

APPROVED

ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MEETING

March 8, 2021

Chairman Bill Kearney called the meeting to order at approximately 7:00 pm.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Acting Secretary Dave Hennessey called roll:

PRESENT ROLL CALL:

Bill Kearney – Present
David Hennessey – Present
Matthew Hopkinson – Present
Peter McNamara – Present
Jim Bergeron – Present
Alternate John Westwood – Present
Alternate David Wing – Present
Alternate Jeff Caira – Present
Planning/Zoning Administrator Jennifer Beauregard – Present

ABSENT/NOT PARTICIPATING: Alternate Karen Plumley

The following notice was read aloud "A Checklist To Ensure Meetings Are Compliant With The Right-to-Know Law During The State Of Emergency" (*regarding access to the meeting*)

Mr. Kearney explained the Board's role and hearing procedure.

MINUTES

January 11, 2021 Re-Review

MOTION: (Hennessey/McNamara) To rescind approval of the January 11, 2021 minutes and reapprove them as originally copied.

VOTE: (5-0-0) The motion carried.

February 8, 2021

MOTION: (McNamara/Hennessey) To approve the February 8, 2021 meeting minutes as amended.

VOTE: (5-0-0) The motion carried.

February 18, 2021

MOTION: (McNamara/Hopkinson) To approve the February 18, 2021 meeting minutes as amended.

VOTE: (5-0-0) The motion carried.

NON-PUBLIC SESSION

MOTION: (McNamara/Hopkinson) Request for a non-public session per RSA 91-A:3, II, 1 (consideration of legal advice or council).

ROLL CALL VOTE: Mr. Hennessey – Yes
Mr. McNamara – Yes
Mr. Kearney – Yes
Mr. Hopkinson – Yes
Mr. Bergeron – Yes

Mr. Kearney noted that when the Board returned, after the non-public session, the Board would move forward with the meeting. The Board entered into a non-public session at approximately 7:10 pm.

MOTION: (McNamara/Hennessey) To leave the non-public session.

ROLL CALL VOTE: Mr. Hennessey – Yes
Mr. McNamara – Yes
Mr. Kearney – Yes
Mr. Hopkinson – Yes
Mr. Bergeron – Yes

The Board returned to public session at approximately 9:03 pm.

MOTION: (McNamara/Hennessey) To indefinitely seal the minutes of the non-public session.

ROLL CALL VOTE: Mr. Hennessey – Yes
Mr. McNamara – Yes
Mr. Kearney – Yes
Mr. Hopkinson – Yes
Mr. Wing – Yes

REQUEST FOR REHEARINGS**CASE #ZO2021-00002**

Map 31 Lot 11-22

BILAPKA, Bruce & PAGE, Andrea – 49 Woekel Circle – Seeking a Variance to Article III, Sections 307-8, 307-12, Table 1, and 307-13 of the Zoning Ordinance to permit an upgrade to and expansion of an existing 2-bedroom home on an undersized lot with no frontage on a public way and inadequate front and side yard setbacks. The Board voted to APPROVE the Variance. RSA 677:2 Motion for Rehearing requested by John F. Bisson, Cronin, Bisson & Zalinsky P.C. on behalf of Charles Smith & Robert Habeeb, 36 Woekel Circle, Map 31 Lot 11-279.

Mr. McNamara stated that he believed that the Board made the correct decision to grant the applicant a variance given all of the facts presented. He noted that it was his opinion that they needed to rehear the case, as they normally go through all five criteria thoroughly. He felt that it was necessary to rehear the case to have proper documentation for approving or denying a variance. From what he understood, most of the complaints from the request for rehearing are regarding disputed borders, which is not something the Board takes into consideration.

Mr. Kearney agreed with Mr. McNamara. He stated that while he felt the Board made the correct decision, they did not follow the proper protocol, so the case should be reheard.

Case #ZO2021-00002

MOTION: (McNamara/Hopkinson) To rehear Case #ZO2021-00002.

ROLL CALL VOTE: Mr. Hennessey – Yes
 Mr. McNamara – Yes
 Mr. Kearney – Yes
 Mr. Hopkinson – Yes
 Mr. Bergeron – No

(4-1-0) The motion passed.

The case will NOT stand and WILL be reheard.

