

**UNAPPROVED MINUTES
Town of Auburn
Zoning Board of Adjustment
January 26, 2016**

Present: Mark Wright, Chairman, Elizabeth Robidoux and Jeffrey Benson, Members; Robert Beaurivage, Peggy Neveu and Kevin Stuart, Alternate Members. Minutes recorded by Denise Royce.

Also Present: Carrie Rouleau-Cote, Building Inspector and Jeffrey Porter, Conservation Commission.

Absent: Jim Lagana, Vice Chairman and Mike DiPietro, Member.

Mr. Wright called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and introduced the Board members and explained the rules of procedure for tonight's hearing to those present. Mr. Wright pointed out that Jim Lagana, the Vice-Chairman of the Board as well as Mike DiPietro who is a member of the Board were absent for tonight's hearing.

At this time, Ms. Royce read the first case into the minutes for the record.

**Case #15-22
David & Cara Bronson
82 Nathaniel Way – Map 5, Lot 104-9
Zoned Residential Two
Tabled from November 17, 2015**

Applicant is requesting a Variance to permit a 16 x 20 foot shed to be within 75 feet of a Level One watershed wetland protection buffer in a Residential Two zone. (Article 5, Section 5.08(1)(a))

In the absence of Mr. Lagana and Mr. DiPietro, Mr. Wright elevated both Mr. Beaurivage and Mr. Stuart to full voting members for this case.

Mr. Bronson explained that he had met with the Conservation Commission last month and provided the Board members with photos of the proposed location. Mr. Bronson pointed out the location of where he would like to place the proposed shed on the plot plan presented to the Board members. Mr. Wright asked Mr. Bronson to read his application into the minutes for the record. At this time, Mr. Bronson read his application. Mr. Bronson showed a mortgage plot plan which he stated was provided by the builder at the closing which did not show any wetlands on it. Mr. Bronson further stated that he was never told that there were wetlands on this property prior to purchasing it. Mr. Wright asked when they purchased the home. Mr. Bronson stated September 2015.

Mr. Wright asked Mrs. Rouleau-Cote, the Building Inspector if she had anything to add or comment on this case before he asks the Conservation Commission. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote pointed out that because this was a cluster subdivision and with a structure this say that the applicant would need to maintain 60 feet from structures on abutting properties because there are no sideline setbacks so they would need to maintain 60 feet from structure to structure. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote also pointed out that there are protective covenants associated with this subdivision but that the Town of Auburn does not enforce those. Mr. Wright asked what the distance was from the abutting property to the proposed shed. Mr. Bronson stated that there would be 92 feet from the abutting foundation to the proposed shed.

Mr. Wright asked Mr. Porter, Conservation Commission Chairman if he had any questions or comments to add. Mr. Porter stated that the original plan for the subdivision was already granted a reduction to the Level One wetlands down to 75 feet with the understanding that no encroachment into the 75 foot wetland buffer would occur. The Conservation Commission has had some discussion with the applicant to either reduce the size of the shed or relocating the shed and the vote was pretty unanimous and that the Conservation Commission is not in support of this location. It was reiterated that the Conservation Commission suggested that they reduce the size of the shed or relocate the shed.

Mr. Stuart asked Mr. Bronson why the shed could not be moved. Mr. Bronson pointed out that there was a fairly steep hill which is shown in the photos that he submitted to the Board members. At this time, the Board reviewed the photos. Discussion ensued with regard to the difficulty in relocating the proposed shed. Mr. Bronson stated that he could put it in another location but he would have to remove trees but would still be somewhat in the wetland buffer. Mr. Wright asked Mr. Bronson if he would be 52 feet to the wetland from where the proposed shed would be as depicted on the plan but within the 75 foot wetland buffer. Mr. Bronson said yes. Mr. Benson pointed out that in Mr. Bronson's application that he indicated that the shed would only be partially in the wetland buffer. Mr. Bronson stated that he was not quite sure but believed it was from the confusion with regard to the plot plan that he received from the builder and then received the plot plan showing the wetland buffer. A brief discussion ensued with regard to the proposed shed location being completely within the wetland setback. Mr. Wright asked about the size being 16 x 20 feet was a fairly large shed and asked what would be placed inside the shed. Mr. Bronson indicated that there would be patio furniture, snowmobile, snow blower, various garden tools, kids' bikes, generator and ladders. Mr. Beaurivage asked Mr. Bronson if reducing the size of the shed was an option. Mr. Bronson stated that he could but the ideal size would be a 16 by 20 foot shed but if it was not feasible then he would have to do something smaller but everything that he would be putting into the shed is taking up half of his garage right now.

