

**UNAPPROVED MINUTES**  
**Town of Auburn**  
**Zoning Board of Adjustment**  
**May 24, 2022**

**Present:** Mike DiPietro, Chairman. Kevin Stuart, Vice-Chairman. Shawn Matte & Jill Dross, Members. Nick Pappas & Steven Kimball, Alternate Members. Minutes recorded and prepared by Denise Royce.

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

**Absent:** Patrick Bergeron, Member. Shannon Daoust, Alternate Member.

Mr. DiPietro called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. At this time, Mr. DiPietro introduced the Board members to everyone present tonight and then explained the procedure for tonight's hearing. Mr. DiPietro explained that the Board had six (6) cases before them tonight. Mr. DiPietro elevated Mr. Pappas to full voting status for the first case and then he would rotate between Mr. Pappas and Mr. Kimball. Mr. DiPietro informed everyone that Mrs. Rouleau-Cote was also present tonight and pointed out that we would have everything on the big screen tonight so that everyone could follow along. Mr. DiPietro asked Ms. Royce to read the case into the minutes. Ms. Royce read the first case into the minutes for the record.

**Case #22-07**

**Joseph & Brittanny Chandonnet**

**12 Cottage Avenue – Tax Map 25, Lot 36**

**Zoned Residential One**

**Continued from April 19, 2022**

*Applicant is requesting a Variance from Article 4, Section 4.06(6) to allow a 30-foot by 36-foot single story detached garage to be 18-feet from the front property line and 25-feet from the side property line and to exceed lot coverage in a Residential One zone.*

Mr. DiPietro believed there were two (2) or three (3) Variances that would be needed tonight which would be lot coverage and the front setback. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote informed the Board that there was no need for a side setback as they would meet that requirement. Mr. DiPietro explained that the garage was right against the front property line being .7 feet from the property line and would be 21 feet from the edge of pavement. Mr. DiPietro did not believe we have received a request to be that close before. Mr. Chandonnet commented that, he was trying to keep it away from the leachfield and septic. Discussion ensued with regard to the leachfield which was flat. Mr. DiPietro believed there should be some type of setback from the street and understood that the neighborhood was non-conforming but believed that it was almost unreasonable to be on the property line. Mr. Chandonnet asked if they were 3 feet from the property line would that help. A brief discussion ensued with a drawing that showed the garage being 21 feet from the edge of

pavement. Mr. Matte commented that, it looked that there was room to actually slide the garage over and slightly back if they are removing the shed. Mr. DiPietro and Mr. Matte both commented that they would like it to be away from the street. A lengthy discussion ensued with regard to placement of the garage.

Mr. Stuart commented that if they move it over to cover up some of the driveway that it would reduce the amount of impervious. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote explained that impervious coverage pertained to building coverage. Mr. Chandonnet explained that they could remove the fence as the garage would act as a barrier. The Board and Mrs. Rouleau-Cote worked on getting an exact dimension. Mr. DiPietro indicated that if the back of the garage slid back to where the front of the house is it would be 15 feet off the property line. Discussion ensued with regard to reducing the size of the garage. Mr. Chandonnet commented that they intend on staying there a lifetime and if they are going to be collecting stuff that they needed a bigger garage.

At this time, Mr. DiPietro wondered if the Board wanted to go into deliberation. Mr. Stuart said yes.

***Mr. Stuart made a motion to enter into deliberation. Seconded by Mr. Pappas. The Board entered into deliberation at 7:18pm.***

Mr. Stuart began by saying that he thought 15-feet was doable as it seemed like a minimum at least to get off the property line and that this was closer than any other times and that they have rejected other applications that were closer than that. Mr. Matte pointed out that the lot coverage was almost doubled with that size of a garage. Discussion ensued with regard to the size of the garage. Mr. Matte stated that he did not mind the distance from the edge of pavement, but the size of the garage was an issue with the size of the lot. It was noted that the garage would be bigger than the existing home. Mr. Matte thought that they could shrink it down to a 2-stall garage as opposed to 3 car garage which would reduce the lot coverage. The Board members discussed downsizing the garage and trying to figure out what size would be reasonable. Mr. Matte believed a 24-foot by 30-foot garage could possibly work because they will need an access point for storage above.

