

APPROVED

**TOWN OF PELHAM
ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MEETING
February 14, 2022**

Mr. David Hennessey called the meeting to order at approximately 7:00 pm.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Hopkinson called the roll.

PRESENT ROLL CALL: David Hennessey
Peter McNamara
Jim Bergeron
Matthew Hopkinson
Joseph Passamonte
Alternate David Wing
Alternate Jeff Caira
Alternate John Westwood
Planning Director/Zoning Administrator Jenn Beauregard

ABSENT: Recording Secretary Jordyn Isabelle

CASE #ZO2022-00004

OUELLETTE, Lance - APPEAL from ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION - 24 Cardinal Drive - Map 41 Lot 6-148 Concerning Article II, Sections 307-6, 2 and Article III, Section 307-12C Table of the Interim Planning Director's decision regarding building setbacks as those setbacks pertain to applicant's temporary container pods to be located on that site from time to time.

Mr. Hennessey called forward Attorney Groff, the representative for the applicant. Attorney Groff asked that the case be continued to the next session. Chairman Hennessey agreed to continue the case to the March 14, 2022 meeting.

CASE DATE SPECIFIED TO MARCH 14, 2022.

MINUTES:

January 10, 2022

MOTION: (Bergeron/McNamara) To approve the January 10, 2022 meeting minutes as amended.

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

CASE #ZO2022-00002 and CASE #ZO2022-00005

Mr. Hennessey stated that three members of the Board attended the site walk, where they believed there was no interference with abutters' view of the area. Mr. Schneider informed that he spoke with Ms. Beauregard and Mr. Żarnowski, as recommended. He explained that Mr. Żarnowski gave him the information for someone familiar with the area, which he will follow up on.

Ms. Beauregard explained that the applicants had applied for a second variance to split their original variance into two separate applications. She added that the first variance is only for the approval of the proposed garage and that the second variance would be contingent on the approval or denial of the garage.

CASE #ZO2022-00002

SCHNEIDER, Eric - 2 Little Island Park Map 24 Lot 11-310 - Seeking a Variance to Article III, Section(s) 307-12 Table 1, 307-13, 307-14 & Article VII, Section(s) 307- 37, 307-41 of the Zoning Ordinance to permit construction of a 2nd story on a newly renovated existing single story home, using the homes original footprint on a non-conforming lot located within the WCD's 50' setback. Proposing to add a master bedroom with a ¾ bath and laundry room, with partial attic space above and storage. Also, an enclosed 5' x 5' entrance located approximately 6' from property line and a 20'x24' 2-car garage to be constructed from 5' to 10' from property line. The total height of home will be 27' from grade.

Mr. Hennessey opened the discussion to the Board to the Public.

Mr. Bergeron referenced *Crossly v. The Town of Pelham* to explain how granting a variance on the lot could precedent granting similar structures on all lots in the area. He explained how more than 200 lots on the pond suffered from a nonconformity or hardship, and the applicant built a 2-story garage on their lot. He further stated that this decision created a precedent, meaning the remaining 200 neighbors could then make similar claims of putting a 2-story garage up. Mr. Hennessey added that since the time of the case, all of the pond lots are considered non-conforming under current zoning.

Mr. Hennessey agreed with Mr. Bergeron, adding that precedents must also change to reflect the reality of the current environment. Mr. Hennessey further explained that the direct abutter to this lot had a large two-story garage. He questioned if the proposed garage would alter the essential character of the neighborhood.

Mr. Cairra questioned if the proposed structure would be too close to the septic system. Mr. Hennessey explained that a condition of approval would be to ensure that the plan meets State approval of the septic design.

CASE #ZO2022-00002

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Mr. McNamara -	5 yesses; final vote YES
Mr. Bergeron -	4 nos, 1 yes; final vote NO
Mr. Passamonte -	5 nos; final vote NO
Mr. Hennessey -	5 yesses; final vote YES
Mr. Hopkinson -	5 yesses; final vote YES

(3-2-0) The motion carried.