Mr. Wright asked Mr. Bronson why he angled the shed like he did and if he kept it in the same dimensions and turned it and gained 8 or 10 feet would that be possible. Mr. Bronson said that he could do that. Mr. Wright asked what he would gain by moving it

further away. Mr. Bronson stated that if he did that then it may still possibly be right at the line or possibly a foot over the line. Mr. Bronson talked about the location and putting a 16 foot front on it and that the location would be covered by the trees.

Mr. Wright asked if there were any abutters or interested parties present. None were noted.

Mr. Wright talked the ZBA granting minimum relief which is what the Board looks at for granting variances from the requirements of our ordinance. The options are to move it, excavate or cut trees down which is what the applicant does not want to do or he would not be before the Board tonight. The other option is to shorten it by making the square footage of the shed smaller or reposition it and moving it assuming that when the Board goes through the factors and the applicant has met them.

At this time, Mr. Wright asked the Board members if they had any other ideas on how the Board should be looking at this before the Board discuss' the merits of this case. Mr. Stuart asked about rotating the shed. Mr. Porter commented that the plan the Conservation Commission had seen showed the shed partially in the wetlands because there was already a 75 foot wetland setback that had previously been reduced when Mr. Lamphere owned the property. Mr. Porter indicated that the shed design has obviously changed now since this plan shows the shed totally in the wetland buffer. Mr. Porter further indicated that even if the 16 by 24 foot shed was partially in the wetland buffer that the Conservation Commission could not support it and suggested that Mr. Bronson moved the shed location completely out of the Level One wetland buffer or reduce the size of the shed and keeping it in the current location.

Discussion ensued with regard to the location of the propane tank and the well and the slope of the property.

Mr. Bronson asked the Board if he reduced the size of the shed, could he keep it in the same location. Mr. Wright stated no but that he would not require a variance because it would not have to meet side setbacks. Mr. Bronson believed that he could if the shed was 120 square feet or less. Mr. Wright asked Mrs. Rouleau-Cote for clarification and Mrs. Rouleau-Cote explained that even if the shed was 120 square feet or less that he still could not be within the 75 foot wetland buffer but if the shed was 120 square feet or less that he would not be held to the 60 foot setback from structure to structure. Mr. Wright asked Mrs. Rouleau-Cote and Mr. Porter if it surprised them that the applicant was not made aware of the wetland buffer prior to now and that there were no stakes or indication of a wetland buffer. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote pointed out that the certified foundation plot plan showing the wetland buffer was on file as soon as the foundation was poured. Mr. Bronson reiterated that the mortgage plot plan was the only plot plan that was given to him by the builder. Mr. Bronson indicated that the reason they picked this lot was to have the ability to flatten an area out to place a swing set and play area for the kids.

Mr. Wright asked what the pleasure of the Board would be and if they wanted to go into deliberations.

Mr. Stuart moved to go into deliberations, Mrs. Robidoux seconded the motion and the Board entered into deliberations at 7:25pm.

Mr. Wright asked the Board members if there were any thoughts on what is being proposed and how do they feel about the application as presented assuming that the factors have been met. Mr. Benson believed that what was tough here was that there wasn't a hardship here but it sounded like the property owner did not know about the 75 foot wetland setback but that there is an option of moving it up even if it requires additional work to make it work. Mr. Benson did not believe it passes the 5 factors of the hardship because the wetland buffer was already reduced from 125 feet down to 75 feet and to place it 52 feet into the wetland buffer was not an option that would pass the 5 factors for hardship. Mr. Stuart agreed with Mr. Benson and that the Board has heard testimony and seen evidence that the applicant has less intrusive ways to put the shed which may not be exactly what the applicant wants but believes that there are other options to get the shed in a location other than in the wetland buffer that would have less impact. Mr. Stuart also did not believe that it met the hardship criteria. Mr. Beaurivage stated that Mr. Wright pointed out early on that there were other options to make this work and also agreed with Mr. Benson and Mr. Stuart that the applicant should be considering other options because he did not believe that it met the hardship criteria either. Mrs. Neveu also agreed with the other Board members and that it did not satisfy the hardship because the applicant already said that he could do something else. Mrs. Robidoux also agreed with the Board members and did not believe there was a hardship with this application.

