

**APPROVED MINUTES  
Town of Auburn  
Zoning Board of Adjustment  
April 24, 2018**

**Present:** Mark Wright, Chairman, Mike DiPietro, Peggy Neveu, Stephen Carroll and Kevin Stuart, Members; Dennis Vieira and Stoney Worster, Alternate Members of the Board. Minutes recorded by Patricia Rousseau and Denise Royce.

**Also, Present:** Carrie Rouleau-Cote, Building Inspector and Jeffrey Porter, Conservation Commission. Eric Mitchell of ECM.

**Absent:** Dale Phillips & Robert Beaurivage, Alternate Members.

Mr. Wright called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m. and introduced the Board members to everyone present at tonight's meeting.

At this time, Mr. Wright explained the procedure for tonight's hearing and then began with the first case on the agenda which was a case that was Tabled from the last meeting held on March 27<sup>th</sup>. With that said, Mr. Wright asked Mrs. Rousseau to read the case into the minutes.

**Case #18-03  
Kristin & Mark Travassos, Trustees  
405 Wilsons Crossing Road – Tax Map 2, Lot 4  
Zoned Rural  
Continued from March 27, 2018**

*Applicant is requesting an Appeal of Administrative Decision – Interpretation by Auburn Code Enforcement Officer of Article 5.05 Permitted Uses (6) and whether alteration of site is inherent in permitted activities. A Variance from Article 5.08 relief from 125-foot setback from Level One wetland, to utilize 50-feet into the 125-foot designated wetland buffer for production of agricultural crops in a Rural zone. (Article 2, Section 2.02(68) and Article 5, Section 5.04(1)(a) cited by applicant's application)*

Attorney Lefevre started off the conversation and made reference of the meeting that was tabled from March 27, 2018. He also introduced Aaron Wechsler into the meeting. He wanted to talk about the Variance more in tonight's meeting and less about the Appeal. Attorney Lefevre also asked about whether or not the board received the conservation commissions' memo and if they had an opportunity to review the memo. Attorney Lefevre wanted to address one of the issues noted in the memo and then go into the gardening plan. Attorney Lefevre pointed out that the Conservation Commission did take photographs and he did confirm that they were unable to count the trees as requested by one of the Board members at the last meeting because there were lots and lots of trees. Attorney Lefevre believed that the Board members would get the idea from looking at the

pictures that there were a lot of trees on the property and also pointed out that most of the trees were smaller than 5 inches in diameter which was considered as relatively new forest. He then made reference to the conservation memo which recommended a 25ft encroachment and not the 50ft they were asking for. He did mention the 100ft buffer they were suggesting due to it being a Prime wetland. Attorney Lefevre stated that, this was not a DES prime wetland buffer and also mentioned that Auburn does not have any DES prime wetlands.

Attorney Lefevre went through the process which was to go to town meeting, have a vote to adopt the prime wetlands and go to DES to petition DES to designate these areas as prime wetlands. Attorney Lefevre wanted the Board to understand that this was not a designated prime wetland for DES purposes. Next, DES no longer has a 100ft buffer at the state level and cited SB19 law that was adopted around 2012. What they did was eliminated the 100ft buffer requirement unless it was a designated prime wetland for DES.

Attorney Lefevre then moved on to have Mr. Wechsler go over the plan and discuss the impact to the wetlands from a wetland scientist perspective. Mr. Wechsler began by saying that he was a septic designer as well as a certified wetland scientist. Mr. Wechsler passed out copies of the plan to each Board member for review. Mr. Wechsler was asked to show the buffers on the map and then to show where the plantings would be placed. Mr. Wechsler pointed out that, just the lawn would be outside the 125ft buffer and mentioned that Mrs. Travassos would most likely not have the entire area as lawn. In between the 125-75 area he mentions she will have creeping oregano, marjoram, and clover for ground cover to stabilize the soil. Mrs. Travassos also mentioned that she will have creeping thyme as well. He then proceeded to mention that all of those will have healthy root structure just like grass which will stabilize the area and keep the lawn from creeping into the 75ft buffer. Mr. Wechsler mentioned that there was no concern for stabilization. He mentions overall it is a small site and a small footprint of impervious surfaces. This is residential use only, there is no worry for commercial trucks leaking gasoline or oil associated to runoff from commercial trucks. He also mentions that there will be no absorption from nitrogen and other nutrients and chemicals that come from commercial truck that is the reason for the intended buffers. Mr. Wechsler commented that DES's reason for the 100ft buffer was for the absorption of nitrogen and nutrients implemented in commercial sites. Overall the entire area will be vegetated that will slow down the rate of erosion and increase the amount of infiltration. He did mention other areas on the site that have been excavated in the past. He spoke about how when an area is cleared out and re-vegetated it would be more stable than it currently is. The trees out there now aren't offering a significant amount of structure. As the conservation commission mentions the root structure is terribly shallow. Mr. Wechsler stated that this proposal will do a better job stabilizing an area than the trees. He asked if anyone had comments.