VARIANCE GRANTED.

Chairman Hennessey explained that the variance was granted with the specified conditions and that there is a 30 day right to appeal the decision.

CASE #Z02022-00005

SCHNEIDER, Eric - 2 Little Island Park Map 24 Lot 11-310 - Seeking a Variance concerning: Article III, Sections 307-7, 307-8C, 307-12 Table 1, 307-13, 307-14 & Article VII, Sections 307-37, 307-41 of the Zoning Ordinance to permit construction of a 2nd story on a newly renovated existing single story home, using the homes original footprint on a non-conforming lot located within the WCD's 50' ft. setback. Also, an enclosed 5' x 5' entrance located approximately 6' from property line. New application to increase proposed height to under 30' from driveway grade. Proposed garage will be heard on original application (Case #Z02022-00002).

Mr. Hopkinson read the list of abutters aloud. There was no one present whose name was not called or did not receive notification of the meeting. Mr. Hennessey noted that he received an email from an individual claiming to have not been notified. He further explained that they had checked with their attorney and would continue with the case.

Mr. Schneider explained that in his original proposal, he listed the height of the building as 27 feet and wanted to change it to 30 feet. He continued that he removed the garage from this application in case it ended up being the cause of denial. He noted that everything else on the application is the same as the previous application.

MOTION: (McNamara/Passamonte) To stipulate that the height of the roof cannot be any more than 30 feet above grade.

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

MOTION: (McNamara/Passamonte) If this is approved, the plan will be subject to State approval of the septic design.

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

Mr. Schneider read through the five criteria for the variance request. Mr. Schneider wanted to clarify that there is an additional entrance outside the foundation perimeter that is not part of the foundation. He explained that it is for entry to the house, which is why it has been included in the provided documents.

MOTION: (McNamara/Passamonte) To subject the plan to shoreline protection approval.

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

Mr. Schneider clarified that his understanding was that the height requirement on the building was 30 feet above the highest point on the driveway, not just 30 feet from any given point on the lot.

Mr. McNamara highlighted that there was information missing under criterion five. Mr. Schneider explained that he misunderstood how to format the answer to the multi-part question and that his answer covered all the criteria.

Mr. McNamara questioned the consensus of the site walk concerning possible obstruction of view. Mr. Hennessey answered that he recollected that there was no opposition.

Mr. Bergeron informed that he did not know if he agreed with the argument that a blocked view of the pond was a valid argument. He believed 30 feet would be a reasonable height for a dwelling. He added that he did not think he would oppose a variance solely based on an objection from someone on the height blocking their view. Mr. Hennessey agreed with Mr. Bergeron, adding that there is no height restriction in the Town of Pelham. Ms. Beauregard clarified that there was a height restriction in the MUZD. Mr. Hennessey continued that since criterion four poses that surrounding properties not be diminished, meaning that the view of abutters does need to be accounted for. He explained that the reasoning, in part, for the height restrictions in these areas is to protect property values. Mr. Hopkinson stated that his observation of the property on the site walk was that no abutters would lose significant sight of the proposed plan.

No one from the Public came forward to discuss the case. Chairman Hennessey closed the discussion to the Public.

CASE #ZO2022-00005

ROLL CALL VOTE:	Mr. Bergeron -	5 yesses; final vote YES with the condition of shoreline approval
	Mr. Passamonte -	5 yesses; final vote - YES
	Mr. McNamara -	5 yesses; final vote - YES with the conditions stated in the motions
	Mr. Hennessey -	5 yesses; final vote - YES
	Mr. Hopkinson -	5 yesses; final vote - YES

(5-0-0) The motion carried.

VARIANCE GRANTED.

Chairman Hennessey explained that the variance was granted with the specified conditions and that there is a 30 day right to appeal the decision.