Mr. DiPietro believed a 15-foot from the front property line was a reasonable compromise because it was a really tough lot and a tough neighborhood. Mr. Kimball talked about a 30-foot by 30-foot garage. The Board discussed lot coverage.

Mr. DiPietro asked if there were any further questions and asked Ms. Dross if she had anything to add. Ms. Dross stated that she agreed with Mr. Matte and did not know if a 30-foot by 30-foot garage would make much of a difference. The Board's thought process was to see what would be reasonable. Ms. Dross though possibly moving the pool would help and give them a little more room. Mr. Stuart agreed with 15-feet from the front setback and then they can also move the pool if the turning radius was going to be an issue.

***Mr. Stuart made a motion to come out of deliberation. Seconded by Ms. Dross. The Board entered into deliberation at 7:28pm.***

Mr. DiPietro stated to the applicant that they heard what they had to say and that there was some concern with the front setback and the size of the impervious surface. With that said, Mr. DiPietro believed they could move to a vote but first asked if there were any abutters present. None were noted.

Mr. DiPietro asked Mrs. Rouleau-Cote for comment. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote stated that what she is hearing from the Board's discussion is that no closer than 15-feet to the front property line and that there moving forward with a 30-foot by 36-foot footprint and that the 5% building coverage will be increased to the 9.3% lot coverage. Mr. Kimball asked if there was a condition that the shed was to be removed. Mr. DiPietro said yes as shown on the plan.

***Mr. Stuart made a motion to vote on the Variance regarding the front property line to be no closer than 15-feet for 12 Cottage Avenue, Tax Map 25, Lot 36. Seconded by Mr. Pappas. Ms. Dross voted to Grant with the 15-foot front setback and that the shed will be removed, Mr. Matte voted to Grant with the 15-foot front setback and that the shed will be removed, Mr. Stuart voted to Grant finding all five (5) factors have been met, Mr. Pappas voted to Grant finding all five (5) factors have been met, and Mr. DiPietro also voted to Grant with the 15-foot front setback and finding all five (5) factors have been met. A vote was taken and, all were in favor and the motion passed.***

Mr. DiPietro moved on to the other Variance request to exceed lot coverage.

***Mr. Stuart made a motion to vote on the Variance to allow the lot coverage to increase to 9.3% where 5% is required for a 30-foot by 36-foot garage in a Residential One zone for 12 Cottage Avenue, Tax Map 25, Lot 36. Seconded by Mr. Pappas. Ms. Dross voted to Grant the 9.3% lot coverage finding all five (5) factors have been met, Mr. Matte voted to Deny, Mr. Stuart voted to Grant finding all five (5) factors have been met, Mr. Pappas voted to Grant finding all five (5) factors have been met, and Mr. DiPietro also voted to Grant finding all five (5) factors have been met. A vote was taken and, the motion passed with a vote of 4 to Grant and 1 to Deny.***

Mr. DiPietro informed the applicant that the Variance was granted and that they would receive a Notice of Decision from Ms. Royce. Mr. DiPietro also informed the applicant that there was a 30-day appeal period where abutters or interested parties could appeal the Board's decision. Mr. DiPietro thanked the applicant and the discussion ended.

**Case #22-08**  
**David Zaleski**  
**4 Juniper Circle – Tax Map 8, Lot 25-5**  
**Zoned Residential Two**

*Applicant is requesting a Special Exception from Article 4, Section 4.06(5)(i) to allow for an additional garage to be added to existing garage with an Accessory Dwelling Unit above new garage in a Residential Two zone.*

Mr. Zaleski read his application into the minutes for the record. Mr. Zaleski explained that it was to add a garage with an ADU above and would meet all setback requirements. Mr. Zaleski presented the Board with a drawing of what the additional garage and ADU would look like. A brief discussion ensued with regard to the building and that they would be connected. Mr. DiPietro elevated Mr. Kimball to full voting status for this case. Mr. DiPietro asked if there were any abutters present. None were noted. Mr. DiPietro asked if there were any questions from the Board for the applicant. Ms. Dross asked about access and Mr. Zaleski pointed out the ADU and access to the Board. Mr. DiPietro believed that if there was nothing else that he would entertain a motion for the Special Exception.

