

UNAPPROVED MINUTES

Town of Auburn Zoning Board of Adjustment June 23, 2015

Present: Jim Lagana, Vice Chairman, Mike DiPietro, Peggy Neveu and Elizabeth Robidoux, Members. Kevin Stuart, Jeffrey Benson and Alternate Members. Minutes recorded by Denise Royce.

Also Present: Alan Villeneuve and Jeff Porter, Conservation Commission. Carrie Rouleau-Cote, Building Inspector.

Absent: Mark Wright, Chairman, Robert Beaurivage, Alternate.

Mr. Lagana called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m. and informed everyone present that he would be chairing the meeting tonight in the absence of the ZBA Chairman, Mark Wright. Mr. Lagana proceeded by introducing the Board members to everyone present tonight. Mr. Lagana pointed out that there were two (2) continuances and one case that was Tabled and asked the applicants if they wanted him to go through the rules of procedure since they have already heard them. No one asked Mr. Lagana to review the rules of procedure for tonight's hearing.

Mr. Lagana stated that this was a public hearing and that they were certainly welcome to video tape the hearing and asked the gentleman to introduce himself. Mr. Jean Methot introduced himself to the Board members and everyone present. Mr. Mudge indicated that Mr. Methot was present tonight to video tape the proceedings at his request.

Mr. Lagana elevated Mr. Stuart to full voting status for the first case and asked Ms. Royce to read the first case into the minutes for the record.

**Case #15-04
Dana & Jocelyn Carlucci
Silver Hill Road – Map 2, Lot 25
Zoned Rural
TABLED from March 31, 2015**

Applicant is requesting a variance to allow excavation within the 125 foot wetland setback of a Level One wetland in a Rural zone. (Article 5, Section 5.08(1)(a))

Mr. Roscoe Blaisdell began by presenting on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Blaisdell indicated that since the last meeting that he has gone out and done the topography of

the whole area that they would be dealing with and flagged the wetlands and located the wetlands and the property lines. Mr. Blaisdell stated that he has put details on the plan with regard to the existing pit which was approximately 12,700 square feet. Mr. Blaisdell also showed an area of expansion of approximately one-half of an acre and the location of where the silt fence would be placed. Mr. Blaisdell stated that they have met with the Conservation Commission which was very simple. At this time, Mr. Blaisdell asked the Board if there were any questions. Mr. Lagana asked if they were going to remove the balance of the gravel and then reclaim the area. Mr. Blaisdell said yes and that it would be a year or two (2) at the most and then they would be done and would reclaim it soon after. Mr. Lagana thanked Mr. Blaisdell for coming back before the Board with a revised plan.

Mr. Lagana asked if there were any comments from abutters. None were noted. Mr. Lagana asked the Conservation Commission for their comments. At this time, Mr. Villeneuve stated that they did meet with Mr. Blaisdell and the Carlucci's and that many of the things that they asked for was not on this plan yet. Mr. Villeneuve further pointed out that within the minutes of the Conservation Commission that they did not vote to support this plan but voted to support the idea of this plan. They have some concerns and understand that it was not in the purview of this Board but that there were multiple things that were at play here and that they have never done this work before. Some of the things the Conservation Commission would like was that they would like to see the ground stabilized that has not been stabilized within 40 years and believed that they would have to get some sand. Mr. Villeneuve also talked about the road getting in and out of there which goes through a wetland and added that there was a culvert that they would have to cross and was unsure whether or not they should be crossing. Mr. Villeneuve further stated that they talked about putting silt fence up and was unsure if it was an appropriate precaution. The Conservation Commission asked where they would be stockpiling the topsoil on site which is not shown on this plan but they talked about it. They asked about any equipment that would be stored on site with regard to gas leakage being 25 feet from a large Level One wetland. Mr. Villeneuve further stated that they talked about a reclamation plan which would be more than just loam and seed because they wanted something that would be done to reclaim this area. Mr. Villeneuve talked about the length of time that this pit would be open without stabilizing. Mr. Villeneuve believes it can be done but did not believe that this plan was the end game for getting that done. Mr. Lagana asked Mr. Villeneuve that if the area was excavated responsibly and reclaimed properly and then settled finally that would the land be better than what it is now. Mr. Villeneuve stated that they support the idea that this could be done and believe that it would be a better place when they're done. However, they don't think that they have shown enough detail of a plan because they don't want to be sending people out there to check. Mr. Villeneuve added that they have never done this before either where they were coming within 25 feet of a Level One wetland.

