

**APPROVED MINUTES**  
**Town of Auburn**  
**Zoning Board of Adjustment**  
**March 26, 2019**

**Present:** Mark Wright, Chairman. Mike DiPietro, Vice-Chairman, Stephen Carroll & Kevin Stuart, Members; Dale Phillips, Dennis Vieira and Stoney Worster (7:09pm), Alternate Members of the Board. Minutes recorded by Amy Lachance and prepared by Denise Royce.

**Also, Present:** Carrie Rouleau-Cote, Building Inspector/Code Enforcement.

**Absent:** None.

Mr. Wright called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

Mr. Wright began by introducing the Board Members to everyone present at tonight's hearing and moved on to explain the procedure for tonight's hearing.

Mr. Wright explained to the applicants present that they would be asked to read their application into the minutes and if there were any abutters present that he would give the abutters time to comment.

At this time, Mr. Wright pointed out that one of the Board members informed him that he had a conflict as he was an abutter to the first case with Bruce Rolfe and therefore would recuse himself to sit on this case and Mr. DiPietro moved to sit in the audience. With that said, Mr. Wright moved to elevate Mrs. Phillips to full voting member for the first case so they will have 5 members to vote on this case. Mr. Wright then asked Mrs. Lachance to read the first case into the minutes.

**Case #19-02**  
**Bruce Rolfe/Rolfe Builders, LLC**  
**543 Bunker Hill Road – Tax Map 5, Lot 85-3**  
**Zoned Residential Two**

*Applicant is requesting a Variance to allow the septic and house to be within a Level One wetland; a Variance to allow a driveway access and culvert to be within a Level One wetland; and, a Variance to allow the house to be within a Level Two wetland in a Residential Two zone. (Article 5, Section 5.08(1)(a)) (Article 5, Section 5.08(1)(a)) & Article 5, Section 5.08(1)(b))*

Mr. Rolfe asked for a copy to read before the Board. Mr. Rolfe read his application into the minutes for the record. Mr. Rolfe talked about the driveway and that it would be better for site distance if he moved the driveway to get to the house but he needs to get direction from the State on that one. The last Variance request would allow him to move the house back away from the road and behind the wetlands. Mr. Rolfe indicated that there was a

lot of clean up to be done there as well. Mr. Wright asked how many Variances he was looking to obtain. Mr. Rolfe said three (3). Mr. Wright believed that a number of his comments applies to all of the Variance requests. Mr. Wright also commented that, Mr. Rolfe had mentioned that he was still waiting for state approval as well. Mr. Rolfe said yes for the culvert.

Mr. Wright asked Mr. Rolfe for any further comments before he opened it up to the abutters. Mr. Rolfe added that, all he wants to do is clean it up because it's been an eyesore for a number of years and all the neighbors are ready for it because they were sick of driving by there.

Mr. Wright asked if there were any questions or comments from abutters. Mr. Molihan commented that he agreed with Mr. Rolfe that the place needed to be cleaned up and he had no problems with Variances being granted because he needed Variances when his house was being built. Mr. Molihan wanted to point out the easements on the property because his property holds the leachfields for several properties and did not have any problems with Mr. Rolfe's requests. Mr. DiPietro who is also an abutter commented that, what Mr. Rolfe is proposing to do will be good for the town by getting the property in shape and cleaned up. Mr. DiPietro also commented that he did not have an issue with Mr. Rolfe's requests and that it was a good plan. Mrs. Picard commented that it would be nice to have it cleaned up as she drives by it every day and asked how big the property was. Mr. Wright indicated that it was 2.2 acres which was noted in the Zoning Determination written by the Code Enforcement Officer. Mrs. Picard also stated that a number of the Variances were going through the state as well and hoped he put something better than what's there now. Mr. Porter commented that, they had asked that the plans be put before the Conservation Commission and we have not seen the plans so in terms of setback reliefs we don't know what were looking at right now but as far as the state's setbacks, the town is more restrictive. A discussion ensued between Mr. Porter and the Board with regard to the plan. Mr. Porter indicated that he had not seen the plan and after reviewing the plan noted that he had asked to see the distance from the wetlands that he would be with the house. Mr. Rolfe pointed out that, that plan was the same plan that was presented to the Cons Com. Mr. Wright asked Mrs. Rouleau-Cote to comment. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote stated that, that was the same plan that she completed her Zoning Determination which showed where the proposed house would be as well as where the driveway would be. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote also pointed out that, the applicant did show a larger footprint for where he intends the house to be but that was to give him room to manipulate a footprint in that area. Her comments to the Cons Com were just that, at this hearing it should be determined how much yard would be included within that wetland buffer relief and whether the applicant wants 20 feet around his house and how that would be established is something that the Board should consider. As for the driveway, it's not a dredge and fill permit but a permit by notification for a residential driveway culvert so it'll be a very minimal impact plan that will be prepared. There is a culvert there now and it's definitely not sized appropriately per our driveway standards and again, that permitting process is under the jurisdiction of the NH Wetlands Bureau. There will be a plan prepared but it will be a very minimal impact application so it's not a true dredge and fill. Residential driveways are a very small category at the Wetlands

