

**APPROVED**

**TOWN OF PELHAM  
ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MEETING  
August 12, 2019**

Vice Chairwoman Svetlana Paliy called the meeting to order at approximately 7:00 pm.

Secretary Diane Chubb called roll:

**PRESENT:** Svetlana Paliy, Diane Chubb, David Hennessey, Peter McNamara, Alternate Deb Ryan, Alternate Matthew Hopkinson, Alternate John Westwood (arrived after the meeting commenced), Planning/Zoning Administrator Jennifer Beauregard

**ABSENT:** Bill Kearney, Alternate Richard Rancourt, Alternate Heather Patterson

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**CONTINUED HEARING(S)**

**Case #ZO2019-00011**

**Map 36 Lot 10-191-21**

**MCLEAN, Stephen – 73 Grouse Run - Seeking a Variance from Article III, Section 307-12 of the Zoning Ordinance to permit a shed greater than 8’ in height to be constructed within the 15’ rear setback and the 30’ front setback.**

Ms. Ryan was appointed to vote for the case.

Ms. Paliy stated a site walk had been conducted (August 3, 2019). Mr. McNamara offered an amendment to the site walk minutes. He wanted the record to indicate while looking at the slope the applicant told them it was difficult to mow the lawn. He asked that the minutes read *‘The applicant noted it was extremely difficult to cut the sloped area of the lawn toward the back of his property’*.

**MOTION** (McNamara/Hennessey) To approve the site walk minutes of August 3, 2019 as amended (language offered by Mr. McNamara).

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

Ms. Chubb read the August 3, 2019 site walk minutes aloud.

The applicant Stephen McLean came forward to discuss his request for an 8ft x 12ft shed (Reed Ferry shed with a height of approximately 9.5ft) within the rear setback. He provided a photograph of the swale in question (from the previous meeting) from when the house was originally designed. Using the photograph, he pointed out the proposed location of the shed. He told the Board if the major focus was water runoff, he would be open to including sonotube piers to allow water to freely flow underneath.

**PUBLIC INPUT**

Mr. Paul Drewniak and Russell Smith, 9 Caribou Crossing came forward. Mr. Smith referenced the photograph that was displayed and reiterated to the Board they were the direct abutter to the applicant. He felt they, as abutters, had presented a thorough case (in opposition to the request) and attended the site walk to express a number of their concerns from aesthetics to water flow. He told the Board they weren't opposed to the shed; however, they believed there were other locations it could be situated. The current proposed location would be aesthetically displeasing and disrupt water flow into their property.

Mr. Drewniak thanked the Board for their review process and felt he and Mr. Smith presented a thorough case. He reiterated their concern about aesthetics and significant runoff. He understood there was a swale in the area installed by the builder. He didn't want it to be altered in any way as he believed water would then essentially flow into his driveway. He asked that the Board review the presentation they provided during the previous meeting.

Mr. Hennessey asked Mr. McLean to explain his suggestion about raising the shed to allow water flow. Mr. McLean replied if the major concern was water flow, he would be open to installing sonotube piers to allow water to flow freely underneath the shed.

**MOTION** (Hennessey/Chubb Motion to stipulate that there has to be no hinderance to water flow through the (existing) swale.

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

Ms. Chubb recalled there was a question about wetlands. Ms. Beauregard stated there were no actual wetlands on the applicant's property; there was a small corner of a wetland buffer located at the back of the applicant's property. A plan sheet was included in the member's information packet that showed the wetland areas within the entire development. Ms. Chubb inquired when the wetland areas were designated. Ms. Beauregard replied it was designated at the time of the subdivision plan (2015). Ms. Chubb recalled in other cases seeing wet land that weren't specifically designated 'wetlands area'. She confirmed with Ms. Beauregard that there weren't any 'no cut' or 'buffer' areas stopping the proposal. Ms. Beauregard indicated that was correct. She added anything under 2,000SF would be exempt from the buffer.