CASE #ZO2021-00001

Map 22 Lot 8-85

GENDRON, Patrick & Kim – Seeking a Variance to Article III, Sections 307-7, 307-9 & 307-12 (B), (D), & Table 1, Article IV, Section and Article V, Section 307-18 of the Zoning Ordinance to permit a Workforce Housing Development in the B-5 Zone. The Board voted to DENY the Variance. RSA 677:2 Motion for Rehearing requested by David M. Groff, Esquire on behalf of Patrick Gendron, 579 Bridge Street, Map 31 Lot 11-22.

Mr. McNamara read aloud from RSA 672:1, III-e: *“All citizens of the state benefit from a balanced supply of housing which is affordable to persons and families of low and moderate-income. Establishment of housing that is decent, safe, sanitary, and affordable to low and moderate income persons and families is in the best interests of each community and the state of New Hampshire, and serves a vital public need. Opportunity for development of such housing shall not be prohibited or unreasonably discouraged by use of municipal planning and zoning powers or by unreasonable interpretation of such powers.”*

Mr. Bergeron recused himself. Mr. Kearney appointed Mr. Wing to vote in place of Mr. Bergeron.

MOTION: (McNamara/Hopkinson) To adopt the position that the ZBA interprets the Zoning Ordinance that such a workforce housing use is allowed in all districts that permit residential use, including multi-family and accessory dwelling use. This interpretation is made in recognition of the Town's statutory obligation under RSA 674:59 to "provide reasonable and realistic opportunities for the development of workforce housing. This interpretation will hold and remain in place until the Town adopts a zoning ordinance amendment that once again addresses workforce housing.

ROLL CALL VOTE: Mr. Hennessey – yes
Mr. McNamara – yes
Mr. Kearney – yes
Mr. Hopkinson – yes
Mr. Wing – yes

(5-0-0) The motion carried.

Mr. Hennessey stated that the lack of the words “workforce housing” does not mean that the Town forbids or prevents workforce housing. He asserted that workforce housing is allowed in the form of multi-family units and accessory dwelling units in all residential areas. He reiterated that it was not true that the Town prohibits workforce housing. He believed that the decision they made to deny the applicant was the correct decision as he did not feel an adequate case was made to show a hardship, which was the only criteria not met. He would not vote in favor of a rehearing.

Mr. McNamara stated that he did believe the applicant made a case for a hardship. He did not think that the applicant had presented anything new to warrant a rehearing. He believed that most of the additional information was a repetition of what was brought up during the meeting. He would not vote for a rehearing.

Mr. Hopkinson stated that he agreed with Mr. Hennessey and Mr. McNamara. He believed it would be a rehashing of everything already stated as nothing new had been brought forth. He would not vote for a rehearing.

Mr. Wing asserted that he would not support a rehearing. He stated that he did not see any new information presented, only a summation of the previous request for a variance.

Mr. Kearney stated that the Board needed to set a deadline for when information can be turned in. The applicant had sent information to the Board late in the afternoon before the meeting, not leaving ample time for the Board members to absorb the information. Ms. Beauregard agreed. Mr. Kearney asserted that he believed the Board made the appropriate decision and that the applicant had not presented sufficient information on a hardship. He was not in favor of rehearing the case.

Case #ZO2021-00001

ROLL CALL VOTE: Mr. Hennessey – no
Mr. McNamara – no
Mr. Kearney – no
Mr. Hopkinson – no
Mr. Wing – no

(0-5-0) The motion failed.

The case WILL stand and WILL NOT be reheard.

HEARING(S)

CASE #ZO2021-00009
Map 8 Lot 9-69-36

MONTANARO, James & Shelley – 62 Arlene Drive – Seeking a Special Exception to Article XII, Section 307-74 of the Zoning Ordinance to permit the addition of an Accessory Dwelling Unit attached to a Single-Family Home

Mr. Hopkinson read the list of abutters aloud. There were no persons present who asserted standing in the case, who did not have their name read, or who had difficulty with notification.

Ms. Shelley Montanaro came forward to discuss the case. She informed that her daughter and son-in-law were moving to Town from Connecticut, and she wanted to downsize by adding an ADU to her lot. She informed that they had lived here for 4.5 years and loved it so far.

Mr. Hennessey stated that he thought they should advise applicants not to refer to family members in ADU cases. He informed that previously, the law stated that relatives had to live in the units, but that is no longer the case. He did not want the record to be seen as showing that the Board is approving these because someone is a family member rather than meeting all the criteria. He wanted to make it clear that these were not in-law apartments; they are accessory dwelling units.

Mr. Kearney stated that this is a pretty clear and simple case for them; either the criteria are met or not met.