Bureau. Mr. Wright picked up on one of Mrs. Rouleau-Cote's comments or statements that the plan we are looking at here she mentioned the footprint of the building might change or be different than what is on this plan. Mr. Rolfe indicated that it would not be any larger than what is shown because it allows him to put a house in that location and to twist and turn the house if he has to. Mr. Rolfe stated that he did that way so he didn't have to come back if he went over in one section and what he does usually is a 40-foot radius around the house and anything that they disturb they would loam and seed and everything else would be untouched. All they want to do is get rid of all the garbage that is on the property. A brief discussion ensued with regard to the plan. Mr. Stuart asked if it included the septic system. Mr. Rolfe said yes it would be within the 40-foot radius. Mr. Stuart pointed out that from one corner of the house it would be 65.74 feet from one Level Two wetland and another corner of the house is 58.12 feet from another Level Two and from the other corner of the house would be 108.41 feet and the septic would be 83.71 feet. Mr. Stuart asked if he would be asking for those dimensions. Mr. Rolfe pointed out that it all depended on the type of house he builds because it could be a smaller house which would increase the distance from the wetlands but it would not be any larger than that.

Mr. Wright asked if there were any other questions from the Board. Mr. Stuart asked if he planned to remove the existing house and the existing shed. Mr. Rolfe stated that the existing house does not meet setbacks now. Mr. Stuart asked if the existing house had a basement. Mr. Rolfe stated no that it was on cinder blocks currently. Mr. Rolfe stated that he would be removing the existing house and let it grow back to its natural state. It was noted that the existing driveway was currently a hazard.

Mr. Wright asked Mrs. Rouleau-Cote if she had any further questions or comments. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote just wanted to inform the Board that, currently there is no record of any state approved septic system for the existing house. It is a junkyard for sure and basically the clean-up would be greatly appreciated by everybody in town. The existing culvert does not comply with current driveway standards. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote talked about placing a reasonable condition with regard to 40 feet around the construction site and putting in delineation of it being a wetland buffer and no further activity should occur to make sure that the future owner will know that they are somewhat limited as to the activities they can do on the lot.

Mr. Wright asked Mrs. Phillips if she had any questions. Mrs. Phillips commented that if they put in the appropriate driveway culvert that there shouldn't be a problem and the 40-foot radius would be appropriate. Mr. Vieira saw a house across the street that Mr. Rolfe built and it was high quality. Mr. Stuart asked Mr. Rolfe if he had any concerns about placing placards out there to delineate the wetlands. Mr. Rolfe said he did not have a problem with that.

Mr. Wright asked if anyone else had any questions. Mr. Carroll believed there were 3 Variance requests. A brief discussion ensued regarding the 3 Variances. Mr. Carroll asked what the state setbacks were. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote stated that, there were no state setbacks except for septic systems and that was 75 feet and he's looking for 85 feet so

he meets that state setbacks for septic systems but as far as the house placement there is no setback limit at the state level.

Mr. Wright talked about placing the conditions with 40 feet around the house and placing placards to delineate the wetlands would apply to the Variances for the house and the septic and didn't think it made sense to apply them to the culvert as he didn't believe it had anything to do with that part of the property. Mr. Wright believed that they could vote on the Variances individually unless the Board wanted to go into deliberations.

Mr. Wright asked if there were any questions or comments or a motion to go into deliberations. None were noted. With that said, Mr. Wright stated that he would entertain a motion to vote on the Variances one at a time.