Mrs. Robidoux moved to come out of deliberations, Mr. Beaurivage seconded the motion and the Board exited deliberations at 7:29pm.

Mr. Wright explained to Mr. Bronson that he has heard the Board's discussion and the concern of the Board to grant minimal relief and that there are other options in terms of location as well as possibly going with a smaller size shed and that if it was reconfigured or reworked that it might be something that the Board would consider. Mr. Wright also pointed out the concerns from the Conservation Commission which weighs heavily on the Board and the fact that the Conservation Commission is unanimously against the proposed location of the shed. Mr. Wright further explained that the Zoning Board of Adjustment is bound by the ordinance and the subdivision regulations requirements which is a strict interpretation of the ordinance. Mr. Wright did not have anything else to add but to put it up for a vote. Mr. Wright believed the Board would look at it differently had the shed not been totally within the 75 foot wetland buffer. Mr. Wright informed Mr. Bronson to possibly go back and speak to the Conservation Commission to work something out.

Mr. Wright indicated that he would entertain a motion to vote on the application as submitted. Mr. Wright also asked the Board members that if they were to deny that they state which factor that the applicant did not satisfy.

Mrs. Robidoux made a motion to vote on the application as presented, Mr. Stuart seconded the motion. Mrs. Robidoux voted to deny as he did not meet the hardship criteria, Mr. Beaurivage voted to deny as it failed to meet the hardship criteria, Mr. Benson voted to deny because it did not meet the hardship criteria, Mr. Stuart voted to deny because he did not believe it met the literal enforcement as well as it was not consistent with the spirit of the Zoning Ordinance, and Mr. Wright also voted to deny because it did not meet the literal enforcement as well as it was not consistent with the spirit of the Zoning Ordinance. All voted to Deny and the motion did not pass and therefore the request has been DENIED.

Mr. Wright explained to Mr. Bronson that he had 30 days to request a rehearing of their decision and that typically in order to request a rehearing that they Board would be looking for different facts and circumstances but if you were to move things around and change things then a new application would be needed to be filed.

At this time, Mr. Bronson exited the meeting and the discussion ended.

Case #16-01

Sean & Janet Johnson

16 Jennifer Lane – Map 12, Lot 19-14

Zoned Residential One

Applicant is requesting a Variance to allow a 16 x 24 foot shed to be within the 30 foot side setback in a Residential One zone. (Article 4, Section 4.06(6))

Mr. Wright elevated both Mrs. Neveu and Mr. Beaurivage for this case.

Mr. Johnson began by saying that he was before the Board two (2) months ago and that they were applying for the same application as before to keep the shed within the 30 foot setback. Mr. Johnson stated that they did not appeal it at the time because they understood the Zoning Board's decision on that and so they looked for a way to move it or approve it. While doing so, they ran into some issues and Mr. Johnson stated that he had Mrs. Rouleau-Cote, the Building Inspector out there several times. At this time, Mr. Bronson passed out packages to each Board member for review which included photos of the area and issues that occurred while attempting to relocate the shed. The Board reviewed the packets provided to them and reviewed the photos. Mr. Johnson pointed out that they came across a stump dump while digging. Mr. Johnson also pointed out the areas that were wet.

Mr. Johnson read his application into the minutes for the record. Mr. Johnson stated that he has had a number of experts and engineers come in and take a look at the back

of their property and that they at a loss at how to deal with the amount of water in the back yard because the water has nowhere to go but to sit at the low part of the yard.

Mr. Wright asked about the old shed. Mr. Johnson said that it was there when they purchased the house. Mr. Wright asked what happened to it. Mr. Johnson stated that it had basically rotted and that the roof had collapsed in the previous winter and the reason they went with the bigger shed was because they have 3 boys and the amount of bicycles, sporting equipment and lawn care materials and basically the lack of storage. Mr. Wright asked how close the abutter was from behind the shed. Mr. Wright and the Board members reviewed the photo showing the distance from the shed to the abutter's house. Discussion ensued with regard to the dimensions of the old shed which was an 8 by 16 foot shed placed in the exact location.