Mr. Kearney opened the discussion to the Public. No one came forward.

Mr. Kearney asked Ms. Beauregard if the applicant had met all the criteria. She replied that they did.

Case #ZO2021-00009

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Mr. Hennessey – yes
Mr. McNamara – yes
Mr. Kearney – yes
Mr. Hopkinson – yes
Mr. Bergeron – yes

(5-0-0) The motion passed.

Mr. Kearny explained that there is a 30 day right to appeal.

SPECIAL EXCEPTION GRANTED.

CASE #ZO2021-00007

Map 37 Lot 10-373

TUCARELLA, Nicholas & Ashley – 124 Dutton Road– Seeking a Special Exception to Article III, Sections 307-18 & 76 of the Zoning Ordinance to permit outside storage of forms and lumber on property as a General Home Occupation in the Residential District.

Mr. John Bisson came forward via telecommunication to represent the applicants.

Mr. Hopkinson read the list of abutters aloud. Mr. Jeff Costura of 111 Dutton Road came forward as he was unsure if he was an abutter. Ms. Beauregard explained that she would need to verify if he was within 200' of the property. Mr. Bergeron stated that the State statutory requirements did not have linear requirements; abutters are seen as those who are across the street or directly touching the property. Ms.

Beauregard explained that it was a local requirement, as it enables them to notify more abutters rather than fewer.

The Board took a ten-minute recess so that Ms. Beauregard could verify if Mr. Costura were an abutter. Ms. Beauregard provided the tax map showing that Mr. Costura is not a direct abutter, as he was not directly across the street. Ms. Beauregard clarified that the applicant was on an entirely different map from the applicant. She also explained that the applicants were the ones who provide the list of abutters.

Mr. Bisson informed that the property is a little over 12 acres in size located in the residential Zone. He stated that the applicants were looking for a special exception to allow an area of outside storage on their property. The area of storage they are proposing is approximately 1500 square feet in size. He stated that there was significant buffering due to the property's size, and a vast majority of abutters would not see the storage area. He believed that the applicant had taken appropriate steps to minimize the impact on neighbors, including planting landscaping and building a fence for shielding.

Mr. Kearney asked Mr. Bisson to go through the special exception requirements.

1. The proposed use is consistent with the purpose and intent of the district within which it is proposed to be located.

Mr. Bisson stated that home occupations are permitted by special exception in the Residential district. He asserted that it was consistent with the district because it allows for storage areas as long as the remaining criteria are established.

2. The proposed use is compatible with the character of the surrounding neighborhood.

Mr. Bisson explained that because the property is so large, it has thorough screening from the neighbors. He stated that it is not an occupation that will be attracting visitors, retail, or parking. He stated that they are only looking for an area for the storage of wood and forms used in the applicant's business off-site.

3. The exterior of buildings and grounds shall be maintained in a manner compatible with the residential character of the district.

Mr. Bisson believed that installing the stockage fence in conjunction with the large growing plants would be consistent with the residential neighborhood. He stated that the property was very large, so that it was its own buffer. He explained that the storage area would account for less than 1% of the overall property. He added that there would be no additional buildings for the storage of the materials, so the applicant would only need to maintain the appearance of the stored materials.

4. The occupation is clearly secondary and subordinate to the primary residential use and shall not change the residential character of the neighborhood.

Mr. Bisson asserted that it was a home first and that this area was only for storage of some additional items from the business. He explained that there would be no activity on the property except for the delivery and removal of the materials.

5. It shall not consume more than 49% of the gross residential living space including accessory structures and shall not change the residential character of the property.

Mr. Bisson stated that the storage area does not use any living space as it is all outside and is a small portion of the lot.

6. There will be no more than two on-site non-resident employees.

Mr. Bisson informed that there would be no employees on the site.

7. Home occupation is not permitted in a duplex or multi-family dwelling.

Mr. Bisson informed that it is not a duplex or multi-family dwelling, so this was not applicable.

8. One sign which advertises the business is permitted.

Mr. Bisson stated there would be no signage at the property.

9. All outdoor storage shall be screened from neighboring view.

Mr. Bisson believed that the photos provided to the Board showed the efforts that had been made to shield neighbors from view. He stated that the criteria recognizes that outside storage is appropriate and believed that this was the case.

10. The use is not objectionable, noxious, or injurious by reasons of the production of emission of odor, smoke, refuse matter, fumes, noise, vibration, heat, or excessive illumination.

Mr. Bisson stated that it was simply storage and no activity would happen on the property.