***Mr. Stuart made a motion to vote on the Variance request to allow the house to be within a Level Two wetland buffer with the condition that there is a 40-foot buffer with placards designating the wetland setback limits and the encroachment be no greater than what is shown on the plan submitted; the State approval of the Septic; and, also the State approval for the culvert/driveway for Case #19-02, 543 Bunker Hill Road, Tax Map 5, Lot 85-3. Seconded by Mr. Vieira. Mr. Vieira voted to grant, Mrs. Phillips voted to grant, Mr. Carroll voted to grant, Mr. Stuart voted to grant as he believed all five (5) factors have been met, Mr. Wright also voted to grant finding all five (5) factors for the Variance have been met. A vote was taken and, all were in favor and the motion passed.***

***Mr. Stuart made a motion to vote on the Variance request to allow the septic and the house to be within a Level One wetland and the encroachment be no greater than what is shown on the plan submitted; the State approval of the Septic; and, also the State approval for the culvert/driveway for Case #19-02, 543 Bunker Hill Road, Tax Map 5, Lot 85-3. Seconded by Mr. Vieira. Mr. Vieira voted to grant, Mrs. Phillips voted to grant, Mr. Carroll voted to grant, Mr. Stuart voted to grant as he believed all five (5) factors have been met, Mr. Wright also voted to grant finding all five (5) factors for the Variance have been met. A vote was taken and, all were in favor and the motion passed.***

***Mr. Stuart made a motion to vote on the Variance request to allow a driveway access and culvert to be within a Level One wetland as submitted conditioned upon State approval for the driveway culvert access; and, that the area disturbed around the house and shed be left in its natural state for Case #19-02, 543 Bunker Hill Road, Tax Map 5, Lot 85-3. Seconded by Mr. Vieira. Mr. Vieira voted to grant, Mrs. Phillips voted to grant, Mr. Carroll voted to grant as he believed all five (5) factors have been met, Mr. Stuart voted to grant as he believed all five (5) factors have been met, Mr. Wright also voted to grant finding all five (5) factors for the Variance have been met. A vote was taken and, all were in favor and the motion passed.***

Mr. Wright informed Mr. Rolfe that he has received all three (3) Variances and that there was a 30-day appeal period in which someone could appeal the ZBA decision. Mr. Wright also explained that he must act upon the Variance within two (2) years.

With that said, Mr. Wright asked Mrs. Lachance to move on to read the next case into the minutes. Mr. DiPietro resumed his seat on the Board for the next case.

**Case #19-03**

**Dale Phillips**

**19 Rattlesnake Hill Road – Tax Map 5, Lot 11**

**Zoned Residential One**

*Applicant is requesting a Variance to subdivide Tax Map 5, Lot 11 into 2 lots within only 399.19 feet of frontage where 400 feet is required in a Residential One zone. (Article 4, Section 4.06(6))*

Mr. Wright informed everyone that the applicant is a member of the Board and that she has stepped down or recused herself from this case on the basis that she is the applicant. Mr. Wright indicated that there were five (5) voting members so he did not need to elevate anyone for this case.

At this time, Mrs. Phillips read her application into the minutes for the record. Mrs. Phillips began by saying that when she purchased the property, she had 400 feet of frontage which is shown on the plan recorded at D-4685 back in August of 1974. Mrs. Phillips explained that, she had the property surveyed and when they had completed the survey, they found out that she only had 399.19 feet of frontage on Rattlesnake Hill Road. Mrs. Phillips showed the proposed subdivision plan that showed both lots being 199.60 feet. Mrs. Phillips went on to read the rest of her application for the Board members.

Mr. Wright asked if there were any abutters present. Mrs. Phillips stated that her grandson was present who would be purchasing the lot. Mr. Wright asked Mrs. Phillips if she'd have two (2) non-conforming lots. Mrs. Phillips explained that, on the subdivision plan they show it as both being non-conforming and containing 199.60 feet but the other way is to have one at 200 feet of frontage and the other at 199.19 feet of frontage which would be non-conforming but it was up to the Board. Mr. Wright asked Mrs. Phillips if she'd be okay with one being 200 feet and the other lot to be 199.19 non-conforming. Mrs. Phillips said yes that would be fine.

Mr. Wright asked Mrs. Rouleau-Cote for her comments. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote began by saying that, in speaking with town counsel that the proper thing that the Board should consider is to keep the existing lot with the house on it conforming and having 200 feet of frontage and the new lot be non-conforming with 199.19 feet of frontage. The only other comment she had was that, the applicant does have a previous survey plan that was recorded that does show the 400 feet of frontage and with the new technology of survey



equipment is much better than it was previously so there is a previously recorded plan that does show it had 400 feet.