Mr. Hennessey pointed out that the (review) process had worked; Zoning wouldn't have come into effect if the shed was not as tall. He said he would probably vote in favor of it, depending on what other arguments were made. He was glad that the applicant had to come in front of the Board, and they had conducted a site walk and viewed the swale. He believed the motion they made was the crux of one of the issues; the water flow cannot be impeded. He also believed raising the shed and installing the sonotubes would allow water to flow and protect the properties. Mr. Hennessey agreed that the land at the swale was dangerous and needed to be taken care of. After viewing the neighborhood during the site walk, he didn't agree with the statement that there would be an impact on the aesthetics. He pointed out if the shed was 1.5ft. shorter there wouldn't have been a case in front of the Board and the applicant could have built it as a matter of right.

Ms. Ryan stated she was considering the information in the minutes and the testimony provided.

Mr. McNamara agreed with Mr. Hennessey that the site walk was instructive. In terms of alternate placements, to move it down the slope and closer to the wetland conservation district would involve a lot more land disruption than what the applicant was proposing, not to mention the difficulty of accessing the shed. He felt the land and general configuration of the corner lot, in terms of hardship, was distinguishable from most of the other properties in the area because of the slope and constraints from the well and septic placements. He had reservations but would probably vote in favor of the request.

Ms. Paliy recalled the Board approving a lot of sheds. She questioned the height and if the applicant could have found one that was 1.5ft. shorter. Mr. McLean explained he could have found a shorter shed and purchased from a box store; however, he believed they would be less in terms of quality. He noted the standard height for an 8ft x 12ft shed was 9.5ft.

Mr. Hennessey stated after conducting the site he measured his own shed and understood the height of the proposed shed was standard. Ms. Paliy commented if the shed had a flat roof it would probably collapse from snow load in the winter.

Ms. Chubb offered her thoughts on the request after conducting the site walk. She stated the applicant's property faced the front road (Grouse Run) while everyone else on the road faced in. She said the applicant's back yard was the abutter's side yard; this was the only house within the development situated in that manner. She understood the desire for privacy. She found the plantings along the swale were effective and visually pleasing and over time would provide privacy. Ms. Chubb said her issue was everyone around the circle would see the shed. If she lived in the neighborhood she wouldn't want to look out of her house and see the shed. The neighbors in the area have shed in their back yards. She recalled the applicant indicating there was another location for the shed closer to his house that would not impede the view of the neighbors or have water issues. She said the applicant just didn't want it that close to his house; however, she didn't think it would be unreasonable. Ms. Chubb noted the only opposition was from the direct abutters; there were no complaints from any of the other neighbors. In looking at the evidence in front of the Board she wasn't sure how she would vote.

Mr. McNamara suggested the Board discuss each of the criteria.

*1. Variance not contrary to the public interest:*

Ms. Chubb didn't have a problem with this criterion. Mr. Hennessey felt placing the shed closer to the house made sense except for the location of the applicant's septic system, which could be an issue. He believed the proposed location was better and it made sense to locate the shed above the swale if there was a continuation of water flow. Mr. McNamara commented the proposed shed was a common structure in any neighborhood and didn't feel it was contrary to public interest. He also felt the spirit of the ordinance was observed. Ms. Ryan agreed with Mr. Hennessey and Mr. McNamara. Ms. Paliy stated the property was a corner lot and didn't feel anything was changed for the public; it was something that everyone else did without coming in front of the Board.

*2. Spirit of the Ordinance:*

Ms. Chubb agreed. Mr. McNamara also agreed, for the reasons previously stated. Mr. Hennessey agreed. Ms. Ryan agreed. Ms. Paliy also agreed.

*3. Substantial Justice:*

Ms. Chubb agreed because putting a shed on a lot was common. Mr. McNamara noted that the design was approved by the development's Homeowner's Association and understood they took no position regarding the placement of the shed. He felt substantial justice had been done. Mr. Hennessey agreed. Ms. Ryan said she felt better having heard the answer to the wetland question. Ms. Paliy felt having a shed was normal.

*4. Values of surrounding properties are not diminished:*

Ms. Chubb stated she struggled with this because the Board only heard from the abutters who had complained and come forward with evidence. She was still undecided. Mr. McNamara didn't feel values would be diminished; the applicant was forthcoming with testimony about buffering and landscaping the property. In addition, the applicant would ensure water (flow) continued. He said the homes were nice in the area and was sure the applicant wouldn't put up a shed to detract from their property value. For the purpose of the record and public, Mr. Hennessey noted the Board previously received a 'wrist slap' from a

judge because he gave an opinion as an expert regarding property values. He didn't want to go that route again and spoke as a member of the Board and not as someone in real estate; he saw sheds in the neighborhood similar to the proposed and didn't feel it was much different or would have an effect. In looking at the plot plan and hearing testimony, Ms. Ryan understood situations could be difficult; however, knowing the applicant would take care of the water and the shed could be there if it was a foot shorter, she said it seems it should be allowed. Ms. Paliy said based on what was already stated, she didn't feel the proposed shed would diminish values.