COURT ORDERED REMAND

CASE ZO2021-00001-CR

GENDRON, Patrick & Kim— 579 Bridge Street - Map 22 Lot 8-85 (*Court Ordered Remand to review only the hardship criterion as directed by the Housing Appeals Board's decision order dated September 16, 2021*) Seeking a Variance to Article III, Section 307-7, Article IV, Section 307-16B, and Article V, Section 307-18 of the Zoning Ordinance to permit a Workforce Housing Development in the B-5 Zone.

Mr. Hennessey explained that this would not be a meeting on workforce housing. He continued that the case is a remand that was handed back to the Board from the Supreme Court, who restricted the concerns of the Board to only the financial hardship the applicants would be facing. He reiterated that this decision is State mandated. He explained this meant that they would not be going through the five criteria, only the financial hardship criteria.

Mr. Bergeron recused himself from the discussion. Mr. Hennessey appointed Mr. Wing to vote in place of Mr. Bergeron, as Mr. Wing was present at the site walk.

Attorney Christopher Drescher came forward to represent the applicants along with Mr. Joe Maynard of Benchmark Engineering. Mr. Maynard summarized that they were looking to produce a workforce housing project in the Town's B5 District. He explained that under the agreement from the Court, they had to contract an economist to estimate the cost of the proposed 90 unit development and what would be allowed under the current multifamily ordinance.

He noted finding a large discrepancy between the two about the number of bedrooms allowed per square foot. He highlighted that the number of houses they could construct under the current ordinance would be roughly 30, a significant decrease from the proposed project.

Mr. Drescher explained that one of the largest impacts to the project's cost would be the extension of the water line from Main Street to the property through Pennichuck Water, which has strict guidelines and taxes on the pipes and access.

Mr. Drescher presented a video of Mr. Jeff Donahoe, the economic analyst who conducted the review of the project. He provided an introduction of his background, including a history of similar projects he has been familiar with. He explained the calculations behind the costs of each project. The 90-house project could generate a profit of \$2.1 million (or 5.7%), and the 31-unit project would be a loss of \$1.4 million (10%). He stated that if the community wanted to provide workforce housing, they would need a project with a higher density. Mr. Donahoe explained that the prominent increase in cost for the 90-unit project is the allocation of the land acquisition, the waterline extension, and the turn lanes that would need to be added to Bridge Street.

Mr. Passamonte asked if the Town could send the proposed project out for an independent review from another economic analyst. He did not believe what was presented was reflective of current times. Mr. Hennessey stated that Mr. Passamonte could make a motion if he desired, noting that he did not believe the analysis was inaccurate. He added that while things have changed, he did not think that the numbers would be drastically dissimilar.

Mr. Hennessey asked if the figures used in the analysis included properties that had their septic systems connected to public sewer systems. Mr. Maynard believed that the figures were from houses on municipal sewer and water.

Mr. Caira agreed with Mr. Passamonte on having the Town conduct its own analysis on the project. Mr. Maynard informed of the difficulty of finding an economist, especially one specializing in the area.

Mr. Hennessey stated he would accept the presented numbers and the principle that more units are needed to carry the workforce housing units being sold at a low price. Mr. Hennessey questioned that they were still dealing with a conceptual plan before Planning. Mr. Maynard replied that they had completed a substantial amount of work on the property over the past several years and that while the plan is still preliminary, it is further along than most due to the extensive information base they have.

Mr. Hennessey expressed that the Zoning Board has never had to produce a reasonable idea on the number of units a project could have when deciding on a plan, unlike the Planning Board. Mr. Maynard explained how they calculated the different number of units, noting that he put his calculations on the sides of the submitted plans. He explained that all of the numbers they used were based on State guidelines. Mr. Hennessey expressed that he was reluctant to put a number down, as that is not an ordinary proceeding of the Zoning Board. Mr. Hennessey asked Mr. Drescher what he thought. Mr. Drescher replied that he agreed with the previous comments from the Board. He suggested approving the variance for up to 90 units, and then they could work with the Planning Board on the specific numbers.