***Mr. Stuart made a motion to Grant a Special Exception as presented tonight for 4 Juniper Circle, Tax Map 8, Lot 25-5 as presented tonight. Seconded by Mr. Matte. Mr. Kimball voted to Grant, Mr. Stuart voted to Grant finding all four (4) factors have been met, Mr. Matte voted to Grant, Ms. Dross voted to Grant finding all four (4) factors have been met, and Mr. DiPietro also voted to Grant finding all four (4) factors have been met. A vote was taken and, all were in favor and the motion passed.***

Mr. Zaleski thanked the Board. Mr. DiPietro thanked the applicant and indicated that they would receive a Notice of Decision from Ms. Royce. Mr. DiPietro also reiterated that there was a 30-day appeal period as he stated before and the discussion ended. Mr. DiPietro asked Ms. Royce to read the next case. Ms. Royce read the case into the minutes.

**Case #22-09**  
**Tara & Rick Scheidell**  
**59 Juniper Circle, Tax Map 8, Lot 25-26**  
**Zoned Residential Two**

*Applicant is requesting a Variance from Article 5, Section 5.08(1)(a) to allow for encroachment into the 125-foot wetland buffer for the installation of an inground swimming pool, patio and accessory structure (gazebo) in a Residential Two zone.*

Mrs. Scheidell read her application into the minutes for the record. Mrs. Scheidell stated that no trees would be removed as the area is already an established backyard and they plan to revegetate the area with shrubs to delineate the wetland buffer.

Mr. DiPietro asked Mrs. Scheidell if that plan was to reduce the buffer from 125-feet to 105-feet. Mrs. Scheidell said yes. Mr. DiPietro asked the Board if there were any questions for the applicant. Ms. Dross asked Mrs. Scheidell what happened when she went to the Conservation Commission. Mrs. Scheidell indicated that they did not give much guidance as alternative options and they were not in favor of it.

Mr. Stuart asked where the proposed gazebo would be located. Mrs. Scheidell pointed out the location of the gazebo on the plan. Discussion ensued with regard to relocating the gazebo in different areas. It was noted that other locations would be an issue as they needed to maintain 60-feet from abutters structure because they are located within a cluster subdivision and the location of the leachfield and shed. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote pointed out the wetland buffer and explained that the pool would not be within the buffer that it would only be the gazebo and patio that would be within the buffer area. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote commented that she did not have any concerns as long as best management practices were used. Mr. Stuart asked about the existing shed and if it was in the setback. Mrs. Scheidell stated that it was not within the wetland setback. Mr. DiPietro did not believe that they were asking for much relief as they were only looking for 20-feet. It was noted by the Board members that they were looking to reduce the 125-foot wetland setback to 105-feet. Mr. Matte suggested entering into deliberation. Mr. Stuart asked if there was anyone from the Conservation Commission present tonight. None were noted. Mr. Kimball stated that the Board all had the minutes of that meeting. Mr. Stuart noted that in reading the minutes that the Conservation Commission was not in support of this. Mrs. Scheidell added that they were not in favor of the neighborhood and believed that was a factor. Mr. Kimball read a section of the minutes for the Board members. Again, the Board discussed possibly moving it to a different location but noted the issues with the septic location and it being too close to the shed and maintaining 60-feet from structure to structure. Mrs. Scheidell presented the Board with photos of what is currently existing in her backyard now which was flat and grassy area.

Mr. DiPietro asked if there were any abutters. None were noted. Mr. DiPietro stated that if there were no further questions that he would entertain a motion to vote on the application as presented. Mr. DiPietro elevated Mr. Pappas to full voting status for this case.

