

**TOWN OF ALTON
ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
MINUTES
Public Hearing
July 7, 2011
Approved 11/3/11**

I. CALL TO ORDER

Tim Morgan, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 7:07 p.m.

II. INTRODUCTION OF PLANNING DEPARTMENT AND ZONING BOARD MEMBERS

Timothy Morgan, Chair, introduced himself, the Planning Department Representative, and the members of the Zoning Board of Adjustment:

John Dever, Building Inspector and Code Enforcement Officer
Paul Monziona, Member
Lou LaCourse, Clerk
Steve Miller, Member

III. APPOINTMENT OF ALTERNATES

Timothy Kinnon was not present at this meeting; there was also no alternate present.

IV. STATEMENT OF THE APPEAL PROCESS

The purpose of this hearing is to allow anyone concerned with an Appeal to the Board of Adjustment to present evidence for or against the Appeal. This evidence may be in the form of an opinion rather than an established fact, however, it should support the grounds which the Board must consider when making a determination. The purpose of the hearing is not to gauge the sentiment of the public or to hear personal reasons why individuals are for or against an appeal but all facts and opinions based on reasonable assumptions will be considered. In the case of an appeal for a variance, the Board must determine facts bearing upon the five criteria as set forth in the State's Statutes. For a special exception, the Board must ascertain whether each of the standards set forth in the Zoning Ordinance has been or will be met.

V. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

P. Monziona made a motion to approve the agenda as presented. L. LaCourse seconded the motion which passed with four votes in favor and none opposed.

VI. CONTINUED APPLICATIONS

Case #Z11-07 117 New Durham Road	Appeal of Administrative Decision Map 9 Lot 53	Alton Bay Campmeeting Association Rural Residential Zone
---	---	---

Application submitted by Attorney Arthur Hoover on behalf of the Alton Bay Campmeeting Association to appeal the decision of the Zoning Officer regarding the determination that a 5 unit, multi-family apartment building is an abandoned non-conforming use in the Zone.

J. Dever read the case into the record. Attorney Hoover came forward on behalf of the applicant.

T. Morgan pointed out that two of the members who had heard the presentation at the June meeting were not in attendance at this meeting; specifically, T. Kinnon and P. Larochele. Following that through, the only members who had heard the presentation in June and were also in attendance this evening were T. Morgan, P. Monziona, and L. LaCourse. He asked Mr. Hoover if, in light of that fact, he would like to proceed this evening or have a continuance. Mr. Hoover consulted briefly with his client and replied that they would elect to postpone; T. Morgan requested a rescheduling to the meeting on August 4, 2011 which was satisfactory to the applicant.

S. Miller suggested that this continuance should not be counted against the two allowed by the ordinance.

S. Miller made a motion to not count this continuance against the claimant.

P. Monziona recalled that this issue was continued during deliberation and after public hearing so that the Board could consult with counsel as to how to proceed. He suggested that the Board may wish to propose something additional to the applicant at this time as opposed to next month, which would cause an additional month of lag time for them. T. Morgan asked Attorney Hoover if he would entertain a brief discussion with the Board members who were sitting at the June meeting, as long as there was no decision; he informed Attorney Hoover that P. Monziona was trying to tell him something. Attorney Hoover agreed to this discussion.

P. Monziona made a motion to open deliberation on Case Z11-07 for limited discussion. L. LaCourse seconded the motion which passed with four votes in favor and none opposed.

P. Monziona stated that the Board members had met with town counsel on this issue. He also stated for the record that at the time the Code Enforcement Officer made his decision to deny the permit, there was sufficient basis for the denial based on the lack of information supplied to him to show the intent to continue. The members feel that the denial was correctly given based on what the Code Enforcement Officer had for evidence at that time. However, additional evidence has been presented at the hearing; this is being viewed de novo and is based on the evidence that was presented to the Board. Also, the specific question is whether the intent was to continue with five units as opposed to any other number of multi-units. The Board or the Code Enforcement Officer has never been given a copy of the Purchase and Sale documents or any other evidence directly on that point. He and other members have an idea that although they would have preferred all the evidence at the time of the application, he would consider making a motion that would afford the applicant an opportunity to submit additional evidence; they are in deliberative session now which would mean that there is no additional evidence to be submitted. It would however be appropriate to make a motion to that effect now; if they waited until next month and the applicant agreed to it, then it would be yet another month if the applicant agreed to do it.

P. Monziona made a motion to afford the applicant additional opportunity to submit direct evidence to the Board, if any exists, on the intent to continue with a five unit structure, and that this evidence be submitted before the next continued hearing. S. Miller seconded the motion which passed with four votes in favor and none opposed.

J. Dever requested that said evidence be submitted as soon as possible to give the Board ample time for review. Attorney Hoover agreed to this request.

L. LaCourse seconded S. Miller’s motion to have this continuance not count against the two allowed the claimant. The motion passed with four votes in favor and none opposed.

Case #Z11-10 Rte 28 South/Suncook Valley Rd.	Special Exception Map 8 Lot 49	Robert H. Carleton, Trustee Rural Zone
---	-----------------------------------	---

Application submitted by Tyler Phillips on behalf of the Robert H. Carlton Revocable Trust, Robert H. Carlton, Trustee, for a Special Exception to Article 300, Section 320 C.2 to allow other than a single family home on a non-conforming lot.

J. Dever read the case into the record. Public Input in this case had already been closed; the Board continued at the deliberative stage pending the site walk. S. Miller asked about addressing the Police Department's concerns about entry and exit onto Route 28; T. Morgan recalled that the previous Special Exception on this subject a condition was placed to have a proper DOT permit for the use of Route 28. Several of the criteria established for the previous Special Exception could also be appended to this approval, if granted. J. Dever handed out copies of the previous Special Exception granted for this project. P. Monziona pointed out that the Board has already granted the Special Exception to allow a Recreational Camping Park in the Rural Zone; this Special Exception discussed tonight was a condition of the prior approval as a way to avoid creating a non-conforming lot due to lack of frontage.