Mr. Hennessey summarized that the analyst informed that as the number of units goes down, the net worth of the project will go down, forcing for more expensive houses.

Mr. Hennessey asked if the Board believed the Town should get their own economic analysis on the plan after the Planning Board approves a specified number of units. Mr. Drescher expressed that he had no objections to the Board getting another review of their consultant's report. Mr. Hennessey stated that he was trying to comply with the request from the State but did not believe they had the financial information needed to base a decision. Mr. Drescher stated he believed their report was relatively thorough and accurate. Mr. Hennessey agreed that the sales reports seemed accurate; he was more concerned with the figuring of the number of units to be built, as that is the crux of the applicant's argument.

Mr. McNamara stated that he did not believe that the State remand was as specific to require the Zoning Board to specify an exact number of units for the project, only an upper limit, and then the Planning Board, after a thorough review, can decide to lower the number. Mr. McNamara added that the Court had

the number of 90 units before them. Mr. McNamara stated that the Board needs to answer if the applicant has demonstrated to some degree that there is an economic hardship involved in developing the land without an increased density. Mr. Hennessey wanted to highlight that the applicant did not argue a financial argument in the first case.

Mr. Hennessey asked Mr. McNamara and Mr. Drescher if the Board could approve the variance, dependent upon the Planning Board's decision of how many units this should be. He explained that he did not know how to come up with a number of units, expressing he would like to defer it to the Planning Board to decide. Mr. McNamara stated that an additional review of the plan could generate more questions and controversy as opposed to resolving anything. Mr. Hennessey believed that the analysis would waste time and money. Mr. Hennessey reiterated that he would like to vote on the variance and let Planning set the number of units. Mr. McNamara replied that was not what the appeal board told them to do.

Mr. Passamonte stated that he felt the remand asked them to vote on information not presented in the original testimony. Mr. Passamonte highlighted how much of the information in the remand was different from the original testimony. He explained that those were his reasons for wanting to send this out for an independent review. He noted that the applicant's review uses the whole 44 acres of the parcel, not the 30 acres that were proposed. Mr. Caira agreed with Mr. Passamonte.

Mr. Wing asked which fair market rates they were using for their calculations. Mr. Maynard replied that the numbers in the report are from the previous year's numbers from Hillsborough County. He then asked why they used 1,632 square feet for the 31 multifamily units. Mr. Maynard replied that the number was based on a floor plan they wanted to use for the project. Mr. Wing explained that the size of the house that could be built is different when looking at 90 versus 31 units and that if the square footage is increased in the 31-unit scenario, then the profit goes from minus 10% to positive 1-2%. Mr. Maynard replied that could be correct but would not be the expected profit for the amount of work put into the project.

Mr. Drescher reiterated that Board could approve the 90 units as a ceiling cap for the Planning Board to have control over.

Mr. Hennessey opened the discussion to the Public.

Ms. Janet Walters of 16 Plower Road came forward to address the Board. She asked if the calculations presented included the cost for new schools, more teachers, busing, education, police, highway road, Town costs, and the loss on neighbors' taxes due to the housing project. Mr. Hennessey replied that the applicants would not need to come up with that information; the Town would provide the report based on statutory analyses.

Ms. Lisa Corbin of 655 Bridge Street came forward to address the Board. She stated that she agreed with the Town running their own financial analysis on the project. She noted that the amount of land mentioned was different and that she had not heard about the flood zones at the site walk. Mr. Hennessey replied that that would be something the Planning Board would delve into.

Mr. Drescher agreed that he did not understand why the housing appeals board requested the case to go through the Zoning Board and then the Planning Board instead of only going through the Planning Board. He continued that he hoped that the Board would at least grant the ceiling limit for the number of units allowed.