Mr. Porter commented that one of the things that was discussed at their meeting was that they needed to review a full plan for reclamation and how long it would take. Mr. Porter reiterated a lot of what Mr. Villeneuve had stated as well. Mr. Lagana asked the

Conservation Commission that if the Board were to act on this, did they believed that the issues could be worked out at the Planning Board level. Mr. Villeneuve believed that the Board could approve it conditionally upon Planning Board review.

Mr. Lagana asked Mrs. Rouleau-Cote if she had any comments. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote stated that, yes typically the Planning Board would be the jurisdiction with regard to the level of restoration plan. Typically they come before the Planning Board once a year to renew their excavation pit permit. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote added that with regard to the granting of the variance to the wetland buffer that there are some additional requirements or expectations that would be imposed to the applicants. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote believed that possibly a little more work should be put into place for them to go to the Planning Board with a reclamation plan, operational plan on how they would be proceeding as well as best management practices. Mr. Blaisdell commented that there would be a technical review of the plan and pointed out that they have not done test pits out there yet because they did not want to put a lot of money into this until if they weren't going to get anywhere. A brief discussion ensued between Mr. Blaisdell and Mr. Lagana. Mr. Lagana pointed out to Mr. Blaisdell that if the Board does take action on this by granting the variance even with conditions and they begin test pits and they get to transporting equipment and find out that the culvert won't support it and you find some surprises. Mr. Blaisdell indicated that they would put another culvert in. Mr. Villeneuve wanted to remind Mr. Lagana that the variance goes forever and that they would want to put limits to specific parts of it because it was a Level One wetland. Mr. Villeneuve stated that this was a sensitive issue.

Mr. Lagana asked if there were any questions from the Board members. Mrs. Robidoux had a couple of things to ask about which was about the access area. Mr. Blaisdell pointed out that it was an existing access and that he did not see any improvements that would be needed. Mrs. Robidoux noted that if they found they had to improve the access because the culvert would not support the weight of the trucks, the plan could not move forward as the Ordinance specifically prohibits construction of an access through a Level One wetland. She added that she was uncomfortable about the comment Mrs. Rouleau-Cote made with regard to RSA 155-E pertaining to excavation within a Level One wetland. Discussion ensued with regard to whether it was a stream or body of water. Mr. Blaisdell stated that it was a beaver pond and it could be gone tomorrow and that it was not considered a body of water.

Mr. DiPietro stated that he was prepared to move the motion contingent upon Planning Board review and best management practices and operation and reclamation plan. Mr. DiPietro believed there was enough topography shown that the Planning Board could decide. Mr. Stuart agreed with Mr. DiPietro and believed it would meet the criteria because it already is in a fragile state and that the Planning Board will have to set forth the criteria and that the Conservation Commission stated that it could work and that there was enough detail on this plan to say that it can be done. Mr. Benson also agreed with Mr. DiPietro and Mr. Stuart and said that it was too bad that the Board could not put a time limit on it and that the Planning Board has the capability to put an end to it if it

goes on and on because they have to come back every year to renew their permit. Mr. Lagana also agreed with the Board members and hearing that the Conservation Commission at least approves of the concept is pretty compelling. Mr. Lagana also pointed out that if a motion were to be made that he would respectfully request that the scope of the excavation be limited to the testimony that they heard this evening in terms of cleaning up the existing area and the other half an acre that exists there and that the scope of the excavation does not extend beyond that. Mr. Lagana also added that all wishes of the Conservation Commission are exercised and that best management practices in cooperation with the Planning Board are achieved. Mrs. Robidoux wanted to add that the Planning Board is looking for a restoration plan where it is this close to a wetland and would want to see a more in depth grading and erosion control plan presented to the Planning Board so that the outside review engineer can take a look at it.

Mr. DiPietro made a motion to vote on the application as he believes that the five (5) factors have been met with the following conditions: 1) Planning Board review; 2) that Best Management Practices are adhered to; 3) that an operation and reclamation plan that the Planning Board will review; 4) that the excavation be limited to the scope as presented this evening in terms of the existing area and the extra half acre as discussed as presented on the plan dated 4/29/15; and 5) that the Planning Board put stock in the Conservation Commission; 6) that the plan submitted to the Planning Board should show type of seed and mix and identify plantings; 7) identify storage and refueling areas if any; and, 8) submission of a grading and erosion control plan for Tax Map 2, Lot 25, Dana and Jocelyn Carlucci Excavation Pit on Silver Hill Road seconded by Mrs. Robidoux. Mrs. Robidoux voted to grant, Mr. DiPietro voted to grant, Mr. Stuart voted to grant, Mr. Benson voted to grant, and Mr. Lagana also voted to grant as the five (5) conditions have been met. The motion passed in the affirmative.