***Mr. Pappas made a motion to Grant a Variance with the condition that Best Management Practices be used for 59 Juniper Circle, Tax Map 8, Lot 25-26 as presented tonight. Seconded by Mr. Stuart. Mr. Pappas voted to Grant as all the conditions have been met and noted that the pool would not be within the wetland setback, Mr. Matte voted to Grant as all the conditions have been met and noted that the pool would not be within the wetland setback, Ms. Dross voted to Grant noting all five (5) factors have been met, Mr. Stuart voted to Grant finding all five (5) factors have been met, and Mr. DiPietro also voted to Grant finding all five (5) factors have been met. A vote was taken and, all were in favor and the motion passed.***

Mr. DiPietro reiterated about the 30-day appeal period and wished the applicant good luck and the discussion ended. Mrs. Scheidell thanked the Board and exited the meeting. Mr. DiPietro asked Ms. Royce to read the next case into the minutes. Ms. Royce read the case into the minutes.

**Case #22-10**

**Michael & Jane Gilon**

**66 Stoneybrook Lane, Tax Map 11, Lot 56-16**

**Zoned Residential Two**

*Applicant is requesting a Variance from Article 4, Section 4.06(6) to allow the construction of a garage that would exceed the maximum building area by 0.8% in a Residential Two zone.*

Mr. Gilon read his application into the minutes for the record. Mr. DiPietro pointed out that the photos were helpful. Mr. DiPietro asked the Board members if they had any questions for the applicant. Ms. Dross asked about the proposed four (4) car garage and that the picture showed only a three (3) car garage. Mr. Gilon stated that, that was on the original plot plan when the house was being built back in 1996.

Mr. DiPietro asked Mrs. Rouleau-Cote if she had anything to add. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote commented that the wetland in the front is classified as a Level 3 which he needs to maintain a 25-foot setback off of that. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote pointed out that back in 1980 something when Stoneybrook was developed that every wetland had a 125-foot wetland setback. Mr. DiPietro noted that the Variance before them is an area Variance which was less than one percent. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote stated that, as the applicant has stated that he does qualify for a smaller garage and would not have to come before the ZBA, and they did have a lengthy discussion about that. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote went on to say that his application explicitly states that this is for a residential garage and not a commercial garage or home shop or home business but strictly a home garage. Mr. Stuart asked if there was a business assigned to this address. Mr. Gilon said yes but has since been pulled by the state. Mr. Stuart asked if he was still running a business from this location. Mr. Gilon said not for automotive but that he did have a firearms business. Mr. Stuart further asked if it was for his personal vehicles. Mr. Gilon stated that it was for his hobby. A brief discussion ensued with regard to the garage. The Board understood it was for a three (3) car garage. Mr. Gilon commented that he did not want a cookie cutter garage and therefore made one of the bays higher than the other two (2) garages. Mr. Kimball asked who's going to police it when someone purchases the property and says there's a high bay and I'm going to run my plumbing business out of there. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote commented that, that the fact that he is before the ZBA and he's getting a Variance and that's going to be one of the conditions. Mr. Kimball was talking about future. Mr. Stuart stated that the conditions would run with the land.



Mr. DiPietro asked if there were any further questions. Mr. Kimball asked if that residential use agreement become part of the Variance. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote pointed out that, they may want to word their motion to be that they are granting him permission to construct a residential garage for residential use only to exceed lot coverage by .8% to be 5.8% where 5% is the maximum. Mr. DiPietro asked if any of the Board members wanted to make that motion. Mr. DiPietro elevated Mr. Kimball to full voting status for this case.

***Mr. Stuart made a motion to vote on the application for a Variance as submitted to allow a residential garage for residential use only and to exceed lot coverage by .8% to be 5.8% where 5% is the maximum for 66 Stoneybrook Lane, Tax Map 11, Lot 56-16 as presented tonight. Seconded by Mr. Matte. Mr. Kimball voted to Grant as described believing all five (5) factors have been met, Ms. Dross voted to Grant finding all five (5) factors have been met, Mr. Matte voted to Grant finding all five (5) factors have been met, Mr. Stuart voted to Grant finding all five (5) factors have been met, and Mr. DiPietro also voted to Grant finding all five (5) factors have been met. A vote was taken and, all were in favor and the motion passed.***

Mr. DiPietro reiterated that there was a 30-day appeal period and wished the applicant good luck. Mr. Gilon thanked the Board members and exited the meeting and the discussion ended.