Mrs. Robidoux asked Mr. Johnson if this was the same position of the shed as the last hearing. Mr. Johnson said yes and that he is just trying to prove hardship to move it anywhere else. Mr. Bronson also indicated that while doing some excavating that they hit a vein of water and the hole just filled up with water.

Mr. Wright asked if the abutter was present. Ms. Koufopolos commented that the prior shed was an 8 by 8 foot shed. Ms. Koufopolos also stated that Mr. Johnson was informed numerous times about cutting trees on her property behind the shed and about the parking of vehicles around the shed. Ms. Koufopolos also stated that they had also cleared a trail on her property behind her pool to head to the other neighbors land and to be able to head over to Tower Hill Pond. Ms. Koufopolos specifically asked Mr. Johnson to not use that and that just this past weekend there was a four wheeler that went through there. Mr. Wright explained to Ms. Koufopolos that with regard to the trespassing issue that she should notify the authorities when it occurs. Ms. Koufopolos understood and indicated that she would. Ms. Koufopolos was concerned with the size of the shed which was 18 feet tall and 16 by 24 feet and feels that 2 feet or 10 feet was too close.

Mr. Wright spoke to Mr. Johnson and pointed out that Mr. Johnson has heard the abutter's testimony and would allow him to respond if it had to do with the case at hand. Mr. Johnson commented that the shed was an 8 by 16 foot shed and that he did have photos. Mr. Johnson also stated that there was no clear distinction of where the property line goes because there was no granite bound because either the previous owner buried it or removed it. Mr. Johnson also stated that the parking of cars was done by the previous owner. Mr. Wright asked Mr. Johnson how close the shed was to the property line. Mr. Johnson stated that the shed was two (2) feet from the property line. Mr. Wright asked Mr. Johnson if he was able to walk around the shed without encroaching on the abutter's property. Mr. Johnson said that two (2) feet did not leave you much room to do that.

Mrs. Purcell who lives across the street stated that she was present tonight in support of allowing the shed to remain in its existing location.

Mr. Wright asked if there were any other questions or comments. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote commented that relative to the former building that any shed 120 square feet or less could be placed on the property line. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote also informed the Board that when the current shed was built that it actually encroached over the property located on the abutter's property but that it has since been moved to be on Mr. Johnson's property and no longer on the abutter's property. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote also pointed out that since the last hearing that she has been out with Mr. Johnson several times to view the conditions of his property and try to work with him to try to find another location and indicated that there were challenges with the property. Mr. Wright asked when it was moved off the abutter's property. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote stated that it was moved prior to the first hearing. Mr. Wright asked how difficult it was to move the shed. Mr. Johnson stated that at that time it was just rolling it forward off the footings and explained how he did it. Mr. Wright asked Mr. Johnson how far he could move it away from the property line and still maintain the integrity of not dealing with water, runoff and the slope. Mr. Johnson stated that the further they move it forward then they would be dealing with the hillside. A brief discussion ensued with regard to the location.

Mr. Beaurivage asked Mr. Johnson if the shed was on footings where it sits currently. Mr. Johnson said yes temporary footings. Mr. Beaurivage asked if it would be reasonable to move it 5 or 10 feet away from the property line and closer to the house. Mr. Johnson stated that he would then be going into the hillside and the slope of the land. The Board discussed a reasonable location to move the shed. Mr. Stuart asked Mr. Johnson if it was his intention to put in permanent footings. Mr. Johnson explained that he would keep the temporary footings and keep shimmying it if it keeps sinking but the majority of the weight is being carried by the back footings. Mr. Benson asked if Mr. Johnson were to move it forward and flip it 90 degrees. Mr. Johnson stated that it still would not make a difference. Discussion ensued with regard to the difficulties of moving the shed. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote commented on Mr. Benson's suggestion of moving the shed forward and turning it 90 degrees and that 10 feet was certainly better than 2 feet.

Mr. Wright asked the Board members if they had any more questions for the applicant. Mr. Beaurivage asked about maintenance work on the shed in the future and that he believed that it should be a minimum of 5 to 6 feet was more reasonable than 2 feet which was pretty tight. Mr. Wright explained that granting relief up to a certain point and say that the Board could give a variance and can be no closer than 5 feet, 8 feet or 10 feet and they can devise that and they the applicant could go back and try to make it work. Then the applicant would have a decision that would at least give him parameters so that he wasn't moving things around and coming back and not knowing what would be acceptable.

