under the proposed house, or up to the street, it would probably have to be a named storm; something with extreme conditions. Which he knows his neighbors maybe have experienced that over the years, but they don't feel that the footprint of the house and the construction site of the house is going to impact the neighboring lots, as far as additional runoff. The only water flooding that's going to come up is in an extreme named storm, with an extreme high tide flooding situation.

Mr. Burke stated that that the Board previously granted 15 feet of relief; but that was a vehicle for the applicant to initiate the application with CRMC, because they had to get some type of ruling from the Zoning Board before they could go there. And during that discussion the Board did anticipate that CRMC may require the applicant to move closer to Slocum Street. This is another iteration, a progression of the applicant's multiple applications.

Detailed discussion was held on what CRMC has determined to be the feature they are concerned with. And also detailed review of the proposed relief requested. Mr. Kern also noted that there are other buildings in the area that are actually closer to the front property lines.

Mr. Joseph Brennan, attorney representing Alan and Karen Leach of 10 Slocum Street. They have a couple of points in opposition. The first one that's been mentioned in the past and he wouldn't dwell on too strongly, and the applicant brought it up, is that

his clients are very concerned about the flooding and the issues that are happening along the River with the high moon tides. That could create flooding problems, which may force people to park on the street during those times, which doesn't make the area safe. And he doesn't know if it's true, he's been told from his clients that the applicant has already put sand and rocks on the lot without proper approvals. He's discussed the possibility of a retaining wall and just putting it in; and they're not sure if the applicant will get those approvals. They've also been told by the Harbor Master that the applicant has put a steel pipe into the ground and moored a boat to it without proper approvals. He's not sure if the Harbor Master is going to do anything regarding that. So, they're just worried about future illegal building, dumping, anything along those lines. Because in their opinion, the applicant hasn't proven in good faith that he's going forward with everything.

Mr. Tietz stated that he needed to put a stop to this conversation, because it is not relevant at all to the application, whether he is or is not violating the regulations of the harbor and Mr. Brennan doesn't have any personal knowledge of it, and asked that they move on to their other arguments.

Mr. Brennan stated that it is knowledge of his clients who he represents. Obviously, nothing would ever be personal knowledge of himself, but as an attorney he has to represent that. The second argument, that the Board has already decided on this application. And hearing testimony, they had considered going to 10 feet and decided to go to 15 feet. That being said, the applicant can't meet the Standards for a dimensional variance, because he can't show that he's asking for the least relief necessary. He has a means, he has an ability to put a house. The size of the house, he can build it within the

envelope that he's already had previous approval for. So, he doesn't believe that the applicant has the least relief necessary. When he purchased this lot, he said he lives across the street from it, he knew it was a small lot, he knew there wasn't a lot of land available to build, because there's water from the River and that it comes up. He knew there would be CRMC problems. So, he doesn't believe that the applicant can meet the requirement for the least relief necessary. And, finally, where you get into the Code for the Town of Bristol, his first point of contention is that, being in an R-10 zone, the Code requires a minimum frontage and minimum lot width, both of 80 feet. This application seems incomplete, or insufficient, seeing as how the applicant has not asked to have 60-foot feet of frontage, so 20 feet of relief from that, and additionally for minimum lot width. So, he assumes the Building Official couldn't even issue a building permit to build without getting that relief. And, secondly, in relation to the side yard setbacks, they're situated at 12 feet, when the Zone requires 15 feet. He knows in the Zoning Certificate and in the Staff report, it cites Section 28-221(a). But, if you read that Section, in Section (b) says, "provided that the front and rear yard dimensions of the lot, as built upon, shall conform to the regulations, you can cut it down". The applicant clearly showing as part of his package that, as built upon, he will be building inside of the front yard dimensions. So, therefore, he can not avail himself of the benefit of this Section and he must ask for side yard setback relief. So, he knows that the applicant puts forward, oh I just need frontage relief. However, this lot is too small. These regulations were created for a reason. The applicant really needs side yard setback, he needs lot width, he needs lot frontage and he need front yard setback. There's a reason this lot shouldn't be built on and hasn't been in so long. So, for that reason, and for all these

reasons, they believe that the application is insufficient and that he has a means of a building envelope he could build on, with 15 feet of frontage, if he wanted to. But, again, he would estimate that the building permit could be challenged at the Court level, because there's a lot more approvals that he needs and has not asked for.

Mr. Tietz asked Mr. Brennan which Section he was citing. Mr. Brennan stated it was Section 28-221(a)(2)(b).

Mr. Brennan stated that while Mr. Tietz was looking up the Section, he does understand that there is the Section that allows for a zoning modification permit from the Building Official, but the Building Official states in his Staff report and in the previous minutes of the meeting that it is a legal non-conforming lot. And that Section, because it is non-conforming, that such modifications can't be granted either.