**Case #22-11  
Sharon Stanley  
34 Brookside Drive, Tax Map 25, Lot 14  
Zoned Residential One**

*Applicant is requesting a Variance from Article 4, Section 4.06(6) to allow the removal of existing garage and replace with larger new construction garage in a Residential One zone.*

Ms. Stanley read her application into the minutes for the record. Mr. DiPietro commented that, by looking at the plot plan that it looked like the garage would be 12-feet from the property line. Ms. Dross asked what the size of the existing garage was. Mr. DiPietro asked if there was an existing garage in place now. Ms. Stanley said yes that there was a 24-foot by 24-foot garage there now and explained that she has to fold in her mirrors before entering the garage and there isn't enough room in the existing garage. At this time, Ms. Royce presented the Board with the original plot plan showing the location of the 24-foot by 24-foot garage. The Board reviewed the plan before moving on. Mr. DiPietro indicated that, they were looking at 12-feet on one side where 30-feet is required and 34-feet in the front where 50-feet is required so they would be looking at two (2) Variances. Mr. Kimball also pointed out that there was a lot coverage Variance that was required to increase it to 10.6%. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote indicated that it was a corner lot so it has 50-foot setbacks all the way around the property so in her zoning determination it states that "the proposed structure will encroach within the 50-foot front setback and 50-

foot rear setbacks (corner lot)". Mr. DiPietro so noted that they would be looking at three (3) Variances. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote added that it was a fairly flat lot.

Mr. DiPietro asked the Board members if they had any questions. Mr. Stuart asked about moving the garage back a little farther that it would be further off the property line and closer to the house. Mr. DiPietro thought it would be very close to the back deck. Mr. Kimball commented that he was really struggling with the hardship because to have an existing garage 24-feet by 24-feet which is grandfathered where it is. Ms. Stanley reiterated that she has a hard time getting her car into the garage now and they literally have no room to put anything in the garage when they park the two (2) cars in there. A brief discussion ensued with regard to the size of the garage. Mr. Kimball talked about possibly reducing down to a 24-foot by 30-foot garage which would give them six (6) more feet. Ms. Stanley pointed out the location of the leachfield and the location of the water line because they are connected to Manchester Water. Mr. Matte commented that he would be okay with a 30-foot by 24-foot garage because they do have to contend with the water line. Mr. DiPietro stated that they could always grant them a 34-foot by 40-foot garage that they could always build smaller, but they can't build any bigger. Mr. Kimball was struggling with the hardship. Mr. Stuart suggested entering into deliberation.

***Mr. Stuart made a motion to enter into deliberation. Seconded by Mr. Kimball. The Board entered into deliberation at 8:18pm.***

Mr. Stuart began by saying that as far as the hardship and having an existing garage already and believes that a 34-foot by 40-foot garage is hard to meet the hardship criteria. Mr. Stuart believed there were options by moving it closer to the house and making it smaller. Mr. Stuart did not believe it met the hardship criteria as submitted. Mr. Kimball stated that he concurs with what Mr. Stuart stated and Mr. DiPietro also concurred with what was said and believed it was pushing the envelope with regard to hardship.

Mr. DiPietro stated that, if there was no further discussion that they could come out of deliberations. Mr. Kimball commented that, with one of the previous applicants they gave them an opportunity to adjust their dimensions for something that was more reasonable as opposed to denying it or reapplying and was unsure how the Board felt about that. Mr. Stuart stated that, they have heard our discussions and they can speak with the applicants once they come out of deliberations. Mr. Pappas asked what would the Board be okay with regard to size. Mr. DiPietro stated 32-feet by 36-feet would not be a hardship which would decrease the lot coverage. Mr. Kimball also pointed out that the existing garage on the neighbor's property was right on the property line.

With that said, Mr. DiPietro suggested coming out of deliberation if everyone's comfortable and made the motion to exit deliberation.