Mr. Stuart asked if looking at the plans whether or not the beds were raised. Mrs. Travassos commented that it was just to show the area where the plants were. Mr. Stuart asked about agriculture in between the creeping items. Mrs. Travassos stated that she would be doing a lot of weeding as it was 90% controlling it. Mr. Stuart asked about

rototilling large sections. Mrs. Travassos replied no because there were too many sections. Mrs. Travassos did confirm the use of chainsaws and other small equipment to clear the land at first. Discussion ensued with regard to maintaining the garden.

Mrs. Travassos replied weeding and how to control other types of fruits and trees and herbs with different safe methods such as using hay while some things may do better in raised beds verses others and possibly using black tarp for some other planted items. Mr. Stuart asked if there was any delineation plan between the lawn and where the agriculture would go. Mrs. Travassos commented by showing him on her drawn-out plans that there was a delineation for the lawn and agriculture. (i.e. the creeping thyme oregano etc.) She did mention a different ground cover for the areas that she was not allowed to plant grass. Mr. Wechsler talked about the areas that they would put some kind of stones. Mrs. Travassos did add that she would like something like stones which would be something natural verses fencing. Mr. Wechsler indicated that stone would fit in with the esthetics. He also mentioned he did not want to put a fence because it restricts the movement of wildlife. He agreed putting up signage along the buffer to identify where it is.

Attorney Lefevre commented that they did not have anything else to add but asked if maybe the Conservation Commission had something to add.

Mr. Worster commented that it's an extensive garden and asked if the Travassos's were planning on a farmer's market or was it just for personal use. Mrs. Travassos confirmed that it was just for personal use to feed her family. Attorney Lefevre explained for the new members that were not present for the first meeting on March 27, 2018 that they are just looking to feed their family of 4 that requires at least 2 acres of farm land and they are just short of that. This garden is meant for just their own consumption and not meant for a farmer's market but just for personal use.

Mr. Wright asked if there were any other questions from the board before he asked the conservation commission if they have any comments. None were noted.

At this time, Mr. Porter of the Conservation Commission commented that the buffer is not DES wetlands but the town did adopt Mark West's study that did designate that area as a level One wetland. Mr. Porter stated that they did approach it as a DES wetland and made use of the 100ft wetland as a best use case. Mr. Porter was unsure if it was in the minutes of the site walk but they did bring up the fence and confirmed that they did want some kind of placards instead of fence which is what they've done in the past with other developers to delineate the buffer and that was all they were looking to do.

Attorney Lefevre stated that he has 2 hayfields that run along the forest and he does not need placards or signs to show where any of that is. Attorney Lefevre went on to say that the Travassos are going to have the agriculture right up to the natural forest and that it will be defined and he did not feel it was necessary.

Mrs. Neveu commented that, last time they were talking about two (2) areas from at the last meeting on March 27, 2018, she questioned if they were only talking about one area tonight. Attorney Lefevre stated that the Conservation Commission went out there and indicated that the application did mention an area around the house and an area out back and referenced the maps that they had to show to the board the areas they were talking about. Attorney Lefevre indicated that the Conservation Commission did not have anything to say about that but it was correct that there were two (2) areas. Attorney Lefevre mentioned that it may have been a hayfield and that the Travassos will be using it for nut trees and fruit trees. Mrs. Travassos mentioned that it is 1.39 acres if they clear back there. They estimated that there is an acre and a quarter uncleared. Mr. Porter mentioned that the Travassos didn't have a need to clear back there. Mrs. Travassos confirmed that there was enough cleared back there that they did not need to clear any more. Mrs. Neveu wanted to confirm with Mrs. Travassos and Attorney Lefevre that they were asking for a 50ft reduction in both places. Attorney Lefevre commented yes. Mrs. Travassos confirmed that they only need to cut the trees in the front.