Mr. Stuart asked Mr. Johnson if the application today was the same application that was previously submitted. Mr. Johnson stated that he was basically trying to prove hardship because it was the issue why it was denied the first time.

Mrs. Robidoux moved to go into deliberations, Mrs. Neveu seconded the motion and the Board entered into deliberations at 8:22pm.

Mrs. Robidoux understands that there may be hardship with this but her main concern is that this is the same application that was denied previously and did not believe that the Board had the authority to revisit an application like that. Mrs. Robidoux believed that they could during an appeal period but that they are outside the appeal period and by law she did not believe they could revisit an application. Mrs. Robidoux cited Fisher v. Dover. Mrs. Robidoux believed that the circumstances needed to be different. Mr. Beaurivage talked about the applicant attempting to relocate the shed so an attempt was made. Mr. Stuart agreed with Mrs. Robidoux that no change from the first application but that they have heard more evidence on the hardship but did not believe that there was a material change in the application. Mr. Stuart stated that it could be a foot difference and that the Board has heard testimony that it can be moved. Mr. Stuart believed there were things that could be done with this and did not believe this application met the criteria and agreed with Mrs. Robidoux. Mr. Benson agreed with Mrs. Robidoux as well and believed there were options available and that the application was denied the last time. Mr. Benson stated that he has read the minutes and believed that the hardship was self-made by building it. Mr. Benson agreed that they were talking about the same issues with no options of moving it elsewhere. Mr. Benson added that there are things to be done but would be more difficult. Mr. Wright asked Mr. Beaurivage if he completed his thoughts and comments. Mr. Beaurivage stated that he is still looking at what this gentleman is attempting to do and that it is clearly demonstrated by the photographs that the issues with the soil conditions and the very wet area that he is dealing with. Mr. Wright commented that he understands what Mrs. Robidoux and Mr. Stuart is saying but he's trying to approach it a little bit differently and believed this was a new application and has read through the minutes. Mr. Wright heard that the applicant has stated that he can move it but is looking for the Board to tell him how many feet before he goes any further in spending more money. Mr. Wright pointed out that he believed it was a different application for two reasons of which were that the evidence to support the application appears to be different and additional and the testimony of the applicant appears to suggest that whatever it is that the Board granted that they would have to go and figure a way on how to do it. Basically, Mr. Wright further pointed out the concerns from the abutter with regard to being able to walk around the shed without trespassing onto the abutter's property is a concern. Mr. Wright stated that he would be uncomfortable granting the shed to be 2 feet away knowing that there is this concern. Mr. Wright stated that his view is that he would be more comfortable having more space and moving 5 or 8 feet forward would be better. Mrs. Neveu added that she understands what Mrs. Robidoux was saying and agreed with Mr. Wright that 2 feet does bother her as well and that if it was moved 5 feet more would be more comfortable. Mr. Wright believed that by adding 8 feet to the 2 feet would give it 10 feet off the property line. Mrs. Robidoux added that if it was a rehearing request and that this evidence was presented in a rehearing that she would have felt more comfortable hearing this case. Mr. Wright asked the Board that if the applicant was to amend his application to request 8 feet would she feel more comfortable. Mrs. Robidoux said yes. A brief discussion ensued with if the applicant were to amend his

application. The Board had a concern because it would be changing what was noticed. A discussion ensued with regard to the fact that no dimensions were requested that it would be placed upon the Board members to decide how much.

Mrs. Robidoux moved to come out of deliberations, Mrs. Neveu seconded the motion and the Board exited deliberations at 8:41pm.

Mr. Wright explained to the applicant and everyone present that they have heard the Board's deliberation and concerns and that they have heard how the Board is trying to address some of those concerns and still apply this in a reasonable manner. Whether or not the Board decides to grant it with some additional relief or not will be decided.

At this time, Mr. Wright asked the Board members if they had anything else to add and if not that he would entertain a creative motion from anyone.