***Mr. DiPietro made a motion to come out of deliberation. Seconded by Ms. Dross. The Board entered into deliberation at 8:22pm.***



Mr. DiPietro began by informing the applicant that, they have heard their discussion and they can move the vote on the application as presented with these numbers and vote on that or they can try to make it a little better to get it down to a 32-foot by 36-foot garage which could possibly get them enough grants. Mr. Stuart commented that, the other one they granted was a 30-foot by 36-foot which is kind of where he was at with the similar circumstances which they will get a lot more use out of than a 24-foot by 24-foot. Mr. Kimball also believed a 30-foot by 36-foot garage was a lot more reasonable and would require much less encroachment. Mr. Stuart agreed that it was a difficult lot. Mr. Kimball believed that a 24-foot by 24-foot garage was somewhat of a hardship for them which he can respect that. Mr. Kimball went on to say that he believed some amount of relief would be reasonable and they would like to minimize the non-conformance of the lot. Mr. DiPietro commented that, what he is hearing is that the Board would pretty much approve a 30-foot by 36-foot garage. Mr. Kimball asked Ms. Stanley if she would like to amend her application. Ms. Stanley said okay that they could do a 30-foot by 36-foot garage. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote calculated the lot coverage for a 30-foot by 36-foot garage to be 10.6% lot coverage where they are currently at 10%. Mr. DiPietro commented that there would be three (3) Variances and they can say no closer than 12-feet from that one size. Discussion ensued with regard to the amount of relief to be granted. Mr. Kimball believed that 12-feet because that was where the existing garage was located, and they wanted to stay away from the existing water line.

Mr. DiPietro asked if there were any abutters present. None were noted.

***Mr. Kimball made a motion to Grant a Variance to construct a 30-foot by 36-foot garage to be no closer than 12-feet from the side setback for 34 Brookside Drive, Tax Map 25, Lot 14 as presented tonight. Seconded by Ms. Dross. Ms. Dross voted to Grant, Mr. Matte voted to Grant, Mr. Stuart voted to Grant finding all five (5) factors have been met, Mr. Pappas voted to Grant, and Mr. DiPietro also voted to Grant finding all five (5) factors have been met. A vote was taken and, all were in favor and the motion passed.***

***Mr. Pappas made a motion to Grant a Variance to construct a 30-foot by 36-foot garage to be no closer than 40-feet from the front setback for 34 Brookside Drive, Tax Map 25, Lot 14 as presented tonight. Seconded by Mr. Matte. Ms. Dross voted to Grant finding all five (5) factors have been met, Mr. Matte voted to Grant finding all five (5) factors have been met, Mr. Stuart voted to Grant finding all five (5) factors have been met, Mr. Pappas voted to Grant finding all five (5) factors have been met, and Mr. DiPietro also voted to Grant finding all five (5) factors have been met. A vote was taken and, all were in favor and the motion passed.***

***Mr. Kimball made a motion to Grant a Variance to construct a 30-foot by 36-foot garage to allow up to 10.6% lot coverage for 34 Brookside Drive, Tax Map 25, Lot 14 as presented tonight. Seconded by Mr. Pappas. Mr. Pappas voted to Grant, Mr. Matte voted to Deny as he believed the size of the garage was too big for the lot, Ms. Dross voted to Deny as she believed 10.6% was too much, Mr. Stuart voted to Grant finding all five (5) factors have been met, and Mr. DiPietro also voted to Grant finding all five (5) factors have been met. A vote was taken and, the motion passed with a vote of 3 to Grant and 2 to Deny.***

Mr. DiPietro informed the applicant that they prevailed on all three (3) Variance requests and informed them of the 30-day appeal period, and they will work with Mrs. Rouleau-Cote in moving forward. The applicants thanked the Board members and the discussion ended and the applicant exited the meeting.

Mr. DiPietro asked Ms. Royce to read the last case into the minutes. Ms. Royce read the case into the minutes. Mr. DiPietro elevated Mr. Kimball to full voting status for this case.