Mr. Lagana informed the applicant of the 30 day appeal period at which time an abutter or interested party could appeal the ZBA decision.

Case #15-09

David and Michelle Mudge

425 Manchester Road, Tax Map 25, Lot 4

Zoned Residential Two

Requesting an Appeal of the ZBA Decision

Made on May 26, 2015

Mrs. Neveu was elevated to full voting status for this case.

At this time, Mr. Mudge read from his notes and began by addressing the Board by saying that, the Board granted conditional approval of his appeal as being punishment for something that he has not done. Mr. Mudge believed that the Board members

should be punished for taking his livelihood away from him for the past six (6) months. After 17 years the Board is now putting conditions on him and went through the conditions that the Board placed upon him. Mr. Mudge began by saying that this was an appeal of an administrative decision and not a variance and was only about sales and repairing of vehicles as was stated in the original permit stated. Mr. Mudge pointed out to the Board members that his tradename is "Dave's Repair Shop" and not "Dave's Classic Repair Shop" as that name was never officially used by him or licensed by the DMV.

At this time, Mr. Mudge went through the conditions imposed upon him by the ZBA Board at the May 26, 2015 Public Hearing. Mr. Mudge began with condition #1 which states that "any repair activity is tied to Mr. Mudge being a licensed dealer and should the dealer license lapse that no repair activity takes place." Mr. Mudge indicated that this was not on his permit and that 17 years later the Board has imposed this as a condition. Condition #2, Mr. Mudge which indicated paper sales only and no display sales on the property which meant no sales of vehicles on the property which was also indicated on the original permit of which Mr. Mudge agreed with. Condition #3, Repair activity shall be relegated to Classic vehicles only of which the state does not issue provisional classic vehicle licenses and that his original permit stated no such thing and that David Jore never stipulated anything like that. Mr. Mudge indicated that all he never said "all I do is 100% classics" and that he gave the Board proof of the types of vehicles worked on and sold. Mr. Mudge indicated that all he said was "that during the summer months the vehicle work was about 50% of what he does and the rest of the work was about 90% classics and that during the winter months while he was in Florida, it was just about looking for classics while he was down there." Condition #4, no cars off the street, no pickup trucks off the street as the tradename implies and excludes lawnmowers, small engines, boats and snowmobiles; and, was left blank." Mr. Mudge stated that his tradename "Dave's Repair Shop" does not imply any such thing other than general repairs and that Dave Jore always knew that he would be working on other things besides classics. Mr. Mudge stated that the Board knew that he always had a business there because at the 2010 ZBA meeting the Board did not have a problem or say anything about him doing mowers. Condition #5, that advertising immediately ceases as a commercial garage and that the property is not sold with the intention of being a commercial garage. Mr. Mudge stated that he would agree with condition #5 only if conditions #1, #3 and #4 were removed as the permit would end with him and would not be passed on like a variance thus, protecting the town from the garage and property being used for any improper commercial use that the ZBA wouldn't want. Mr. Mudge wanted to remind the Board that this was about "Dave's Repair Shop" and not "Dave's Classic Repair Shop" that the Board keeps referring too. Mr. Mudge informed the Board members that he never did advertise the property as Commercial but only as Residential. Mr. Mudge further added that the Commercial building aspect was only a description of the buildings size being 29 feet by 45 feet with a 16 foot ceiling height and that the town allowed it to be built long before he purchased the property. Mr. Mudge reiterated that conditions #1, #3 and #4 were not on his original permit and don't apply here. Mr. Mudge stated that, how much work can one unemployable, retired and

handicapped 69 year old do that could possibly be a threat to them after 17 years of operation. Mr. Mudge stated that the ZBA has created and exaggerated a problem that didn't and doesn't exist.