Mr. Wright asked if there were any questions or comments from the Board members and believed that, in the past they have tried to keep as much conformity in the ordinance and that Mrs. Rouleau-Cote has reinforced that with her thoughts and comments and to grant relief for one lot to be conforming and the subdivided lot to be non-conforming. Mrs. Phillips stated that she would have the plan corrected as requested.

Mr. DiPietro indicated that he was prepared to make a motion.

***Mr. DiPietro made a motion to vote on the Variance as presented with the condition that the lot with the existing home say at 200 feet of frontage and that the lot that is being subdivided off would be 199.19 feet for Case #19-03, 19 Rattlesnake Hill Road, Tax Map 5, Lot 11. Seconded by Mr. Stuart. Mr. Vieira voted to grant, Mr. Carroll voted to grant as all conditions have been met, Mr. Stuart voted to grant as he believed all five (5) factors have been met, Mr. DiPietro voted to grant as all five (5) factors have been met, and Mr. Wright also voted to grant and believed that all five (5) factors have been met. A vote was taken and, all were in favor and the motion passed.***

Mr. Wright explained that the Variance has been granted and that there was a 30-day appeal period where abutters or interested parties could appeal the ZBA decision. Mr. Wright also stated that they had two (2) years to subdivided. Mrs. Phillips stated that she would get the plan corrected and thanked the Board for their time.

#### **Case #19-04**

**Christopher S. Duggan**

**56 Nutt Road – Tax Map 14, Lot 7**

**Zoned Residential One**

*Applicant is requesting a Special Exception to operate a home business making furniture in a Residential One zone. (Article 4, Section 4.06(3)(c))*

Mrs. Phillips resumed her position at the Board for this case. Mr. Duggan did not have a copy of his application and therefore was presented with one by the Board. Mr. Duggan read his application into the minutes for the record. Mr. Duggan stated that he was trying to supplement his income by building furniture and did not want to diminish his property in doing so. Mr. Duggan stated that he has a log mill which is approximately 16 feet long that only runs an hour or two at the most. Mr. Duggan talked about the types of wood furnishings he makes. Mr. Wright asked how long he's been doing this. Mr. Duggan stated that he's been doing it a few years. Mr. Wright asked if he's received complaints from neighbors. Mr. Duggan said no.

Mr. Wright asked if there were any abutters present. Mr. Ginalski began by saying that he's running a furniture business and bringing in loads and loads of pine logs that are stacked up all along the property lines and there's logs everywhere. Mrs. Sartorelli, who lives across the street brought photos for the Board to review. At this time, the Board reviewed photos taken of the property and the surrounding properties. Mrs. Sartorelli talked about three (3) driveways that Mr. Duggan has but was told to remove one of them. Mrs. Sartorelli talked about bulldozers, trucks and other equipment being close to the stream.

Mr. Wright asked if there were any other abutters that wished to speak. Mr. Martin of Nutt Road commented that he was kind of torn and believed he should do what he wants but commented that they yard was kind of messing and doesn't look nice and brings down the neighborhood.

Mr. Wright moved on to ask Mrs. Rouleau-Cote to comment as the Code Enforcement Officer. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote began by saying that, there has been correspondence with the applicant over the last few years beginning with the driveway and when the town was redoing Nutt Road. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote pointed out that, Mr. Duggan will claim that the driveway was there when he purchased the property but either way it was never a permitted driveway and when the town was redoing the road, at that point he was asked to discontinue the use of that driveway. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote instructed the Road Agent, Mike Dross to eliminate any curb cuts to make sure that the area was not intended as a driveway. There were logs stored there at that time that she was told were logs removed during road work. After that, the area was used for parking trailers and some machinery and he was again asked to discontinue the use of that driveway. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote explained that, he then applied for and asked for another curb cut to the other side of his home of which a driveway permit was issued as he did meet the driveway criteria and there was a condition that driveway #2, the driveway near the wetland was to be eliminated. It was intended as a residential driveway and that there was no discussion of a commercial use. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote stated that he did obtain a business license with the State of New Hampshire with an address of Nutt Road so for all intended purposes he is running a business out of his home and therefore was informed that he would need to go before the ZBA for a Special Exception. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote also mentioned that, it was in close proximity of a stream and did not know how much activity was being done within the wetland buffer. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote also informed the Board that the applicant was told to go before the Conservation Commission. Mr. Porter stated that he did attend the Conservation Commission meeting and there was no determination made but that the Board wanted to conduct a site walk. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote talked about the close proximity to the abutters within that area and stated that there were a few sawmills in town but those were located on 20 plus acres where this one is on a little over an acre of land.