#### **Case #22-12**

**Ryan Frasca**

**55 Sandy Knoll Drive, Tax Map 5, Lot 2-10**

**Zoned Residential One**

*Applicant is requesting a Variance from Article 5, Section 5.08(1)(b) to allow for the construction of a 24-foot by 28-foot attached garage which will be within the Level 2 wetland buffer in a Residential One zone.*

Mr. Frasca read his application into the record for the minutes. Mr. Frasca indicated that no trees would be removed and that the area where the garage is proposed is currently paved. Ms. Dross asked about the current garage under and asked if it would be closed off. Mr. Frasca said yes that it will be dead space. Mr. Kimball asked how the new garage would sit if the area slopes down. Mr. Frasca explained that when you enter the driveway it slopes down, and the new garage would line up with the basement level and the above level of the garage would line up with the first level of his house. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote pointed out that when you drive in the driveway that you have to turn to go into the garage and with the new garage you would just drive straight into the garage. A brief discussion ensued with regard to the location of the new garage. Mr. Kimball believed by having the garage it would prevent any spills to go into the aquifer. Mr. DiPietro stated that, it looks like it would be 38-feet to that drainage area. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote explained that she did do a site visit and basically, it's a roadside drainage area that comes down along Sandy Knoll and comes onto his property and he has a driveway culvert and then continues on Cohas Drive.

Mr. DiPietro asked if there were any abutters present. Mr. and Mrs. Anthony of Haven Drive stated that they do not have any objection with what Mr. Frasca is proposing.

Mr. Kimball suggested going into deliberations.

***Mr. Kimball made a motion to enter into deliberation. Seconded by Mr. Stuart. The Board entered into deliberation at 8:45pm.***

Mr. Kimball began by saying that from his perspective that he believed it was pretty straight forward and thought that by having a garage there would be a benefit and enclosing it would reduce the impact to the wetland. Ms. Dross agreed with what Mr. Kimball was saying. Mr. Matte added that any spill within the garage would be contained and easily picked up. Mr. DiPietro added that it was not too big of a garage either. Mr. Kimball also noted that Mr. Frasca was not asking to increase impervious coverage or setbacks and believed it was a net benefit to the wetlands.

***Mr. Stuart made a motion to come out of deliberation. Seconded by Mr. Matte. The Board entered into deliberation at 8:46pm.***

Mr. DiPietro asked for a motion to vote on the application.

***Mr. Stuart made a motion to Grant a Variance for a 24-foot by 28-foot garage and that the structure be no closer than 38-feet from the drainage area for 55 Sandy Knoll Drive, Tax Map 8, Lot 25-5 as presented tonight. Seconded by Mr. Kimball. Mr. Kimball voted to Grant finding all five (5) factors have been met, Ms. Dross voted to Grant finding all five (5) factors have been met, Mr. Matte voted to Grant finding all five (5) factors have been met, Mr. Stuart voted to Grant finding all five (5) factors have been met, and Mr. DiPietro also voted to Grant finding all five (5) factors have been met. A vote was taken and, all were in favor and the motion passed.***

Mr. Frasca thanked the Board for their time and the discussion ended and Mr. Frasca exited the meeting.

## **Minutes**

Mr. DiPietro moved on to the approval of the minutes of April 19, 2022. Mr. Stuart had a question regarding the minutes of which Ms. Royce clarified and therefore there were no issues with the minutes of April 19, 2022.

***Mr. Stuart made a motion to approve the minutes of April 19, 2022, seconded by Ms. Dross. A vote was taken and, the motion passed.***

## **New Business/Other Business**

Mr. DiPietro asked if there was any other new business. None were noted at this time. Ms. Royce informed the Board that they have two (2) cases already for June and would possibly have six (6) cases again next month. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote commented that, we've been telling people that the Board will not be meeting in July so we're working on it.

Mr. DiPietro thanked everyone and stated that he would entertain a motion to adjourn.

## **Adjourn**

<p><b><i>Mr. Matte made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Pappas. All were in favor, the motion passed unanimously, and the meeting stood adjourned at 8:53 p.m.</i></b></p>
---

**The next scheduled meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, June 28<sup>th</sup>, 2022 at 7:00pm and will be held at the Town Hall, 47 Chester Road unless otherwise noted on the upcoming Agenda.**