*5. Unnecessary Hardship:*

Ms. Chubb stated she would go with the second part (5B) of the hardship because the applicant's home was the only one on the street/in the cul-de-sac facing a different direction. Mr. McNamara believed the orientation of the land and the house, the slope and placement of the septic and well limited what the applicant could do and spoke to the uniqueness of the property within the neighborhood. Mr. Hennessey believed 5A was applicable. He believed there were special conditions of the property and particularly 5A,ii was in force. Ms. Ryan stated she felt 5A was applicable. Ms. Paliy agreed 5A was applicable as the hardship seemed to be associated with the Town's regulations. She noted sheds sold by local companies had a pitched roof (due to winters) which increased structure height.

**BALLOT VOTE  
#ZO2019-00011:**

Ms. Paliy – Yes to all criteria  
Ms. Chubb – Yes to all criteria-with stipulation not to impede water flow  
Mr. McNamara – Yes to all criteria-with stipulation contained in motion  
Mr. Hennessey – Yes to all criteria  
Ms. Ryan – Yes to all criteria

(5-0-0) The motion carried.

**VARIANCE GRANTED**

Ms. Paliy noted there was a 30-day right of appeal.

**HEARING(S)**

**Case #ZO2019-00016**

**Map 30 Lot 11-138**

**FIELDS, Craig & Frances – 144 West Shore Drive – Seeking a Variance from Article III, Section 307-12-Table-1, 307-8C of the Zoning Ordinance to raise structure from existing height of 18'2" to height of 22' for a total rise of 3'10" .**

Ms. Chubb 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.

Mr. Craig Fields and Mr. Craig Fields Sr. came forward to discuss the requested variance. Mr. Fields explained they were proposing to raise a structure three feet, ten inches to increase the height on the second story. He stated his parents would be moving into that house and the increased height would make it easier for them. Mr. Fields, Sr. added there were two homes on the property; a small home in the front and a larger home in the rear. He said he would move from the larger home into the smaller home. Currently the second floor within the smaller home was very low; his son resided in the home for the past eight years and couldn't sleep upstairs because of the ceiling's low height. He noted they weren't expanding the footprint; they were only requesting an increase to the height. The number of bedrooms wouldn't increase (currently two).

Mr. Fields read aloud the responses to the variance criteria as submitted with the application.

Mr. Hennessey inquired if there was currently a bathroom on the second floor. Mr. Fields answered yes; they were only raising the height of the building. Mr. Hennessey asked Ms. Beauregard if the request triggered Shore Land Protection. Ms. Beauregard answered no; the owner wasn't doing anything new to the land itself. She suggested the applicant contact Shore Land, so they were aware that work was being done. Mr. Fields, Sr. reiterated the footprint would remain the same; they wouldn't be breaking ground.

Mr. Hopkinson was curious about the current height of the second floor comparably to what it would be. Mr. Fields replied it depended upon where it was measured based on the slope of the roof. He said a person would hit their head in any part of the room unless they were in the center of the pitch of the house. He said he hadn't measured the height. Mr. Hopkinson asked if the style of the house would change. Mr. Fields replied the height would be increased but the look of the house would remain the same. Ms. Chubb asked for clarification of how the structure's height would be raised. Mr. Fields, Sr. stated just the walls would be increased in height.

Mr. Brian Soucy, 5 Valley Hill Road came forward. He stated he would be building the second floor. He told the Board the walls would be increased, and the roof would stay the same with a 5/12 pitch. He informed the Shore Land people were contacted. Since no work would be done beyond the existing footprint there were no Shore Land issues.

Ms. Paliy wanted to know if the owner would need to come back in front of the Board if the pitch of the structure was changed. Ms. Beauregard explained if the applicant raised the height beyond the approved height, they would need to come back in front of the Board. She believed the Building Inspector had already done an initial review of the plan and was aware of what the applicant was looking to do.