Mr. Wright asked about the Conservation Commission meeting and if the Board conducted a site walk as well as what occurred at that meeting. Mr. Porter stated that the bulk of the discussion had to do with the second driveway and the restoration of that area and that was all they were presented with and the Board entertained a motion to conduct a site walk. Mr. Stuart talked about the driveways and asked what the status was from

the town's standpoint with regard to the driveway. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote indicated that it should be left to be restored to a natural vegetated state. A brief discussion ensued with regard to the discontinued driveway. Mr. Duggan stated that it has since been restored and is left alone. Mr. Duggan commented that, the previous homeowner indicated that her husband used to park his truck there and as far as the stack of logs there are logs there and that he's in the process of moving it out of there. Mr. Duggan indicated that he would like to clean it out over the summer and put some nice plants in. An abutter indicated that he has lived there for a number of years and there was never a driveway there and in fact some of the logs are on his property. Mr. Wright reminded everyone that wanted to comment that they address the Board with their comments. Mrs. Sartorelli commented that she took pictures last night where he was dumping logs within that supposed discontinued driveway when he said that he was planning to move those logs. A brief discussion ensued with regard to the logs that were dumped last night. Mr. Duggan indicated that he needed to use the trailer and therefore dumped the logs but plans to remove them. Mr. Duggan indicated that he would be moving them to Salem.

Mr. Wright asked Mr. Duggan that, when he assembles pieces of furniture where he would assemble them. Mr. Duggan indicated that he would use his garage. Mrs. Sartorelli asked if he had permission to do this business now. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote indicated that, Mr. Duggan is before the Board tonight to seek permission to do this at the residence. Mrs. Sartorelli asked what the business hours were because right now it's at all hours of the day and night and wanted to know what the business hours were. Mr. Wright explained that the ZBA is tasked with granting relief and permission for certain things that are otherwise prohibited or restricted in the town. Mr. Wright talked about the Zoning Ordinance for the Town of Auburn and what is allowed and other things that are allowed by Special Exception and if not allowed then they would need to seek a Variance. Mr. Wright asked Mrs. Rouleau-Cote about the definition of Home Shop/Home Business and believes that these are things that area occurring inside the house and not necessarily outside and wondered if she had any comments with regard to the Home Business. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote and explained that the definition is kind of broad and did not believe that we had a furniture business and if the Board were to entertain a motion for the business that she would certainly suggest that there would be a minor site plan review with the Planning Board to discuss hours of operation, the number of logs and storage of logs and where the activities can occur. A brief discussion ensued with regard to the types of furniture business activities that occur in the basement of some places and believed it would be a site plan issue. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote also suggested that the Conservation Commission conduct a site walk because she believed that some of the activity was occurring within a wetland buffer and talked about slash piles. Mr. Wright asked about a noise ordinance. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote stated that we do not have a noise ordinance to that affect but certainly the number of logs on the site would indicate that it's more than just somebody just tinkering around.

Mr. Ginalski also added that it was not only an eyesore but a safety issue for kids as there are a lot of kids in the neighborhood. Mr. Duggan indicated that he has grandkids and would not put kids in danger and would be willing to do whatever the Board wanted him to do and stated that if they wanted him to put up a building and put everything inside



then he would also be willing to do that as well. With that said, Mr. Wright asked if anyone had any further questions or comments or if they wanted to enter into deliberations.

***Mr. Vieira made a motion to enter into deliberations at 8:18 p.m., seconded by Mrs. Phillips.***

Mr. Wright explained to everyone present that they could listen to what the Board is discussing but that they could not speak at this time.

Mrs. Phillips began by saying that, the biggest thing that she's hearing is the mess and everything everywhere and also encroaching onto the abutter's property. Mrs. Phillips believed that if he could get it under control.