Mr. Lagana thanked Mr. Mudge and wanted to get the procedure this evening correct that he understood that Mr. Mudge was before the Board tonight to request a rehearing. Mr. Lagana believed that this was the argument to enforce the request for rehearing. Mr. Mudge showed the paperwork that he spoke from this evening. Mr. Lagana pointed out to Mr. Mudge that this was a request for rehearing and whether or not the Board will decide to rehear the case. Mr. Mudge said that the Board has already put him out of work for six (6) months and they want to throw more on top of that. Mr. Lagana further pointed out to Mr. Mudge that these discussions were exhaustively discussed at the last meeting. Mr. Mudge stated that he did not have the opportunity to rebut the conditions imposed upon him. Mr. Lagana stated to Mr. Mudge that he was very vocal at the last meeting and that they took a lot of testimony. Mr. Mudge indicated that they shut him off after the Board made their motion and placed conditions upon him. Mr. Lagana wanted the record to show that the Board did discuss this very openly in front of Mr. Mudge and they did take all of his input and that the conditions were discussed in the public forum and the minutes will show that and that Mr. Mudge was not rushed. Mr. Mudge said that at the very end he was not given a chance for rebuttal.

At this time, Mr. Lagana asked if there were any abutters that wished to speak this evening. Ms. Piper of Manchester Road had no problem with what they were doing next door to her. Mrs. Mudge commented that her husband did have a lengthy thing that he read to the Board last time with his concerns but at the very end when the Board made their motion and said no lawnmowers or other businesses that he did not have an opportunity for rebuttal at that time and that was where their concern lies.

Mr. Lagana asked if there were any members of the Board that wished to speak. Mrs. Robidoux explained the procedure of the ZBA Board when they hold a public hearing that the Board will hear testimony from the applicant at which time you would present your case and then the public has a chance to get up and speak in support or against the application. Mrs. Robidoux went on to explain that when the Board goes into deliberations and they start to discuss the case amongst themselves and once they come out of deliberations the Board is very good about asking if there are any further comments. Once they conclude with comments and a Board member makes a motion then there is no further discussion from the public because this is when the Board finalizes their decision. Mrs. Robidoux went on to add that, if after the Board makes their final decision, then the applicant has 30 days to request a rehearing and that is where Mr. Mudge is now. Mrs. Robidoux explained to Mr. and Mrs. Mudge that if the ZBA Board grants the motion for rehearing that the law states that it has to be another public hearing which will require abutters being re-noticed. Mr. Mudge wanted to know why he was not given the opportunity to speak when the limitations were imposed upon him. Mrs. Robidoux indicated that it was because the public hearing portion was closed and the Board was making a motion and making their decision. Mr. Mudge said, so when it gets to that point that he has nothing to say about the conditions they put upon

him. Mrs. Robidoux and Mr. Lagana said that this was his chance and that the Board will decide whether or not to rehear the case. If they do then they will hear it at the next scheduled public hearing which will be in July and if they elect not to then Mr. Mudge could either apply for a variance or challenge the Board's decision in Superior Court so there were still opportunities available to him.

Mr. Lagana asked if there were any further input from the Board members. Mr. Stuart had a comment unless the Board wanted to go into deliberations and stated that he was not voting but that he would vote to grant the request for rehearing that this was a case about detrimental reliance and the application that they relied on was for motor vehicles and the Board heard testimony from him that he was doing things beyond classic cars and believed that the restriction that the Board placed upon Mr. Mudge should be revisited. Mr. Stuart was unsure of the limitation of just classic cars comports with the evidence they heard and there was other evidence that he was doing other things beyond classic cars but the rest of it he did not find compelling. Mr. Benson believed that the first condition was fine because if the license lapsed then it's done but condition #5 there was no doubt that the property was listed as commercial and certainly would not change that condition and believed that they could revisit Condition #3 regarding classic cars. Mr. Lagana asked the Board to proceed to a vote.

Ms. Piper wanted to comment and stated that she was also the listing agent and that the property is listed as residential and not commercial. Mr. Lagana asked Ms. Piper if the reference to the commercial garage had been struck. Ms. Piper indicated that she has changed it to reference it as a commercial size garage and residential only. Mr. Lagana thanked Ms. Piper for her statement.

Mr. DiPietro made a motion to grant the request for rehearing for Case #15-09, Tax Map 25, Lot 4, seconded by Mrs. Neveu. Mrs. Robidoux voted to grant as she agreed with Mr. Stuart's point regarding the classic cars, Mrs. Neveu voted to grant based on the classic cars, Mr. DiPietro voted to grant, Mr. Benson voted to grant on condition #3 and Mr. Lagana voted to deny as he believed the case was thoroughly discussed exposed to all parties. The motion passed by a vote of 4 to 1.

