

1 ANTRIM ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

2 Meeting

3 Tuesday, May 26th, 2026

4 MINUTES

5 **Members & Planning Staff Present:**

6 Janet McEwen (Chair), David Clater (Vice Chair), Tom Davis (Member), Doug Crafts (Alternate), David
7 Healy (Member), Doris (Shelley) Nelkens (Alternate), Darby Wilson (Land Use Boards Assistant)

8 **Present over ZOOM:** Carol Ogilvie (Planning Consultant)

9 **Members/Staff Absent:** Michael Ott (Member)

10 **Others present:** N/A

11
12 **Call To Order:** Chair McEwan called the meeting to order at 5:57 PM.

13
14 Doug Crafts was appointed as a voting member.

15
16 **I. Review/Amend Draft Minutes**

17 05/12/26

18 Tom Davis stated he seconded the motion that was missing, which pertained to the Zoning Board
19 permitted the amendment to its Regular Meetings section of its Standards of Procedure

20 *Motion to approve the meeting minutes, as amended, from 05/12/26 made by David Clater, seconded by*
21 *Tom Davis. All in favor, no further discussion.*

22
23 **II. Motion for Rehearing**

24 The Board reviewed a Motion for Rehearing concerning a variance approved on April 28, 2026, for a
25 property located at 376 Stoddard Road. The approved variance permitted a two-foot height extension to a
26 60' length of an existing fence that exceeds the maximum fence height permitted under the Zoning
27 Ordinance. The Board clarified that this meeting was not a public hearing but a review of whether the
28 request for rehearing met the legal standards required for reconsideration.

29 The Motion for Rehearing pertained to a condition of approval attached to the variance. Specifically, the
30 condition required the property owners to replace the existing metal material used in the two-foot fence
31 extension with wood that matches the character of the existing fence within four months of the approval
32 date. The Board's review focused on whether sufficient grounds existed to warrant a rehearing of that
33 condition.

34 The individual requesting the rehearing was unable to attend the meeting but submitted written
35 correspondence for the Board's consideration. The Board also reviewed prior correspondence submitted
36 following the original variance approval. During its review, the Board noted that the information
37 submitted did not contain new evidence substantially different from materials previously considered
38 during the April 28 public hearing.

39 The Board discussed concerns raised regarding the fence extension and its materials, including claims that
40 the metal extension could adversely affect an existing medical condition. Board members noted that

documentation had been submitted during the original variance proceedings; however, they determined that the information provided did not establish a sufficient basis to revisit the Board's prior decision. The Board further noted that some submitted materials were general in nature or not intended for public review and therefore were not relied upon in its determination.

The Board emphasized that a Motion for Rehearing must demonstrate either that the Board made an error in its original decision or that new, substantive information has become available that could reasonably affect the outcome. The Board found that the information submitted in support of the request did not meet this standard. Members also noted that the request challenged a condition of approval rather than the approval of the variance itself.

The Board concluded that the submitted materials did not present new or substantive evidence and did not demonstrate that the Board had erred in its original decision. Accordingly, the Board determined that there were insufficient grounds to grant a rehearing.

Quoted Correspondence

Correspondence submitted by Ms. Hull on May 23, 2026, was read into the record:

“I object to this remaining on the agenda, as I need time to recover before I work on submitting anything and without the time and ability to do so, this is obviously mute, as I am the person asking for this to be reconsidered. Why does Janet work so hard to discount my issues? This is more than insulting. It is clearly a plan on her part to discredit my illness. I am requesting that this be continued to the week after this holiday week in which Monday is not even a day when this could be worked on.”

An email previously sent by the Land Use Boards Assistant was also read into the record:

“I did just speak with Chair McEwen for her input on the matter. She relayed that the Motion will remain on the agenda for next Tuesday. If you can provide a digital version of any correspondence you wish to share, or alternatively, mail this material to the Town Hall, that would be permissible.”

The Board also reviewed correspondence submitted on April 30, 2026. An excerpt was read into the record:

“Please check back on what I sent, as I did state and supply much paperwork (at least 5 pages of the issues regarding my disability as it relates to the RF signals that bombard my property) – both from the Staats surveillance cameras and the sheet metal fencing (which reflects that). An email offered to Darby many days ahead of the hearing gave the pictures that your board members could scan in and see what I was referring to.”

The Board noted that images referenced in the correspondence had not been submitted with that email. Board members further noted that digital meeting materials had been available to the Board and that physical materials had been available during the original public hearing.

Tom Davis moved to deny the Motion for Rehearing concerning the variance approval granted on April 28, 2026, for a two-foot fence height extension at 376 Stoddard Road, based on the grounds discussed by the Board. The motion was seconded by David Healy.

Roll Call Vote

- Janet McEwen – Yes
- David Clater – Yes
- Tom Davis – Yes
- David Healy – Yes
- Doug Crafts – Yes

Vote Result: Motion passed unanimously, 5–0.

Additional Comments:

Planning Consultant Ms. Ogilvie commented that the Board should consider whether the information submitted differed sufficiently from the original record to justify a rehearing. She noted that if the Board determined it had not erred in its original decision, it would not be inclined to grant a rehearing.

Following the vote, the Board directed staff to prepare a letter to the property owners reminding them of the condition of approval requiring the fence extension to be modified so that it matches the character of the existing wooden fence no later than August 28, 2026.

III. Standards of Procedure

Ms. Ogilvie commented that each of the items the Board agreed to at its last meeting had been added to the document.

On Page 4, it was added that the meeting’s typical end time would be 8:00P.M.

On Page 7, it was added that language regarding appeals be added to the document. Reference to state law was added.

Motion to approve the Standards of Procedure, as amended, by Tom Davis, seconded by Doug Crafts.

Roll call vote: Janet McEwen: yes, David Clater: yes, Tom Davis: yes, David Healy: yes, Doug Crafts: yes.

IV. Other Business

None heard

Motion to adjourn:

At 6:36 P.M. on a motion by David Clater seconded by Tom Davis, the Board voted to adjourn, with all in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Darby Wilson

Land Use Assistant

Approved ,2026