Mr. Hopkinson pointed out that if the Board specified the number of units to 90, they should also set a cap of 222 bedrooms. He explained that otherwise, all 90 units could contain three or more bedrooms. He continued that he did not believe they should decide the number of units or bedrooms the project could build. Mr. Hennessey replied that the Town would not determine the number of units - the conditions of the land would. Mr. Maynard stated that they used guidelines to help determine the number of units proposed. Mr. Hennessey explained that the Board does not make policy only abides by the rules outlined in the zoning ordinance. He continued that the number of units would be determined before the Planning Board.

MOTION: (Passamonte/Wing) To send the plan out for an independent review of the numbers.

Mr. Hopkinson stated that he believed this was a waste of time and only delaying things. Mr. Hennessey expressed his agreement. Mr. Passamonte asked how he could vote on the financial hardship if he did not have numbers that he believed were accurate. Mr. Hennessey clarified that they were voting on if there was a financial hardship. Mr. Wing replied that he felt he did not receive enough information on the 30 units to clearly understand the financial hardship. Mr. McNamara stated that he believed their job was to decide whether the applicant made the case that some financial hardship would be involved in creating the workforce housing, not the exact numbers associated with the financial hardship. He added that he did not believe that any opinion would state there is no financial hardship on the project.

Mr. Passamonte asked for clarification on if they were voting on financial hardship on the land or the workforce housing project. Mr. Hennessey replied that the financial hardship is because the State demands every Town provide sufficient workforce housing. He added that he has tried to show that Pelham is currently committed to and provides workforce housing. He continued that the State requires that if there is a workforce housing project, the developers are entitled to increase the density to make the project more affordable. Mr. Hennessey then informed that the original decision did not consider the financial hardship, as the Board was unaware of that requirement regarding workforce housing at the time. Mr. Passamonte stated that the applicants made no financial hardship in the first case. He explained that he did not understand how the Board could vote if the information was not presented initially. Mr. Hennessey stated that the housing board of appeals was the one to send it back, though he agreed.

Mr. McNamara informed that financial hardships are discussed on page four of the remand. He explained that the parcel is unique because it has access to Pennichuck water, has sandy soil, it's on a major highway, and the topography is relatively flat. He explained that those are all arguments that contribute to the financial hardship. Mr. Hennessey reiterated that he did not believe an independent financial analysis would yield different conclusions.

Mr. Passamonte explained that if the applicant built in a conventional way, they would make money on the project. Mr. Hennessey replied that the State wants workforce housing, not conventional housing. Mr.

Passamonte stated that the Town meets the requirements posted by the NRPC. Mr. McNamara noted that was not the point; the point was that in order to make a workforce housing project affordable. Mr. Passamonte stated he did not believe they made a case of financial hardship.

VOTE: (2-3-0) The motion failed.

Mr. Passamonte asked if they could stipulate that the applicant must use all 44 acres of land, not just the 30 acres of land proposed. Mr. Hennessey stated that while that may be what was written in the analysis, that was not what was presented to the Board. Mr. Maynard agreed that the original application was for around 30 acres. Mr. Hennessey reiterated that this was the remnant of just the financial hardship, not the acreage. Mr. Hennessey continued that Mr. Passamonte's argument was good, just more suited for the Planning Board's discussion in setting the number of units.

CASE 2021-00001-CR

MOTION: (McNamara/Passamonte) To approve the variance for up to 90 units as an upper limit with 20% set aside for workforce housing, with the Planning Board's final decision of how many units prevailing per the Housing Board of Appeals decision.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Mr. Wing -	YES
Mr. Hopkinson -	YES
Mr. McNamara -	YES
Mr. Passamonte -	NO
Mr. Hennessey -	YES

(4-1-0) The motion carried.

Mr. Hennessey explained that the plan would be passed along to the Planning Board.