11. A maximum of two registered vehicles related to the business may be kept in view and other equipment must be garaged or screened from neighboring view.

Mr. Bisson informed that commercial vehicles would not be stored on the property, save for what was depicted in the provided photographs. He stated that no commercial vehicles used for operation on the road would be stored there.

12. Delivery of goods and materials is limited to vehicles customarily associated with residential deliveries.

Mr. Bisson stated that the equipment would be transported back and forth to the property by trucks used in the concrete business to move the material. He asserted that this would be consistent with large pickup trucks.

13. Off-street customer parking must be provided.

Mr. Bisson asserted that there would be no customer parking as customers would not be going to the residence.

14. No retail sales other than those that are incidental to and customarily associated with business use.

Mr. Bisson informed that there would be no retail sales, only storage.

15. An accessory structure built or converted for home occupation purposes shall be a size, style and type that is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood and capable of reversion to uses that are customarily accessory to residential.

Mr. Bisson stated that no accessory structures would be built.

16. The general home occupation shall be result in an increase of the amount of wastewater to be discharged.

Mr. Bisson stated that there would be limited storage material that would have no impact on wastewater.

Mr. Kearney explained that if all the special exception criteria are met, they will vote in favor. If not, they would not vote in favor of the special exception.

Mr. Kearney opened the discussion up to the Public.

Mr. Rich Romeo of 118 Dutton Road came forward to speak in opposition of the special exception. He shared photographs from his house of the applicant's yard and what he can see from his home. He informed that the applicant has made some efforts to be less disruptive with his activity but does not think this would be good for his property or his property's resale value. He informed that the applicant keeps many of the forms right on the edge of his property near Mr. Romeo's property. Mr. Romeo stated that the applicant has been quieter but often will load forms at 5:00-6:00 in the morning all days of the week, including weekends. Mr. Romeo did not think this special exception should be granted.

Mr. McNamara asked how far away Mr. Romeo's home is from the storage area. Mr. Romeo replied that his house was about 80 feet away from the storage area. Mr. McNamara asked Mr. Romeo to describe what was in the photograph that he passed around to the Board. Mr. Romeo informed that it was a boom truck that he uses to pick up steel baskets of forms. He stated that trucks come in all the time to pick up forms and make considerable noise while doing so. Mr. McNamara asked what type of trucks typically go in. Mr. Romeo replied that pickup trucks would come in and that the applicant had some kind of boom truck that he tried to learn how to drive in his driveway. Mr. McNamara asked what the frequency of the trucks coming and going was. Mr. Romeo stated that the trucks typically come in the morning, but he does not monitor what his neighbor does.

Mr. Ed Ascolillio of 122 Dutton Road came forward to speak in opposition of the special exception. He informed that he was a direct abutter to the property. He also passed around photographs to the Board that showed 60' boom lifts that have the potential to fall into his property. He stated that people often speed in front of his house and is worried about accidents happening with the large trucks that enter and exit the property. Mr. Ascolillio informed that there are byproducts that come with concrete forms that leach into his yard. He reported that he is only ten feet from the storage area.

Ms. Kathy Romeo of 118 Dutton Road came forward to speak. She noted that Mr. Bisson said it was occasional trucks entering the property, but at times trucks come and go all day. She informed that there are normally more than two people there performing this work. She stated that it is very loud and that the language among the construction workers gets colorful. She stated that it is very disruptive and feels like a business is being done in her backyard. Mr. Kearney asked how long the workers were typically there. She replied that the workers were there loading and unloading for about an hour. She stated that they are constantly backing up box trucks, so the constant beeping is very disruptive for a residential area.

Mr. Ron Smith of 116 Dutton Road came forward to speak in opposition of the special exception. He informed that he is a direct abutter that sits directly behind the applicant's property. He asserted that he looks right into the storage area and that there is no screening. He informed that headlights shine into his bedroom window all the time. He noted that he has horses in his backyard about 200-300 feet from the storage area that often get riled up from the noise on the applicant's property. He stated that the applicant keeps at least two large commercial vehicles in the yard. Mr. Smith informed that he works in

construction and the last thing he wants is to be woken up by construction in his backyard first thing in the morning on the weekends. He felt that this was a satellite company that is convenient for him to work at. He stated that the chemicals that get sprayed on the forms wash into the watershed and potentially into the aquifer. He did not feel that this should be happening in a residential area.