Mr. Vieira commented that what he's hearing is the milling pile of logs. Mr. Carroll commented by looking at the pictures that this is major logs according to the photos with major pieces of wood that is being moved around and that is loud and possibly leaking hydraulic fluid. Mr. Carroll also commented that it was very concerning and adding another building on the property is now making it into a commercial business and who knows how big this business is going to get. Mr. Vieira did not believe that Nutt Road is the place to have this type of business and believed that Mr. Carroll hit the nail on the head. Mr. DiPietro commented the logs and the slash piles and the noise is the issue involved in this neighborhood. The Board discussed putting up trees and believed it would be very difficult to do in this area and would be hard to control. Mr. DiPietro believed if he would be doing it on a smaller scale may be okay but this is very large piles and it's the scale of the operation is what's diminishing to him. Mr. Vieira also pointed out the environmental issue and that Conservation Commission has not viewed the site yet and believed that they should have the opportunity to walk the property to see the proximity to the wetland buffer. Further discussion ensued with regard to the size of the business and the proximity of the wetland buffer. Mr. Stuart believed with Mr. Vieira that the Conservation Commission should have the opportunity to conduct a site walk and view the site to see what's going on.

Mr. Wright talked about the character of the neighborhood and that his recommendation would be to Table this case to give the Conservation Commission the opportunity to conduct a site walk and look at everything and make sure that we are not dealing with a wetland issue and did not believe the Board should be making a decision until we are confident that, that piece has been looked at. If it were a 20-acre piece in a rural district and we did not have abutters in close proximity then they probably would be here but when they do then he believes they have to be more concerned and be mindful of abutting property. Mr. Wright also talked about sending it for site plan review and did not believe it fit the character of the neighborhood and if it was being conducted inside maybe but once it goes outside then it's a different story.

In conclusion, Mr. Wright believed that there was a lot going on and enough that he was not prepared to vote on the case tonight and certainly at a minimum would want the Conservation Commission to go there to find out what's going on and report back so they

know if there is a wetlands issue. Mr. Wright further talked about having this go before the Planning Board and have the abutters show up to voice their concerns and have the Planning Board place restrictions or requirements that might be enough to balance the right of the homeowner to do things on their property. Mr. Wright reiterated that he was not willing to make a decision on it tonight but have time to think about it and have the Conservation Commission give the Board a report but believed that they should all be prepared to have that discussion of is it something that is within the character of the neighborhood and could the Planning Board address the concerns. Mr. Vieira and Mr. DiPietro agreed with Mr. Wright.

With that said, Mr. Wright believed that if everyone was in agreement that they could come out of deliberation and Table the case and have the Conservation Commission give them a report and be prepared to have a little bit more discussion on where do they go with regard to the Planning Board but that is basically outside of the scope of the ZBA. The Board all agreed and Mr. DiPietro made a motion to exit deliberations.

***Mr. DiPietro made a motion to exit out of deliberations at 8:34 p.m., seconded by Mr. Carroll.***

Mr. Wright informed everyone that they were now out of deliberation and they heard the Board's discussion and stated that, unless anyone had anything new to add that he would entertain any brief comments and if there were no further comments that he would entertain a motion from the Board on this case.

***Mr. Vieira made a motion to TABLE this case until they had more information from Conservation Commission and possibly other committees in town for Case #19-04, 56 Nutt Road, Tax Map 14, Lot 7. Seconded by Mr. DiPietro. A vote was taken and, all were in favor and the case has been TABLED until April 30<sup>th</sup>, 2019.***

Mr. Duggan indicated that he would be continuing to move the logs off his property and asked if there were any objections. Mr. Wright indicated that, that was a Code Enforcement question and informed Mr. Duggan to speak with Mrs. Rouleau-Cote and she could answer that question. A brief discussion ensued with regard to the logs that were dropped off last night were for someone's daughter's wedding who resides with Mr. Duggan.

Mr. Wright informed everyone present tonight that there would be no further notification and that this would be their only notification that this case has been TABLED until next month which is Tuesday, April 30<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Wright also informed everyone that the minutes would be posted as well.

## Minutes

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

## Other Business

Mr. Wright asked if there was any new business. None were noted. Mr. Wright thanked Mrs. Lachance for her assistance tonight. Mr. Worster indicated that, if they were going to have a meeting on April 30<sup>th</sup> that he could attend that one but would be retiring finally as they have a buyer for their home and would be closing on May 8<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Wright congratulated Mr. Worster and thanked him for his time.

## Adjourn

***Mr. DiPietro made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Carroll. All were in favor, the motion passed unanimously, and the meeting stood adjourned at 8:45 p.m.***

The Zoning Board of Adjustment is scheduled for April 30, 2019 at 7:00 pm and will be held at the Town Hall, 47 Chester Road unless otherwise noted on the upcoming Agenda.