Mr. Tietz stated that looking at the Section, it does appear, "provided the front and rear yard dimensions of the lot as built upon, shall conform with the regulations of the District". It does appear that that side lot width diminishment is only available as of right, if your front and rear yards are in full compliance. So, he would be interested in hearing what Mr. Tanner thought. But it would appear to indicate that, yes, a side yard variance would be.... Now when there were at the Board last, and he believes it was included in the packet.

Mr. Tanner stated that it was included, the applicant had 15 feet from the front property line. Mr. Tietz stated that would have complied with it and that was the relief that they were granted. Mr. Tanner stated that when they appeared before the Board, back in October of 2019, the Board granted front yard relief only. There was no request for side yard relief, nor did he believe there was any needed. He's never interpreted this

Section of the Code the way that it is being discussed. “Provided front and rear yard dimensions shall conform to the regulations”. In his opinion or get a variance. He has never had anybody interpret it that way before. When it comes to legal non-conforming single lots of record, he is always looked at the lot width to determine the side yard setbacks. They’ve done that on numerous applications here in Bristol, and he’s been doing this for a while. He thinks it’s an interesting way of reading it and he’s always interpreted it as, well, if you can’t meet the front and rear, then you need to go to the Board and get relief.

Mr. Tietz stated that for example, if someone had an existing house that didn’t conform to the front or rear and they wanted to put an addition, they couldn’t take advantage of that side yard, the narrower side yard requirements without coming to the Board. Mr. Tanner stated he doesn’t believe he’s ever read it that way before; he’s never put the two together. If it’s a single lot of record, non-conforming, with less than the required lot width, then they go with the 20% of the lot width is your side yard, or not less than 10. He does remember having that conversation with the previous Solicitor who used to sit on the Board, Mr. Ryan, because he wasn’t sure that it applied to built lots. But if it applies to vacant lots, he was told that it should apply to built lots, so that everybody get the same benefit of that relief; and that’s the way he’s been interpreting it for the last 15 years.

Mr. Tietz stated that he would have to, when he looks at it that way, he certainly see, basically, the reasonableness of the argument on either side. So, unfortunately, he didn’t think he could make it easy for the Board and say one way or the other. It would seem to be a question on whether that’s meant to apply to everything, or just meant to,

basically, apply to what you got before you and say by the way that you've got to come to the front and rear yard, so that they'll conform to the regulations as very. So, he believes it could be interpreted either way.

Mr. Brennan also asked about the minimum lot width and minimum frontage why the applicant doesn't have to as for a variance from that requirement. Or, if they do.

Mr. Tanner stated that he believes that because, as he stated in the Zoning Certificate, that this is a single lot of record. Basically, a grandfathered legal non-conforming lot. By definition we understand that it doesn't conform fully to today's Zoning Codes for the R-10 zone. So, it does lack lot width, lot frontage; so, he doesn't believe a variance is necessary because it's a legal non-conforming single lot of record.

Mr. Teitz stated that he would concur with that. It wouldn't be a non-conforming lot of record if it didn't have some of those issues.

Ms. White asked if Mr. Tietz could clarify a little bit further the discrepancy that's being discussed. Mr. Tietz stated pointed to Section (b) on the screen provided. He read through the Section and explained that the first sentence, which actually the first part of the fist part of the first sentence; does the very first thing apply. Do you need to comply with the front and rear yard as unmodified in order to take advantage of the 10-foot side yard; that's the question. He stated that the idea is that this Section, is something that if people fit within certain parameters, they can build by right and not have to go to the Zoning Board. The Zoning Board would always have the ability to grant a variance for both the front and the side yards. The question is, if the Board determines that that would be necessary, then it would have to be re-advertised, as it's only advertised for a front yard variance at this point in time.

Mr. D'Angelo stated that he does have a permit to maintain the beach. He has not intention of putting a storm wall up; it's all Coastal Resource approval is the next step and the Town of Bristol approvals are the next step. Under no circumstances would a property owner be able to do anything of the sort without proper approvals, submittals of drawings, etc., etc. As far as the Zoning Certificate, he's was taken back by the conversation around that. Needless to say, that if there's something legal in nature that they have to address, they would do that. But he did ask if they could consider the frontage off the street, as they applied for, and try to address that. If there's something more that Mr. Tanner has to inform them about in changing that Zoning Certificate, which is a recorded document and on file for the lot, if they have to address it, they'll address it.

Mr. Burke stated that he understood the issue and was looking for a recommendation on whether they proceed and assume that they're typical interpretation is accurate, or do they re-advertise for a side yard variance.