Mr. Jeffrey Costura of 111 Dutton Road came forward to speak in opposition. He stated he felt that there was too narrow of an interpretation of what constitutes as an abutter. He stated that he wanted to preserve his right to appeal this case if it were to be approved. He informed that he shared the same concerns as Mr. Smith regarding the noise and chemicals. He asked the attorney what he would consider the definition of noxious in terms of chemical runoff. He stated that the Board should consider that. He stated that he was a free marketeer and did not want to interfere with someone's rightful use of their property but did not want to see any water pollution.

Mr. Paul Martin of 6 Leblanc Road came forward via telecommunication to speak in opposition of the special exception. He stated he opposed the proposal 100% and did not want a construction site in his backyard. He informed that there is constantly loud banging and noise coming from the property that starts in the early morning every day.

Mr. Kearney closed the discussion to the Public.

Mr. Hennessey stated that he was concerned with the chemical pollution that the abutters brought up. He asked Ms. Beauregard if the applicant had an MS4.

Mr. Bisson asked to address some of the comments made by the Public. He informed that all chemicals used on the site are green materials, and they could provide documentation that there is no toxicity to them. He stated that there was no toxicity associated with the chemicals used. Mr. Kearney noted that if the special exception were to be approved, a condition would be that the client would need to supply the documentation showing that the chemicals are non-toxic. Mr. Bisson stated that they could do that. He also noted that the applicants have farm animals on their property, so they would not do anything to potentially put them in harm's way.

Mr. Bisson stated that the size of the vehicles and the "60' boom truck" were mentioned by abutters. He noted that the primary vehicle that goes to the property to deliver material does not require a CDL. He explained that the most prominent vehicle depicted in one of the photos had been sold and that they could provide proof of that if needed. He stated that he is not saying that a large truck had never been to the property, just that the largest truck is no longer connected to the property and that the trucks that enter and exit now do not need CDLs to drive.

Mr. Bisson stated that in the photo supplied by the applicant, the most significant investment in terms of dollars for the buffer was in the landscaping and stockade fence to provide screening. He stated that the landscaping that was planted would shortly shield the view of the abutter completely. He stated that there were wetlands on the property, limiting their ability to use some of the back land, making it difficult to put the storage area elsewhere.

Mr. Hennessey asked Ms. Beauregard again if an MS4 had been issued for the property. Ms. Beauregard replied that it had not and that they had not involved the Environmental Specialist. She stated that she read over the Code Enforcement report, and it made no mention of hazardous materials, but she was not sure if he was directly looking for any as he was focusing on where the equipment was being held. Mr. Hennessey stated that if the applicant were to be approved, they would need to do a site plan review with the Planning Board. He noted that there would be an implementation of the MS4 rules at the Town Vote, and he would like to suggest that the Planning Board incorporate an MS4 review as part of the site plan.

Mr. Hennessey read aloud, *“All outdoor storage, display, and any other external indication of the business activity shall be screened from neighboring view,”* from 307-76, III General Home Occupations in Pelham’s Zoning Ordinance. He stated that the fence was inadequate as he was not screening the business use. He continued reading from the ordinance: *“Any use that may be objectionable, noxious or injurious by reason of the production of emission of odor, dust, smoke, refuse matter, fumes, noise, vibration, heat or excessive illumination is prohibited. In addition, the use, storage, or disposal of hazardous materials, chemicals, byproducts, medical waste or similar items considered dangerous to health and safety shall not be permitted without full local and state regulatory approval.”* He stated that he had multiple problems with some of the statements that were made, as it seemed that the applicant was in violation. If an abutter can see the work done or can hear excessive noise, he is in violation. Mr. Hennessey stated that hours of operation are most definitely part of the site plan review. His strong recommendation to the Planning Board would be to set the hours of operation to normal business hours if they were to approve this. He stated that there should be limited hours on Saturday and Sunday as this is a residential area.

Mr. Kearney reminded everyone that either all of the criteria are met, or they have not been met. It is an all or none decision.

Mr. McNamara noted that Mr. Hennessey mentioned conditions six and seven, which he was also going to mention. He stated that the storage area is not screened based on testimony from the abutters and photographs provided. He asserted that if there is noise, then it is against the conditions of the special exception. He stated that this is heavy use from what has been described. He stated that he could not vote on this as presently presented.

Mr. Hopkinson stated that he was in complete agreement with Mr. McNamara. He noted that this makes it difficult for neighbors to enjoy their property. It appeared to be industrial use in a residential zone. He asserted that if he lived in a residential zone and industrial work was being completed next door, he would be upset as well.