#### PUBLIC INPUT

Mr. Steven Meyers, 156 West Shore Drive came forward and told the Board his house directly abutted the applicant's property. He had no objection to the increased height. He was in favor of the variance.

Mr. Joe Rodrigues, 130 West Shore Drive endorsed the variance because it wouldn't impact any abutters and because the owner and his wife could enjoy their retirement by downsizing.

Mr. Hopkinson was appointed to vote.

Ms. Chubb had no problems with the request. Ms. Paliy asked the Board if they wanted to review the criteria. In this case, Mr. McNamara didn't feel it was necessary as the request was fairly straight forward and a small change to the property. He pointed out the neighbors and abutters were all in favor. Mr. Hennessey agreed. Mr. Hopkinson had no questions.

**BALLOT VOTE**  
**#ZO2019-00016:**  
 Ms. Paliy – Yes to all criteria  
 Ms. Chubb – Yes to all criteria  
 Mr. McNamara – Yes to all criteria  
 Mr. Hennessey – Yes to all criteria  
 Mr. Hopkinson – Yes to all criteria

(5-0-0) The motion carried.

#### VARIANCE GRANTED

Ms. Paliy noted there was a 30-day right of appeal.

**Case #ZO2019-00017****Map 22 Lot 8-39**

**CORBIN, Lisa & YORK, Sara – 655 Bridge Street – Seeking a Special Exception from Article XII Section 307-74 of the Zoning Ordinance to Build accessory dwelling attached to existing residence, with 1-bedroom, square footage for new dwelling is 780 sq. feet.**

Ms. Chubb 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. Sara York of 655 Bridge Street, Pelham NH and Mr. Kevin Loring, 136 Bailey Road, Dracut MA came forward. Mr. Loring stated the proposal is for a 26ft x 32ft in-law apartment.

Ms. Beauregard told the Board the applicant has provided the septic design for the existing house plus the accessory dwelling unit. The applicant has worked with the Building Inspector to review the proposed layout; it met the Town's criteria.

Mr. Hennessey pointed out if the criteria has been met the Board had to vote to approve.

**PUBLIC INPUT**

Mr. Pat Gendron, 579 Bridge Street had no objection. He told the Board the side of the house that would have the unit would abut his property. He reiterated he had no problem with the request and hoped the Board passed the variance.

Mr. Hopkinson was appointed to vote.

<b>BALLOT VOTE</b>	Ms. Paliy – Yes
<b>#ZO2019-00017:</b>	Ms. Chubb – Yes
	Mr. McNamara – Yes
	Mr. Hennessey – Yes
	Mr. Hopkinson – Yes

(5-0-0) The motion carried.

**SPECIAL EXCEPTION GRANTED**

Ms. Paliy noted there was a 30-day right of appeal.

**Case #ZO2019-00018****Map 30 Lot 11-102**

**McARTHUR, Joseph H & Johnna & Joseph Q – 61 Dutton Road - Seeking a Variance concerning Article III, Section 307-7, 307-12 & Table 1, 30713, 307-14 of the Zoning Ordinance to permit the existing 10 acre +/- lot to be subdivided into three building lots. The existing home will retain 1 acre of land with 200' of frontage, the lot to the east will have 200' of frontage with about 7 acres of land and the third (middle) lot would have approx. 100' of frontage with 2.2 acres of land.**

**Seeking a Variance concerning Article II, Definitions, #10 Frontage of the Zoning Ordinance to permit the driveway for the two new building lots to be shared and accessed from a common driveway, to be constructed on the middle lot where there is about 100' of frontage.**

**Seeking a Variance concerning Article VII, Section 307-39 to permit a Wetland Conservation District crossing to access the building portion of the rear lot.**

Ms. Chubb 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.

Mr. Hennessey recused himself as he is an immediate abutter. Ms. Ryan and Mr. Hopkinson were appointed to vote. Alternate John Westwood arrived and joined the Board.

Representing the applicant was Joseph Maynard of Benchmark Engineering. He told the Board that the property was zoned Residential and contained approximately 10.4 acres of land. The lot has approximately 500ft (+/-) of frontage. There is a powerline easement that encumbers the easterly side of the lot. The property is currently developed with a single-family home. Mr. Maynard explained they would like to subdivide the property into three lots: 1) existing house would retain 1 acre of land and have 200ft. of frontage, 2) middle lot would have reduced frontage of approximately 100ft and contain approximately 2 acres, and 3) the easterly lot would have 200ft of frontage and contain the remainder of the land, approximately 7 acres.