Mrs. Rouleau-Cote wanted to add that, with regard to the delineation of the wetland buffer that, the town of Auburn does have delineators that we do have for the wetland buffers and that she would ask that the applicant place them along the existing trees for future owners to know that there is a wetland buffer that should be respected. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote went on to say that, there are weekend warriors can go in there and cut trees down not knowing that there is a buffer, and that we have a standardized delineator that she suggested that they put on the 75ft wetland buffer and however the board wanted to deal with the 125ft lawn/agriculture buffer but certainly for the wetland buffer we have a standardized delineator that we typically use that puts everybody on notice that there is a buffer in place. Attorney Lefevre noted that Mrs. Travassos was fine with doing that.

Mr. Porter commented that it was discussed in great detail that there would be no disturbance in that area because there would be no reason to disturb it. one of the discussions that they had. Discussion ensued with regard to planting fruit and nut trees. Mr. Porter talked about not removing any trees in the back area. Attorney Lefevre explained that the intention would be that if you plant trees that you would also keep the ground cover down and that would be the extent of the disturbance.

Mr. Vieira asked about the area in question and asked if the area still had trees now. Mrs. Travassos said yes. Mr. Viera asked about the stumps. Attorney Lefevre commented about the stumps, that most of the stumps were relatively small diameter trees and that the plan is to remove the stumps so they can use it for agricultural use. Mrs. Travassos stated that she cannot garden around stumps. A brief explanation by Attorney Lefevre followed by him saying what Mr. Wechsler had mentioned before that there is a lot of tree fall in that area now because the roots are very shallow but that there are larger trees out there. Once you vegetate with agricultural products you're stabilizing the property and also wanted to mention the slope at the 75ft line at the edge of the delineators is where they're stopping. A discussion ensued with regard to stabilization and removal of trees. Mr. Carroll asked if they could phase it. Mrs. Travassos stated that they were getting

someone to clear the site so they wanted to do it all at once. Mr. Carroll talked from experience that when you clear cut that it becomes a swamp and the ground is soft.

Mr. Wright asked if there any further questions or comments for the applicant. None were noted. Mr. Wright pointed out that they have two (2) request which was an Appeal of an Administrative Decision and a Variance and that they talked during deliberation about tabling this to give the Conservation Commission an opportunity for a site walk and to provide some input to the Board and for the applicant to come up with some fundamental general description of what will occur and some photographs and the area delineated in terms of where things will begin and where they'll stop, the number of trees that will be cut. Attorney Lefevre explained that there would be erosion control out there as well. Mr. Carroll asked about the test pit and what was the outcome from that test pit. Mr. Wechsler answered by saying that they had no seasonal high-water table going down to 60 inches and that the soil was fine sandy loam to medium sandy loam and talked about the soil survey.

Mr. DiPietro stated that he thought the applicant has done a great job with coming back with everything they have asked for including the garden plan and was prepared to make a motion for a variance to utilize the 50ft into the 125ft designated wetland buffer for agricultural crops in a rural zone and to limit excavation to stumps only and to maintain best management practices in the wetland and setback areas and conditioned to delineating both setbacks for the 125ft and the 75ft and to eliminate the use of phosphorus.

***Mr. DiPietro made a motion to vote on the Variance request to utilize the 50ft into the 125ft designated wetland buffer for agricultural crops in a rural zone and to limit excavation to stumps only and to maintain best management practices in the wetland and setback areas and conditioned to the delineation for both setbacks for the 125ft and the 75ft and to eliminate the use of phosphorus, for Case #18-03, 405 Wilsons Crossing Road, Tax Map 2, Lot 4. Seconded by Mr. Stuart.***

Mr. Stuart proposed a friendly amendment to have them follow Article 5.05 for what is permitted. Mr. DiPietro and the other Board members all agreed. Mr. Porter asked if there is no further agricultural use that restoration at the 125ft occur. Mr. Wright thought it was a good point. Attorney Lefevre stated that, if the Board wanted to put a condition on it that says, that this area will only be used for agricultural purposes and would not have turf grasses which is written in the ordinance and if it's not used for agricultural purposes that it would left to reclaim itself and return to forest. Mr. Stuart believed that Section 5.05 would cover it.

Mrs. Neveu asked Mr. Porter if he was okay with 50ft because she thought he wanted 25ft. Mr. Porter indicated that after looking at best management practices that they prefer 25ft but that they were just an advisory board. Mr. Wright indicated that he did appreciate the Conservation Commission taking the time to go out there and believes that they have

an applicant that has come back before the Board with much more detail than previously presented due to the Conservation Commissions efforts. With that said, Mr. Wright asked if there was any further discussion with the motion that was on the table. None were noted. Mr. Wright asked for a vote.