Ms. Koufopolos stated that she did not want them that close to her property and that the requirements were 30 feet. She would not be happy with 8 feet but would be okay with 10 or 15 feet and she was worried about vehicles. Mr. Beaurivage asked Ms. Koufopolos if she's indicated that she would not be happy with anything less than 10 feet. Ms. Koufopolos said that she would like to see at least 10 to 15 feet if it's not too difficult for the hardship for the extra 5 feet. The Board did not believe there was space enough for 15 feet. Mr. Beaurivage asked Mr. Johnson if he could move it 10 feet which would be 8 more feet forward. Mr. Johnson said that it probably could be done but was not sure. Where they placed the shed looked like it fit and wasn't in the middle of the property. Mrs. Neveu asked if 8 feet would be better. Mr. Johnson said yes but the less the better because they are on precast footings. Mr. Beaurivage informed Mr. Johnson that he believed the Board was aware of the fact that when Mr. Johnson goes to move the shed that he could come across issues that may prevent him from moving it forward and that the Board is trying to be reasonable for both the abutter and the Mr. Johnson. Mr. Wright believed that every foot mattered for both parties and believed that it was important to not be trespassing and to have enough space to get around the back of the shed within a reasonable area so as to not trespass onto the abutters property. A brief discussion ensued with regard to if a permit had been pulled prior to placing the structure then things would have been different.

Mrs. Robidoux made a motion to grant a variance for Tax Map 12, Lot 19-14, to allow a 16 by 24 foot shed to be located no closer than 8 feet to the side property line, Mrs. Neveu seconded the motion. Mrs. Robidoux voted to Grant, Mrs. Neveu voted to Grant, Mr. Beaurivage voted to Grant, Mr. Benson voted to Grant, and Mr. Wright also voted to Grant. All were in favor, and the motion passed in the affirmative.

Mr. Wright informed the applicant that he would get a copy of the Board's decision. Mr. Wright further added that there was a 30 day appeal period. Mr. Wright thanked everyone and the discussion ended.

Case #16-02
Kimberly St. Denis
Keith Babb & Lisa Ann Lemay (Property Owners)
528 Manchester Road – Map 25, Lot 11
Zoned Residential One

Applicant is requesting a Special Exception to permit a home shop (hair salon/one chair) in a Residential One zone. (Article 4, Section 4.06(6)(3)(c))

Ms. St. Denis presented Mr. Wright a letter from the property owner. Mr. Wright pointed out that the Board was in receipt of a letter from the property owner allowing Ms. St. Denis to appear before the Zoning Board of Adjustment.

Mr. Wright elevated Mr. Stuart and Mrs. Neveu to fulling voting status for this case.

Mr. Wright asked Ms. St. Denis to go through her application. Ms. St. Denis read her application into the minutes for the record.

Mr. Wright asked if there were any abutters present. Mr. and Mrs. Upham were present and stated that they were present tonight in support of what Ms. St. Denis was proposing.

Mrs. Robidoux asked about getting an updated septic system. Ms. St. Denis stated that she has had a conversation with Mrs. Rouleau-Cote about that and was unaware that there was no septic system design on file. Ms. St. Denis asked if they would be allowed to keep the existing septic system or would they need to put in a new septic system. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote commented that a new septic system because the State of New Hampshire would require a new system. Mrs. Robidoux asked if they had town water at this location. Ms. St. Denis said yes.

Mr. Benson asked the applicant if she would be placing a sign. Ms. St. Denis indicated that she would be keeping it very small and by appointment only and probably a small sign. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote pointed out that the ordinance does allow a 4 square foot sign for a home occupation.

Mr. Wright stated that he did not have any questions. Mr. Stuart asked if it was for only one chair. Ms. St. Denis said yes.

Mrs. Robidoux made a motion to vote on the application as presented for Tax Map 25, Lot 11 with the conditions that the applicant obtains an approved septic plan with the State of New Hampshire and install it; and, a permit for the sign, seconded by Mrs. Neveu. Mrs. Robidoux voted to Grant, Mrs. Neveu voted to Grant, Mr. Benson voted to Grant, Mr. Stuart voted to Grant and Mr. Wright also voted to Grant. All were in favor and the motion passed in the affirmative.

Other Business

Mr. Wright asked the Board if there was any new business. None were noted.

Minutes

Mrs. Robidoux made a motion to accept the minutes of November 17, 2016 as written, seconded by Mr. Stuart. All were in favor with Mr. Wright abstaining, and the motion passed.

Adjourn

Mrs. Robidoux made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Stuart. All were in favor, the motion passed unanimously and the meeting stood adjourned at 9:05 p.m.

The next ZBA Hearing is scheduled for February 23, 2016 at 7:00 pm and will be held at the Town Hall, 47 Chester Road.