Mr. Lagana explained to Mr. Mudge that the Board voted to rehear the case and the case will be reheard at the next ZBA hearing which will be held in July. The Board further explained to Mr. Mudge that abutters would have to be re-noticed and that he would be responsible for paying the fees and if he decided to not move forward with reapplying and paying the fees that the current conditions shall remain in place. Mr. Mudge stated that he has no money to pay the fees or to hire an attorney and the Board wants him to pay more fees. Mrs. Robidoux indicated that Mr. Mudge could ask the Selectmen to waive the fees. Mr. Mudge stated that he would do that because he was retired and unemployed. Mr. Benson informed Mr. Mudge that at the last meeting he was granted permission to work on classic cars so that he has not been unable to work. Mr. Mudge stated that he has not gone to the state and the state does not give

conditional licenses for classic cars so he is still out of business. Mr. Lagana pointed out that there was an awful lot of discussion about classic cars and that was the context within which the Board made its decision because so much of his activity was centered around classic cars. Mr. Mudge stated that he said that in the summer it was 50/50. Mr. Lagana concluded by saying that if Mr. Mudge is to come back that his case would be heard on July 28th.

Case #15-14
Eric Mitchell
On Behalf of JMJ Properties, LLC
Lovers Lane – Map 8, Lot 25
Zoned Residential Two
TABLED from May 26, 2015

Applicant is requesting a variance to allow a stormwater detention pond within the 125 foot Level One wetland buffer in a Residential Two zone. (Article 5, Section 5.08(1)(a))

Mr. Lagana elevated Mr. Stuart to full voting status for this case.

Attorney Andrew Sullivan began his presentation on behalf of JMJ Properties, LLC and stated that they were before the Board last month with a request for rehearing of which was denied. Attorney Sullivan stated they filed the request for rehearing because they had new material to present that was not available at the previous hearing in terms of a wildlife corridor study. Attorney Sullivan believed that the Board made a wrong decision and that they could always appeal that. They are before the Board tonight to present a new application again now with the new wildlife corridor study and believes that it meets the criteria because it's a material change in circumstances which is not from the rehearing but from the original date of the original hearing application at which time the wildlife corridor study was not presented. Attorney Sullivan pointed out that one of the major criteria of which the variance was discussed and analyzed was whether or not the location of the detention pond would have a negative impact on the wildlife corridor. It was not requested of the applicant to do a study but after hearing the discussion, on his own accord, he did that and was hoping that the Board members had a chance to read the wildlife corridor study as he believed it had a benign difference. Attorney Sullivan stated that the wildlife corridor study was not available to the Board at the time of the variance application and now they are made aware of it. Attorney Sullivan believed this was enough information to accept this new application and so they are here tonight with a new application to discuss the wildlife corridor study to show that there is a benign impact in the location of the detention pond. Mr. Lagana asked Attorney Sullivan if the specific relief that they are looking for in terms of the detention pond is exactly the same. Attorney Sullivan said yes. Mr. Lagana stated that although the wildlife corridor was discussed it wasn't just the wildlife corridor. Attorney Sullivan believed it was a major criteria that was discussed and with that further believes that it fits the criteria to allow the subsequent application. A brief discussion ensued with regard to the wildlife

corridor study. Mr. Stuart asked Attorney Sullivan if the application before the Board tonight was the same application and plan that was previously submitted. Attorney Sullivan said yes.

Mr. Lagana asked if there were any abutters that wished to speak. None were noted. Mr. Lagana asked if there were interested parties. Mr. Villeneuve did not understand because they were before the Board requesting a motion for rehearing which was denied and now they have an application for the same thing with different evidence which he believes was available the night that the Board did vote on originally.

Mr. Stuart stated that he was prepared to make a motion.