CASE #ZO2022-00006

WALKER, Richard & Ethel - 81 So. Shore Drive; Map 31 Lot 11-268 - Seeking a Variance concerning: Article III, Section 307-12 Table 1, & Article VII, Section(s) 307-41A, 307-41B of the Zoning Ordinance to permit an existing seasonal camp structure and garage to be demolished and replaced with a 32' x 36' 2-bedroom year-round residence with a 10' x 36' deck and an attached 24' x 30' garage on a undersized and non-conforming lot with less than 200' of frontage. The construction will be shifted to meet the 15' setbacks but will be located within the 50' WCD setback and the deck and steps will be located 6' from the side setbacks where 15' is required. Also, replacing and relocating septic, setback will be 110' from WCD where 125' is required.

Mr. Hopkinson read the list of abutters aloud. A resident came forward, explaining that she did not receive notification. Ms. Beauregard clarified that this was the resident who had emailed the Board, as mentioned in a previous case. Mr. Hennessey stated that they were aware that the resident was not notified, adding that the Town Attorney advised that they continue with the case due to her being present.

He noted that they are concerned that she did not receive notice. Ms. Beauregard explained that the resident is on a private road owned by an association and that the requirements are not clear what the requirements are for abutter notification on private road associations. Mr. Hennessey asked residents around the ponds to stay aware of cases and notify the Planning Department if they have not received official notice of a hearing.

Mr. Earl Sanford, of Sanford Surveying and Engineering, and Mr. Richard Walker came forward to represent the applicants. Mr. Sanford explained the variance request. He explained that the owners were looking to take down the current house and build an all-season house farther back from the lake. He noted that they were also trying to make the lot more conforming concerning the side setbacks and distance from the lake.

Mr. Sanford read the five criteria into the record.

Mr. Walker informed that he has lived at the water for 29 years, noting that the property is only suited for three seasons. He stated that he was glad to see other neighbors present and were interested to hear their input.

Mr. Bergeron asked Mr. Sanford to highlight the parent lots that were consolidated to form the current lot. Mr. Sanford showed the Board. Mr. Bergeron asked what the date of consolidation was. Mr. Walker stated that he was not sure of the date. Ms. Beauregard explained that combining smaller lots in Town for tax purposes was a common occurrence in the past.

Mr. Bergeron asked what the easement procedure for the relocation of the well would be. Mr. Sanford replied that due to the lot's small size, it was impossible to keep the 75' protective well radius within the lot. He explained that they had already signed and recorded a well release with the State due to this.

Mr. Hennessey asked if the State had approved the septic system design. Mr. Sanford answered that they had not. He added that they had completed test fitting, noting that they were advised to bring it before the Board for approval before continuing the process. Mr. Hennessey stated that they needed the septic system design approved by the State, Shoreline approval by the State, and approval from the Zoning Board.

Mr. Bergeron asked if there were any known deeded easements on the property for Woekel Circle. Mr. Walker replied no.

Mr. Hennessey asked how high the building would be once the project was finished. Mr. Walker replied that it would be three levels tall, the same as his neighbors. Mr. Hennessey asked if they would be blocking anyone behind them. Mr. Walker replied that the current structure is not blocking any views.

Mr. Hennessey opened the discussion to the Public.

Mr. Richard Ratcliffe of 48 Woekel Circle came forward to address the Board. He informed that he had known the applicants since they moved in and had been friends with them for 26 years. He stated that he

was happy that Mr. Walker was retiring and moving to the lake. He expressed that he was in favor of the proposal.

Ms. Julia Steed Mawson of 17 So Shore Drive came forward to represent the Little Island Pond Lake Association and the So Shore Drive Road Association. She expressed that she was delighted to see that improvements were being made to mitigate some of the existing issues with the original house. She explained that the New Hampshire Lakes Association offers a program, Lake Smart, that she believes could help answer many questions about the proposal.