Mr. Tietz stated first off, he wanted to note regarding the Zoning Certificate, he would just remind them that the Rhode Island Courts have determined that Zoning Certificates are not neither appealable nor binding. As to the specific question, he believes that in light of the way that this has been interpreted in the past, and in light of the fact that he thinks it could go either way, this is part of one sentence, there's a period, and then there's another sentence. If the applicant wanted to, they could ask for it to be continued, so that it could be re-advertised, but they appear to want to proceed. So, at this point, he recommended that the Board proceed as is. And if this goes to Court, the Court will decide how to interpret that language.

Mr. Burke asked the applicants what they're preference would be. Mr. D'Angelo stated that his feeling was that he would like to proceed with what they submitted; they're request for the front. Because the side yard variance, they may not even need, and they could change their plan and not have to come back in front of the Board in the event that there was some further pursuit by the attorney. He would like to try to address the front setback.

Mr. Alan Leach asked that on the site plan, there's a large rock that is going to be removed and he just wanted to have any idea how that will be removed, because if blasting takes place, when they blasted at the top of the hill a lot of people's wells got affected. And most of them in that area are on wells.

Mr. D'Angelo stated that they would hope that the rock will be excavated out. But, again, they will go with their engineer review for a more comprehensive site plan, which they have to go to Coastal. And any form of excavation that is out of the ordinary, they would probably discuss that with the building department. They're way too in advance to determine that, they don't know how big the rock is.

Mr. Burke recapped what had happened during this hearing in detail and asked if there was any other questions or input from the Board. Due to the interchange with CRMC, the applicants have come in with a revised proposal for a front yard variance of 22 feet on the southerly corner and 18 feet on the northerly terminus closest to Slocum. They are assuming that the Town's interpretation of the revised setbacks for a legal non-conforming lot of record is correct.

X X X X X X

MR. BURKE: Can I have a motion?

13 JULY 2020

MR. KERN: I'll make a motion that we approve the variance requested on 2020-24, Slocum Street, by Mr. D'Angelo. In that after due consideration of the application, including the exhibits and the drawings that have been submitted, the Board finds the following facts. The aforementioned hardship is due to unique characteristics of the subject land, not due to the general characteristics of the surrounding area. The applicant has requested a 22-foot variance on the south corner and an 18.2-foot variance on the north corner of the lot. The Board finds the variance evidence attesting to the significance of moon tide by and large and the applicant has gone to the Coastal Resource Management Council and they came back with a recommendation to reduce the overall size of the building and move it back closer to the road. And it was noted that other buildings are actually closer to the road than the applicant is requested. This hardship is not a result of any prior action on the part of the applicant, nor is it due to any economic disability on the part of the applicant, or any desire of the applicant to realize greater financial gain. The property is considered to be a buildable lot in the Zoning Certificate by the Zoning Officer and is a buildable lot on the Tax Assessor's record. The granting of the relief will not alter the general characteristics of the surrounding area. I move that this be approved by the Board.

MS. WHITE: I'll second.

MR. BURKE: Roll call.

MR. SIMOES: Yes.

13 JULY 2020

MR. KERN: Affirmative, Yes.

MR. TIPTON: Aye.

MS. WHITE: Aye.

MR. BURKE: I also vote Aye.

X X X X X X

(THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED)

(Petition Granted)

**5. 2020-25
BANK OF AMERICA**

**467 Hope St.: D
Pl. 9 – Lot 54**

Special Use Permit to operate an automated teller machine (ATM) bank Formula business use with the Bristol Historic District Overlay Zone.

Mr. Bryan Poisson, approach Architects, presented the Petition on behalf of Bank of America. Mr. Poisson asked for a point of clarification. Seeing there are five members on the Zoning Board, would he need a full five votes for approval. Mr. Burke explained he would need only four.

Mr. Poisson explained that they are seeking a Special Use Permit for a Formula Business in the Downtown Business District and the Bristol Historical Overlay District. They started the process back in the Fall, they have gone through the Historic Board and have received their Certificate of Appropriateness from them back in April. They had the Planning Board Technical Review and have received their favorable recommendations. Essentially the bank is looking to build a new stand-alone ATM remote vestibule. They are going into 467 Hope Street, which is the former Dunkin Donuts space. The space is fairly large, but the bank is just going to be looking to occupy a portion of that space, which is about 313 square feet. The scope of work includes an exterior sign, which is going to be wood along the façade above to match the other existing businesses, as was approved by the Historic Board. Inside they will maintain the existing façade as it currently is construed. They are going to be simply adding an automatic door opener for handicap accessibility to the existing door. Inside the space there will be an ATM vestibule with a check writing desk, with the ATM wall with a machine through it and the service space beyond it. He proved a written statement as part of the application that

essentially went point by point on the different sections of 28-409; showing where they met them, as well as Section 28-150, when talking about the store front. He asked if the Board would like to go through each one by one.