Mr. Mitchell asked to speak and began by saying that it was true that there was considerable confusion with the two (2) applications and pointed out that the variance was denied by a vote of 4 to 1 against. They submitted a request for rehearing and with the request for rehearing they submitted a corridor study report and because the Conservation Commission mentioned on several occasions in the minutes that they wanted the detention pond moved further away from the wetland because they wanted a bigger corridor for wildlife. Mr. Mitchell stated that at that time he indicated that they had not had a study done but the Board voted to deny. They have since had a study done and submitted it with the request for rehearing and believes that it could have been used and should have been used to grant the request for rehearing so that it would have been reheard. Mr. Mitchell explained that with the possibility that it may not be granted or that it were granted that they would not be reheard for another month they did submit an application for the same location with the corridor study and also with some appraisal information based on the value of the lot that would be sacrificed if the pond was moved. That was put on the agenda after the Board looked at the request for rehearing. Mr. Mitchell believes that the rehearing should have been granted with the additional information but now their only option is to appeal to Superior Court. However, the application that they submitted for the same location with different circumstances which includes the wildlife corridor study of which these circumstances makes a difference. Mr. Mitchell pointed out that a member of the Board when voting based it on the Conservation Commission input and if you read the minutes, the Conservation Commission's input was that they wanted a bigger corridor and they wanted a wildlife corridor. Mr. Mitchell went on to talk about the appraisal of the lots. Mr. Villeneuve believed there were more than one factor involved with regard to the Conservation Commission's request to move the detention pond further away from the wetland.

Mr. Stuart made a motion to move to vacate the decision of May 26, 2015 to begin consideration of this application, on the basis that prior to accepting the application and holding a hearing on the application, the Board was required to consider whether it was appropriate to reach the merits of the application given that the application is identical to one previously filed for the same property, seconded by Mr. Benson.

Mr. Lagana stated there was a motion and a second and asked if there were any further comments. Mrs. Robidoux wanted to be sure what they were voting on and that Mr. Stuart was moving to vacate the decision to accept the application at the last hearing and to decide if there were different information. Mr. Stuart explained that they need to consider if there is a material change to allow them to submit the same plan and to decide whether or not that is the case or not. Attorney Sullivan asked the Board if the application as it stands today has been formally accepted as an application. Mr. Stuart said that it was accepted last time and that was how it got here. Mr. Stuart stated that they did accept it and now they are moving to vacate that decision. Attorney Sullivan has never seen an application vacated in his 30 years. Mr. Lagana explained that it was very confusing that evening and proceeded to a vote.

Mrs. Robidoux voted to vacate so that they can do their due diligence, Mr. Benson voted to vacate, Mr. Stuart voted to vacate, Mr. DiPietro voted to vacate and Mr. Lagana also voted to vacate. The Board all voted to vacate the decision of May 26, 2015.

Mr. Benson made a motion to move to consider whether there has been a material change of circumstances affecting the merits of the application; or whether the second application seeks relief which is materially different in nature and degree from the previous application, seconded by Mrs. Robidoux.

Mr. Lagana asked the Board members if there was any discussion on that. Mr. Benson asked if the difference being talked about was the wildlife corridor and to him that was not the material difference between granting or denying and in their case denying the variance request and sees this second application materially the same as the first application. Mr. Stuart agreed that in his mind it was materially the same plan as the first application.

Mr. Lagana proceeded to say that a vote of yes, there has been a material change in which case they will move to hear the case or a vote of no, there has not been a material change in which case they will move to not hear the case.

Mrs. Robidoux voted to yes that there was a material change, Mr. DiPietro voted no as he did not believe there was a material change, Mr. Benson voted no as he did not believe there was a material change, Mr. Stuart voted no as he did not believe there was a material change and Mr. Lagana also voted no as he did not believe there was a material change as it was essentially the same plan as originally presented. The motion did not pass by a vote of 4 to 1.

**Zoning Board of Adjustment
Town of Auburn
Rules of Procedures**

In the absence of Mr. Wright, the Board decided to hold off until the next Public Hearing to vote on the Rules of Procedure.

Election of Officers

In the absence of Mr. Wright, the Board decided to hold off until the next Public Hearing to vote to elect officers.

General Business

Mr. Lagana asked the Board members if there was any new business to discuss. None was noted.

The Board asked Ms. Royce to put the ZBA Rules of Procedure back on the agenda for next month as they wanted to wait for Mr. Wright, Zoning Board of Adjustment Chairman to be present. Ms. Royce understood and would place this on the agenda for July.

Minutes

Mrs. Robidoux made a motion to accept the minutes of May 26, 2015 with one minor correction, seconded by Mr. Stuart. The motion passed in the affirmative.

Adjourn

Mrs. Robidoux made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Mrs. Neveu. All were in favor, the motion passed unanimously and the meeting stood adjourned at 8:17 p.m.

The next ZBA Hearing is scheduled for July 28, 2015 at 7:00 pm and will be held at the Safety Complex, 55 Eaton Hill Road.