Mr. Maynard stated the second part of the variance request (Article II) would allow the two new lots to share a driveway. He understood the Town's Ordinance requires a driveway to be located where a lot has frontage. The third variance request (Article VII) would be to permit a Wetland Conservation District ('WCD') crossing to access the remaining lot. He explained they sized the existing house lot to be one acre and noted there was easily 35,000SF of usable area outside of wetlands and fit the 100x100SF building box as required. He added that the existing driveway had decent sight lines along Dutton Road.

The middle lot contains approximately 96,000SF outside of the powerline easement, of that approximately 78,861SF was contiguous uplands. This lot fits the 100x100SF building box requirement. Mr. Maynard commented a well could be placed on the lot to meet all the setback requirements under the Town Ordinance. The shared driveway will have good sight lines up and down Dutton Road.

From a building standpoint, the last lot contains 99,000SF outside of the powerline easement of that is approximately 81,719SF of contiguous uplands. Similar to the other lots it can contain the required 100x100SF building box outside of setbacks along with a well that meets all requirements. The driveway for this lot would have a WCD impact of approximately 2,500SF with approximately 800SF dredge and fill impact (application through State Wetlands Board) to cross the small wetland in the area. The remainder of the shared driveway would be outside the WCD. Mr. Maynard explained the main reason for requesting a shared driveway was due to the powerline easement that encompassed the easterly side of the lot. He said if the lot had its own single driveway to access the rear area there would be a larger wetland impact. It would also require substantial WCD impacts. From a driveway design standpoint, Mr. Maynard informed the steepest grade would be approximately 4%; most of the grade was under 3%.

Mr. McNamara asked Mr. Maynard to repeat the WCD impact information. Mr. Maynard replied there would be an impact of approximately 2,200SF. Mr. McNamara wanted to know the total length of the proposed driveway and the length of driveway impacting the WCD. Mr. Maynard responded the first house (middle lot) was approximately 300ft back and the rear lot was another approximately 700ft to the rear lot. He said when drawing the plan, he simply drew boxes (for the houses) and believed the driveway could easily be shortened in length by approximately 50ft-75ft. The length where the driveway traverses the WCD was approximately 500ft-550ft (+/-). Mr. McNamara inquired if there would be any raised structures for the driveway or if it would be on flat land. Mr. Maynard stated the driveway would follow the grade up to the wetland; at the wetland crossing they would install a culvert. Recently Fish and Game has been involved with dredge and fill impacts and asked them to install oversized culverts at crossing locations. He

wasn't clear what they would ask in relation to the proposal being reviewed. He believed it would be a larger culvert than what would be required for the flows through the area.

Mr. Maynard then read aloud the responses to the variance criteria as submitted with the application.

#### PUBLIC INPUT

Mr. Robert Gamble, 31 Clark Circle told the Board that the proposed driveway ran along current wetlands. He was unsure how it would be constructed without affecting the wetland that flowed through a majority of the property and cut in between the two proposed (new) houses. He explained along the flatland area in which the applicant spoke about building on were cuts and draws of natural waterflow that brought water from the high ground down into the wetlands around his property. He was afraid that building would increase the water flow and possibly cause flooding into his basement and into the wetlands. Mr. Gamble spoke about the third lot. He was unsure how far the structure would be from the property line and was concerned about the placement of the leach field that could flow down into the wetland and affect the well water.

Mr. Maynard stated the plan represented the accurate location of the wetlands on the property and where the 50ft. WCD falls. He indicated all the building envelopes were outside of those setbacks. He explained there was certain criteria (Town and State) they would have to maintain regarding septic systems. He stated there was ample room on each lot to meet the requirements. Ms. Paliy asked Mr. Gamble if he had seen the plan. Mr. Gamble answered yes; he's walked the property and taken pictures.