Mr. Burke stated he was satisfied with the information he has reviewed. Mr. Simoes stated he was all set. Mr. Kern stated he has reviewed it all and has enough information. Ms. White stated the same. Mr. Tipton stated he also had everything he needed.

No one was present to speak in favor or opposed to the Petition. The Board reviewed and discussed the Petition in detail and noted that rubbish will be removed daily. Mr. Burke stated that he feels the use is consistent with the neighborhood or the Downtown District and they have a recommendation from the TRC, along with HDC.

X X X X X X

MR. BURKE: Can we have a motion? There being no motion coming forth, I will make a motion to approve File 2020-25, Bank of America, owned by the Mullingar Group, LLC, 467 Hope Street. For a Special Use Permit for a Formula Business, installing an ATM at that location. The Special Use is specifically authorized by the Zoning Ordinance, per Section 409(c). That the Special Use meets all the Standards set forth in the subsection of the Zoning Ordinance 28-150, authorizing such Special Use. That the granting of the Special Use Permit will not alter the general character of the surrounding area or impair the intent or purpose of the Zoning Ordinance or the Comprehensive Plan of the Town of Bristol. We've heard testimony and we have evidence within the application packages

13 JULY 2020

and the approvals of the preceding Boards. So, I will make a motion to approve this application.

MR. SIMOES: I'll second the motion.

MR. BURKE: Roll Call.

MS. WHITE: I'm in favor of it.

MR. KERN: Aye. In favor of it.

MR. TIPTON: Aye.

MR. SIMOES: Aye.

X X X X X X

(THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED)

(Special Use Permit granted)

**6. 2020-26
ANDREW D. CASELLA**

**74 Fales Rd.: R-10
Pl. 80 – Lot 226**

Dimensional Variance to construct a 6' x 6' "mudroom" entrance addition to an existing single-family dwelling with less than the required right-side yard.

Mr. Andrew Casella stated that they wanted to add a small side entry to the side of their house. The door would go from facing their neighbor to facing the street. This would give them more room in their house, to have an entryway to place their jackets and everything as they come in the house; otherwise it ends up on the living room floor. His family consists of him, his wife and two children.

The Board reviewed the plans in detail. Mr. Burke noted this is a 7,000 square foot non-conforming lot of record in an R-10 zone. He requires a 14-foot setback and the request is for a 9-foot setback, which would require a 5-foot variance.

There was no input from the public, either in favor or opposed to the Petition.

X X X X X X

MR. BURKE: Can we have a motion?

MR. SIMOES: I'd like to make a motion to grant Petition 2020-26, a five-foot variance on the western side of the property for a mudroom that will be 6' x 6'. That the hardship the applicant faces is that due to inclement weather he has no protection from rain or snow, or whatever. And this here will more or less keep the cold out and he won't be opening up a door to a living room, instead he'll have the mudroom to protect him in that condition. The granting of this requested Dimensional Variance will not alter the general characteristics of the surrounding area or impair the intent or purpose of

the Zoning Ordinance of the Town of Bristol. This relief is the least relief necessary. Also, the hardship is the applicant does not have any desire to realize any greater financial gain on this. Like I stated earlier, the hardship would be that the owner, if this wasn't granted, the owner would have a problem with inclement weather, where the door would be opening up into the kitchen. This would at least give him some protection to safeguard his family in bad weather. That's my motion.

MR. TIETZ: I would request that you make a condition that a revised, signed plan be submitted. I notice this plan has hand-written changes on the size, reducing the size of the mudroom, handwritten on an otherwise signed and stamped survey. So, could it be a condition before any building permit is issued that a corrected survey be attached.

MR. SIMOES: I'll make that condition.

MS. WHITE: I'll second.

MR. BURKE: Roll call.

MR. KERN: I will vote aye.

MR. TIPTON: Aye.

MR. BURKE: I vote yes. I believe it is unanimous.

X X X X X X

(THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVE)

(Petition Granted)

13 JULY 2020

7. ADJOURNMENT:

X X X X X X

MR. BURKE: Motion to adjourn?

MR. SIMOES: I'll make a motion to adjourn, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BRUM: Second.

MR. BURKE: All in favor? (By roll call)

MR. BURKE: Yes.

MS. WHITE: Yes.

MR. KERN: Aye.

MR. SIMOES: Aye.

MR. TIPTON: Aye.

X X X X X X

(THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED)

(MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:46 P.M.)

13 JULY 2020

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

Susan E. Andrade

TOWN OF BRISTOL ZONING BOARD
MEETING HELD ON: 13 JULY 2020

Date Accepted: _____

Chairman: _____