Mr. Bergeron stated that he was familiar with the chemical agents that the applicant was using and asserted that they could be toxic in large quantities. He stated that he did not feel that the applicant had met the special exception requirements, especially regarding screening and noise. He explained that he was all for property rights, but he cannot support it when it comes to being egregious to neighbors.

Mr. Kearney agreed that the noise and screening were non-appropriate and insufficient at this time.

Case #ZO2021-00007

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Mr. Hennessey – no
Mr. McNamara – no
Mr. Kearney – no
Mr. Hopkinson – no
Mr. Bergeron – no

(0-5-0) The motion failed.

Mr. Kearney explained that there is a 30 day right to appeal.

Special Exception DENIED

Case #ZO2021-00008**Map 6 Lot 4-166****BOUCHER, Barbara – 55 Gibson Road – Seeking a Special Exception to Article XII, Section 307-76, III of the Zoning Ordinance to permit the operation of a Pet Service company as a General Home Occupation in the Residential Zone.**

Mr. Hopkinson read the list of abutters aloud. There were no persons present who asserted standing in the case, who did not have their name read, or who had difficulty with notification.

Ms. Barbara Boucher and her daughter Ms. Nichole Boucher came forward to discuss the case. Ms. N. Boucher stated that they were there for a special exception for her pet care service company which involves grooming dogs on the site. She informed that when COVID started, she lost most of her dog-walking clients, so she adapted to include grooming as part of her services. She explained that grooming consists of about 30% of what she does, including pet sitting, nail trimming, training, and dog walking. She informed that this would be the secondary use of the premises and that the business area consumes about 5% of the space in the home. She reported that she does not plan to grow her business and does not have any employees or the intention of hiring any.

Ms. N. Boucher explained that there was a 2'x3' foot sign that sits inside the driveway. There was no outdoor storage, and dogs occasionally bark when outside, but if they bark, they are brought back in. She informed that dogs are not left alone outside. She noted that there is one registered vehicle that has a magnetic sign, and delivery of goods is limited to Amazon and residential deliveries, nothing of huge substance. She stated that clients are only there to drop off and pick up their pets. She informed that she did sell pet CBD related to the pet care service, but it was the only product she sells.

Mr. Hopkinson stated that his biggest concern was that she would board animals on the property, as they could not allow that. Ms. N. Boucher explained that she no longer boards. She explained that she has a physical disability that limits her from boarding animals, so it would not be something that she would pursue in the future either.

Mr. McNamara stated that if they were to approve the special exception, they would need to go to the Planning Board for a site plan where they would want more specificity and diagrams. He explained that home occupations could grow and understands that she does not intend to, but the Planning Board may put restrictions in place to limit the scope of how much the business could grow. Ms. N. Boucher replied that she was okay with any restrictions that the Board wanted to make.

Mr. Wing noted that a requirement for the special exception is that the property is limited to only one sign not to exceed three square feet. Ms. N. Boucher replied that she would take the sign she has up now down.

Mr. Kearney opened the discussion to the Public.

Mr. Ken Boucher of 45 Gibson Road stated that he had no objections to the special exception request. He informed that it was a very small business and does not have any space to grow more than it is now. He noted that there is not a noticeable increase in traffic due to the business.

Mr. Kearney asked how many dogs would be at the business at one time. Ms. N. Boucher explained that she would only have one client's dogs at a time. She stated that there is occasionally some overlap between clients and had only ever had two dogs at once. Ms. B. Boucher added that they had two very small dogs as well.

Case #ZO2021-00008

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Mr. Hennessey – yes
Mr. McNamara – yes
Mr. Kearney – yes
Mr. Hopkinson – yes
Mr. Bergeron – yes

(5-0-0) The motion passed.

Mr. Kearney explained that there is a 30 day right to appeal.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Kearney asked what the date of the next conference was. Ms. Beauregard replied that registration opens on March 29 and that the conference is in May. She added that it is a free conference and encouraged all members to attend. She informed that she attends as many as she can and learns something new each time she goes to one. Mr. Wing stated that the conference is on May 15, 2021. Ms. Beauregard noted that she usually signs the Board members up for conferences and could sign them up if needed. She noted that it is a webinar, and she would send them all a reminder of it.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: (McNamara/Hennessey) To adjourn the meeting.

VOTE: (5-0-0) The motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:03 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Jordyn M. Isabelle
Recording Secretary