***Mr. DiPietro made a motion to vote on the Variance request to utilize the 50ft into the 125ft designated wetland buffer for agricultural crops in a rural zone and to limit excavation to stumps only and to maintain best management practices in the wetland and setback areas and conditioned to the delineation for both setbacks for the 125ft and the 75ft and to eliminate the use of phosphorus; and that they follow Article 5.05 for what is permitted, for Case #18-03, 405 Wilsons Crossing Road, Tax Map 2, Lot 4. Seconded by Mr. Stuart. Mrs. Neveu voted to Deny, Mr. Carroll voted to Grant, Mr. Stuart voted to Grant as he believed that all five (5) factors have been met, Mr. DiPietro voted to Grant as he believed that all five (5) factors have been met, and Mr. Wright also voted to Grant as he believed all five (5) factors have been met and with the added conditions believed that there was ample protection for the wetlands. The motion passed by a vote of 4 to Grant and 1 to Deny.***

At this time, Attorney Lefevre withdrew his Appeal of an Administrative Decision in light of the Boards decision to grant on the Variance. Mr. Wright accepted Attorney Lefevre's withdrawal of the Appeal and no motion was necessary.

Mr. Wright explained the 30-day appeal period where someone could appeal the Board's decision. Attorney Lefevre understood and the discussion ended and the applicant and Attorney Lefevre exited the meeting.

The Board members and Mrs. Rouleau-Cote talked about the second area that was located further into the property. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote explained to the Board that, the fact that they had to modify the land was the issue as agricultural use was permitted if no modifications were needed. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote further added that she would suggest to them to delineate the upper field also. Mr. Wright agreed and asked Mrs. Rouleau-Cote that, if she could clarify that to the applicant that, that would be great and thanked Mrs. Rouleau-Cote.

At this time, Mr. Wright asked Mrs. Rousseau to read the next case into the minutes for the record.



**Case #18-04**  
**269 Rockingham Road, LLC**  
**269 Rockingham Road – Tax Map 25 Lot 40**  
**Zoned Commercial Two**

Applicant is requesting a Special Exception to allow a Multi-Unit Commercial Establishment in the Commercial Two zone which is permitted by Special Exception; a Variance to allow a reduction in the front, side and rear setbacks for a proposed Multi-Unit Commercial Establishment; a Variance to exceed the 40% maximum lot coverage allowed; and, a Variance to allow the building, parking, landscaping and septic system to be within the 75-foot wetland buffer in a Commercial Two zone. (*Article 4, Section 4.07(5)(b) Multi-Unit Commercial Establishment; Article 4, Section 4.07(6) lot size, frontage, yards & height; Article 4, Section 4.07(6) lot coverage; and, Article 5, Section 5.06(1) Prohibited Uses and Activities*)

Mr. Mitchell presented on behalf of the applicant which was 269 Rockingham Road, LLC., Tax Map 25, Lot 40. Mr. Mitchell explained that the property currently has a residential home on it now and explained what they were proposing to do with the property. Mr. Mitchell pointed out the Multi-Unit Commercial Service Establishment and further explained the building, septic and the fact that the property has municipal water. Mr. Mitchell talked about the Special Exception that they were looking to get from the ZBA along with the three (3) Variances. Mr. Mitchell stated that the property contained .33 acres and that at first, they believed they had .68 acres but found out that the State of New Hampshire had bought this property before Route 101 was put in. So basically, the State of New Hampshire had purchased a large area of land and took what they needed for the highway and sold this lot that already had a house on it. Mr. Mitchell pointed out the lot area on the plan for the Board members. Mr. Mitchell stated that there was a need for Variances because of the size of the lot and that they have met with the Conservation Commission of which were present tonight to speak. Mr. Mitchell stated that, they were trying to make it better than what is currently existing and that they were pulling the proposed building further away from the wetlands.

At this time, Mr. Mitchell talked about the wetland location which was a Level 2 wetland which was not a high functioning wetland. Mr. Mitchell talked about the relief that they were looking for from the ZBA Board and asked the Board members if they had any questions and if not that he would go through the request application. The Board did not have any comments or questions at this time and therefore Mr. Mitchell went through the application for Special Exception as well as each of the three (3) Variance requests for the board.