Mr. McNamara asked Mr. Gamble if he currently had any flooding in his basement. Mr. Gamble answered no. Mr. McNamara questioned if he typically had flooding. Mr. Gamble replied he had a little water, but not flooding. He commented the public heard where the proposed sites were but had not heard about the buildings. He inquired if they were single-family or two-family. Mr. Maynard didn't know. He said his client anticipated building their own house. He understood the seven-acre lot met the Town's duplex rules but didn't believe that was the intention. He noted the owner was present for the meeting and could be asked. Ms. Beauregard told the Board that the applicant would be able to build a duplex unless it was otherwise stipulated.

The owner, Joseph McArthur, 61 Dutton Road came forward. In response to the question regarding the structures, he said the proposal at this time was for single-family residences.

**MOTION:** (Chubb/McNamara) To stipulate the proposed buildings will be single-family homes.

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

Mr. David Hennessey, 71 Dutton Road stated he was neither opposed or in favor of the request. He understood the Conservation Commission recently purchased land that abutted the parcel and was surprised they didn't want to weigh in regarding the proposal. He stated the land under the powerlines was one of the major wildlife crossing areas within the Town. He spoke about the wetland, which was a seasonal stream that flows into a brook and under an area at the end of Dutton Road (near the Pelham Plaza) and into Beaver Brook. He believed it was one of the most complex wetlands within the Town. He felt the Conservation Commission should weigh in on the proposal. Mr. Hennessey reiterated he wasn't opposed to the request. He was located on the other side of the powerlines.

Mr. McNamara made a motion to reach out to the Conservation Commission for comment prior to the Board's next meeting. Ms. Chubb seconded. Mr. Maynard noted they submitted a variance request for a WCD impact associated with their proposal. He said if he withdrew the request, he would be forced to go

to the Conservation Commission before he went to the Planning Board. He pointed out with the dredge and fill proposal they would be spending time in front of the Conservation Commission. Mr. McNamara spoke about the position of the Board; if they allowed the variance without the commission's input, they potentially wouldn't know what they were allowing. He understood it would cause the applicant a delay but felt the Board would be better informed as to the specifics of the variance and it was important for their decision. Ms. Chubb pointed out that the driveway length was long and wanted to hear the commission's opinion before approving that portion.

**MOTION:** (McNamara/Chubb.) To reach out to the Conservation Commission for comment on the proposal prior to the Board's next meeting.

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

Ms. Beauregard will contact the Conservation Commission to see if the proposal can be heard at their next meeting (August 14, 2019).

Ms. Paliy asked the Board if they wanted to schedule a site walk. Ms. Chubb would like to hear from the Conservation Commission prior to making a decision regarding a site walk. Mr. McNamara agreed.

Regarding the driveway, Ms. Beauregard told the Board that the Safety Committee would review the driveway (during the plan review process). Ms. Paliy questioned if the Zoning Board were to approve the frontage and WCD crossing if the Planning Board would then be 'stuck' to make it work. Mr. McNamara replied the Planning Board could exercise their own judgment regarding feasibility and would also need comment from the Conservation Commission. Earlier in the day Mr. Maynard spent some time reviewing the Town's driveway regulations and saw nothing about 'length of driveway', except for the requirement that it meet NFPA Standards. Mr. McNamara noted the Fire Department would address safety concerns. His concern was for the two homeowners to have a written maintenance agreement for the driveway to memorialize the shared responsibility. Mr. Maynard understood and indicated they would have a document with a descriptive easement.

Mr. Maynard asked that the Board date specify the case to next month's meeting. He said if they were unable to meet with the Conservation Commission they would continue to a later meeting. Mr. McNamara inquired if the commission could provide an advisory opinion without a formal meeting. Ms. Beauregard stated they could ask the commission for such. She said they needed to see if formally the case could be continued out another month.

The case was date specified to the September 9, 2019 meeting.

Mr. Hennessey returned to the Board.

#### **DATE SPECIFIED CASE(S)**

Case #ZO2019-00018 - Map 30 Lot 11-102- McARTHUR, Joseph H & Johnna & Joseph Q – 61 Dutton Road

#### **MINUTES REVIEW**

Ms. Ryan was appointed to vote.

#### **July 8, 2019, 2019**

**MOTION** (McNamara/Hennessey) To approve the meeting minutes of July 8, 2019 as amended.

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

**ADJOURNMENT**

Ms. Ryan was appointed to vote.

**MOTION:** (McNamara/Ryan) To adjourn the meeting.

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

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:37pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
Charity A. Landry  
Recording Secretary