Mr. Mitchel Kamal and Ms. Christine Kamal of 3 Renee Lane came forward to address the Board. Ms. Kamal stated that they had recently purchased their property in October and had since been made aware of issues resulting from developments in the area. She explained that this raised her concerns about potential problems with runoff from the lot. She asked if there would be something in place to help mitigate the risk of runoff flowing into neighbors' yards. Mr. Walker replied that he plans to move the house back to an existing wall on the lot. He explained that the lot currently has a ramp for water to flow off. As he would not alter the ramp in any way, he did not believe there would be a change to the property's runoff. Mr. Hennessey replied that the applicants would be legally required to ensure that they would contain the runoff. The Kamal's expressed their support and agreements for the proposal due to the improvements to the lot.

Mr. Hennessey stated that he would like a site walk for the property on March 5, 2022, at 9:00 am. He asked the applicants to try to provide a poll or balloon to show the expected height of the finished project along with some form of rock to show the outline of the structure. He noted that this would not be a requirement, just a helpful tool for the Board and abutters.

CASE #ZO2022-00007

CAMPBELL, Ronald & Ellen - 80 So. Shore Drive - Map 31 Lot 11-269 - Seeking a Variance concerning Article III, Section 307-12 Table 1 of the Zoning Ordinance to permit development of an existing undersized non-conforming undeveloped lot, created in 1925 (prior to current Zoning Regulations) with a single-family residence, 8' from side lot where 15' is required. Also, seeking to build on a lot consisting of 6,680sf. Where 43,560 (1-acre) is required, and lot frontage of 50' on a private road where 200' on a class V road is required.

Mr. Hopkinson read the list of abutters aloud. There was no one present whose name was not called or did not receive notification of the meeting.

Mr. Ronald Campbell came forward to address the Board with Mr. Sanford. He explained that he had been a resident since his family purchased the property almost 30 years ago. He stated that he wanted to keep an eye on his father during his retirement and keep the family closer together.

Mr. Hennessey stated that he would like to conduct a site walk of this property on March 5, 2022, at 9:00 am. He asked the applicants to also try to use something to show the proposed height. He asked the Board and residents to watch the weather and call the Planning Department if there were questions. Ms.

Beauregard added that any cancellations of the site walk would be posted on the Planning Department website, the Zoning Board website, and the Town social media.

Mr. Bergeron asked if the property had ever had a dwelling on it. Mr. Sanford replied that while there was some construction of a wall in the back of the property, there had never been a dwelling structure on it. Mr. Bergeron asked if the applicants had tried to acquire land from the 26-acre lot, owned by the Little Island Realty Corporation, surrounding the lot to make it more conforming. Mr. Sanford replied that the Corporation is duty-bound to keep the lot in current use.

Ms. Adrian Keene of 63 So Shore Drive came forward, introducing herself as the Little Island Pond Realty Corporation president. She clarified that the Corporation is not an association but rather a formal corporation registered with the State of New Hampshire.

Mr. Sanford read the five criteria into the record.

ANNOUNCEMENT(S)

Mr. Hennessey informed that there would be several openings on the Board and encouraged residents to apply to volunteer. He explained that if anyone was interested in volunteering, contact Town Hall for a volunteer form.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: (Passamonte/Hopkinson) To adjourn the meeting.

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

The meeting was adjourned at approximated 10:10 pm.

SITE WALK(S) – March 5, 9:00 am

CASE ZO2022-00006 – Map 31 Lot 11-268 – WALKER, Richard & Ethel – 81 So Shore Drive

CASE ZO2022-00007 – Map 31 Lot 11-269 – CAMPBELL, Ronald & Ellen – 80 So Shore Drive

DATE SPECIFIED CASE(S) – March 14, 2022

CASE ZO2021-00004 – Map 41 Lot 6-148 – OUELLETTE, Lance – 24 Cardinal Drive

Respectfully submitted,
Jordyn Isabelle
Recording Secretary