In conclusion, Mr. Mitchell addressed the Board by saying that he would be happy to answer any questions that the Board members may have. Mr. Wright began by saying that, before they open it up to the Board that he would like to hear from Conservation Commission and the Code Enforcement Officer. Mr. Porter stated that, what they are proposing was better than what is currently existing with the property with regard to runoff and the detention pond will actually help with the runoff and believed that it was as good

as it was going to get. Mr. Wright asked Mrs. Rouleau-Cote for comments. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote stated that her only comment was in regards to building size itself and the ability to meet the life safety requirements for the fire truck to come onto the site and the ability to be able to manipulate the occupants of the building around the building because there really wasn't any sidewalk ways and understands that tonight's ZBA hearing is for side setbacks and the like and believes that when the Planning Board and Fire Department and she reviews it that there may be other limitations that may affect the footprint of the building in order to make other things happen. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote further pointed out the use of a dumpster and the like and believes that the commercial use of the property is the right fit and that the question may be is that, is there too much being expected on this site itself. Mr. Wright agreed and noted that they were good comments and observation as well and also understood the intent and to utilize the lot as much as they can. Mr. Wright also understood that if they approve this application tonight that it is possible that there may be changes and they may have to come back before the ZBA again.

Mr. Wright explained that, he was forwarded an e-mail from Mr. Willenbucker and read the e-mail to everyone present which basically indicates that Mr. Villeneuve had met with them and that as abutters they had no concerns or objections to the proposed plan.

Mr. Mitchell commented regarding Mrs. Rouleau-Cote's previous comment and indicated that they had met with the Planning Board informally and that the Planning Board talked about the Fire Department and understand that they will have to meet with the Fire Department first to go over any concerns with regard to access to the building. Mr. Mitchell also understood that they have to meet life safety as well and that they have to go to the Planning Board and that they will not have the public coming and going from the building but they will make sure that everything works out. Mr. Mitchell believes that this proposal works for the property but if it turns out after talking with the Fire Department and the Planning Board that they have to tweak it then they will.

Mr. Stuart asked about the septic that was not on the property and says to be removed. Mr. Mitchell explained that they surveyed the property and believed that the septic was located and that they spoke with the state and informed the Board that it was definitely going to be disconnected and they were doing a whole new septic design.

Mr. Viera asked about the square footage. Mr. Mitchell began by saying that the building was 88ft by 36ft and that each individual unit would be a little bit less than 30ft wide and about 36ft deep. Mr. Viera talked about what Mrs. Rouleau-Cote had stated and if there were flammables would be a different story. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote wanted to clarify that the fire truck does not have to make its way around the building but there just needs to be the proper number of egresses for each unit. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote also mentioned that they are before the ZBA tonight seeking a Special Exception for a Multi-Unit Commercial Service Establishment and that there are limitations as to what those occupants can be. Then, she and the Fire Department would also be looking at the appropriate fire separation for those uses.



Mr. Carroll commented that, after hearing everything that it was possible that it may not be a three (3) unit building. Mr. Mitchell also pointed out that, in the beginning they tried to do a four (4) unit building but now there is interest for possibly two (2) tenants or one tenant for the building so in conclusion there would be no more than three (3) but it could be two (2) or one.

Mr. Wright asked if everyone had an opportunity to ask questions that wanted to ask questions. No further questions were asked. Mr. Wright believed it was a straightforward presentation and that Mrs. Rouleau-Cote made great comments with regard to the Planning Board and the Fire Department.

Mr. DiPietro asked if they would be taking them up separately. Mr. Wright said yes.

***Mr. DiPietro made a motion to vote on the Variance request to allow a reduction in the front, side and rear setbacks for a proposed Multi-Unit Commercial Establishment according to the plans presented tonight and conditioned on Planning Board approval, for Case #18-04, 269 Rockingham Road, Tax Map 25, Lot 40. Seconded by Mrs. Neveu. Mrs. Neveu voted to Grant, Mr. Carroll voted to Grant as all the conditions have been met, Mr. Stuart voted to Grant as he believed that all the conditions have been met, Mr. DiPietro voted to Grant, and Mr. Wright also voted to Grant as he believed all the conditions have been met. All were in favor, and the motion passed.***

***Mr. DiPietro made a motion to vote on the Variance request to allow the building, parking, landscaping and septic system to be within the 75-foot wetland buffer according to the plans presented tonight and conditioned on Planning Board approval, for Case #18-04, 269 Rockingham Road, Tax Map 25, Lot 40. Seconded by Mr. Carroll. Mrs. Neveu voted to Grant, Mr. Carroll voted to Grant as all the conditions have been met, Mr. Stuart voted to Grant as he believed that all the conditions have been met, Mr. DiPietro voted to Grant, and Mr. Wright also voted to Grant as he believed all the conditions have been met. All were in favor, and the motion passed.***

***Mr. DiPietro made a motion to vote on the Variance request to exceed the 40% maximum lot coverage allowed according to the plans presented tonight and conditioned on Planning Board approval, for Case #18-04, 269 Rockingham Road, Tax Map 25, Lot 40. Seconded by Mr. Carroll. Mrs. Neveu voted to Grant, Mr. Carroll voted to Grant as all the conditions have been met, Mr. Stuart voted to Grant as he believed that all the conditions have been met, Mr. DiPietro voted to Grant, and Mr. Wright also voted to Grant as he believed all the conditions have been met. All were in favor, and the motion passed.***

***Mr. DiPietro made a motion to vote on the Special Exception request to allow a Multi-Unit Commercial Establishment in the Commercial Two zone which is permitted by Special Exception according to the plans presented tonight and conditioned on Planning Board approval, for Case #18-04, 269 Rockingham Road, Tax Map 25, Lot 40. Seconded by Mrs. Neveu. Mrs. Neveu voted to Grant, Mr. Carroll voted to Grant as all the conditions have been met, Mr. Stuart voted to Grant as he believed that all the conditions have been met, Mr. DiPietro voted to Grant, and Mr. Wright also voted to Grant as he believed all the conditions have been met. All were in favor, and the motion passed.***

Mr. Wright thanked Mr. Mitchell and the discussion ended and Mr. Mitchell exited the meeting.

Mr. Wright asked Mrs. Rousseau to read the last case into the minutes for the record.

**Case #18-05  
Fran Piascik  
29 Mountain Road – Map 9, Lot 4  
Zoned Residential One**

*Applicant is requesting a Special Exception to allow an Accessory Dwelling Unit which is permitted by Special Exception in a Residential One zone. (Article 4, Section 4.06(3)(m))*

Mr. Piascik read his application into the minutes for the record. Mr. Wright asked Mr. Piascik to tell the Board a little about what they were proposing to do. Mr. Piascik began by saying that the Accessory Dwelling Unit would be 544 square feet and that they would be using one of the garages and believed they would have to go before the Planning Board. This would be a place for his parents and that they are redoing the septic to add a bedroom because they now have four (4) bedrooms and it would be five (5) with his parent's bedroom. It would be a part-time use as his parents are part-time in Florida as well. Mr. Wright asked if it would be completed this year. Mr. Piascik said yes.

Mr. Wright asked Mrs. Rouleau-Cote if she had any questions or comments. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote stated that, they did have a couple of abutters come in asking what it was all about and that they explained to them that it was within the confines of the existing home so there would not be any noticeable change to the exterior. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote added that they are allowed up to 750 square feet and he commented that it was around 544 square feet so he meets all the language of the Accessory Dwelling Unit within the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Wright believed it was pretty straight forward and noted that there were no abutters present and asked for a motion to vote on the application as presented.

***Mr. Stuart made a motion to vote on the Special Exception request to allow an Accessory Dwelling Unit which is permitted by Special Exception as presented, for Case #18-05, 29 Mountain Road, Tax Map 9, Lot 4. Seconded by Mr. Carroll. Mrs. Neveu voted to Grant, Mr. Carroll voted to Grant as all the conditions have been met, Mr. Stuart voted to Grant as he believed that all the conditions have been met, Mr. DiPietro voted to Grant, and Mr. Wright also voted to Grant as he believed all the conditions have been met. All were in favor, and the motion passed.***

Mr. Wright informed Mr. Piascik that there was a 30-day appeal period where someone could appeal their decision and thanked Mr. Piascik for his presentation. Mr. Piascik thanked the Board and exited the meeting and the discussion ended.

### **Other Business**

Mr. Wright wanted welcome the two (2) new alternate members to the Board which were Stoney Worster and Dennis Viera and appreciate their input in tonight's meeting. Mr. Wright asked Mrs. Rousseau to make sure Ms. Royce added their e-mails to the ZBA list. Mrs. Rousseau understood what Mr. Wright was asking and noted it.

### **Minutes**

***Mr. Stuart made a motion to accept the minutes of March 27, 2018 as written, seconded by Mr. Carroll. All were in favor, with and the motion passed.***

### **Adjourn**

***Mr. Carroll made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Mr. DiPietro. All were in favor, the motion passed unanimously, and the meeting stood adjourned at 8:41 p.m.***

**The next ZBA Hearing is scheduled for May 22, 2018 at 7:00 pm and will be held at the Town Hall, 47 Chester Road.**