SPECIAL EXCEPTION WORKSHEET

1 – P. Monziona stated that a plat **has** been accepted in accordance with Alton Zoning Ordinance Section 520B. All members agreed.

2 – L. LaCourse stated that the specific site **is** an appropriate location for the use. During the site walk he noted that the site was much higher and dryer than he expected it to be and it's cut away from the main section of town in such a way that he believes that there will be no issues with excessive noise. S. Miller agreed and added that after walking the site he feels that 150 units would be appropriate; there are significant buffers surrounding the parcel from the abutters. He thinks this is a good location for a camping site. T. Morgan agreed and added that, in addition to those reasons, it is an appropriate location for the use because it is allowed in that zone by Special Exception, and the proper applications are before the Board. P. Monziona stated that the site walk was particularly helpful to him in fully appreciating the location, and he would agree for the reasons stated. He also added that his agreement would be contingent on certain conditions, specifically many of those that were set forth in the Conditions of Approval for the previous Special Exception. The site would not be an appropriate location unless those conditions are met.

3 – S. Miller stated that factual evidence **is not found** that the property values in the district will be reduced due to incompatible uses. There was no factual evidence presented by any experts showing that there would be any change in abutters' property values, one way or the other. All members agreed.

4 – T. Morgan stated that there **is no** valid objection from abutters based on demonstrable fact; there were abutters who came forward and objected; their objections were well taken but the subjects that were of concern to them were unfortunately not within the purview of this Board. They are things that would be addressed by the Planning Board concerning how the camp would be maintained and run and regulated. For the purpose of this Special Exception, he feels that there is not a valid objection. P. Monziona agreed for the same reason; the abutters' objections were valid in a general sense and were totally understandable. For the limited criteria this Board is to consider in making decisions, those objections are not applicable. L. LaCourse agreed. S. Miller also agreed and added that this property is currently used as a rock pit which at times can have significant noise. Snowmobiles have the run of the place during the winter. Also, there was expert testimony that there would not be any significant negative impact on the ecosystem in terms of the number of people expected to use Merrymeeting Lake. P. Monziona added for the record that his agreement on the abutters' issues, as all of these, is conditioned on certain Conditional Approvals.

5 – P. Monziona stated that there **is no** undue nuisance or serious hazard to pedestrian or vehicular traffic, including the location and design of access ways and off-street parking; again, he makes that determination only contingent on certain conditions of this approval. For example, unless the road issue is satisfied – the condition of the previous Special Exception being granted – or any of the other issues from the Department Heads or the NH Department of Environmental Services. Without meeting those conditions, some of these things would impose a hazard to vehicular traffic or constitute an undue nuisance. He agrees, but only on those express conditions. L. LaCourse agreed for all the aforementioned reasons. S. Miller agreed due to DOT standards. T. Morgan agreed and thinks the DOT issue is an important one here.

6 – L. LaCourse stated that adequate and appropriate facilities and utilities **will** be provided to insure proper operation of the proposed use or structure. From what was seen on the site walk, there are plans to run a significant amount of water over there by passing it underneath the river in a very proper way, and electrical facilities will also be properly provided. S. Miller agreed and added that there is no evidence to the contrary and that the owner is well capitalized to provide the proper facilities. T. Morgan agreed. P. Monziona agreed providing certain conditions are met.

7 – S. Miller stated that there **is** adequate area for safe and sanitary sewage disposal and water supply. There is no evidence to the contrary and he feels comfortable that this constraint is being met. T. Morgan agreed with the exception that they would need to require that all permits be in place and approved by the state. P. Monziona agreed, providing certain conditions are met. L. LaCourse agreed.

8 – T. Morgan stated that the proposed use or structure **is** consistent with the spirit of the ordinance and the intent of the Master Plan; as he had said in one of the prior criteria, this is contemplated by the Zoning Regulations in this area provided the Special Exception criteria are met. P. Monziona and L. LaCourse agreed. S. Miller agreed; it is currently used for business purposes and in his opinion it will be more people friendly going forward.

P. Monziona made a motion to approve the Special Exception for Case Z11-10 specifically on the following conditions of approval, those being those set forth in the Notice of Decision of May 10, 2011 on Case Z11-06, except for Condition #1, all others in that motion to be applicable here as well. L. LaCourse seconded the motion which passed with four votes in favor and none opposed.

VII. NEW APPLICATIONS

<p>Case #Z11-12 23 Lady Slipper Lane</p>	<p>Rehearing of Special Exception Map 76 Lot 18</p>	<p>Thomas and Lorraine Mitchell Rural Zone</p>
---	--	--

Application submitted by Tom Varney on behalf of Thomas and Lorraine Mitchell for a Rehearing of the Special Exception to Article 300, Section 320, to have the condition that the new basement not be used as living space removed from their approval. This property is zoned rural.

Note: The case number on the agenda was incorrect; this was listed as Case Z11-05 but should be Case Z11-12.

J. Dever read the case into the record. Tom Varney of Varney Engineering along with the applicants, Tom and Lorraine Mitchell, came forward to present. They had been at the hearing on May 5, 2011 where they were granted their requested Special Exception. One of the conditions of that special exception was that the new foundation area could not be used as living space, but for storage only. It was the intent of the Mitchell’s to use

that new basement space as a bedroom and bathroom. During the hearing, the condition in question was not discussed, though other factors were. There is no reason Mr. Varney can think of why they should not be able to use the basement space as living space; they are not restricted on land area and it is not near wetlands or flood zones. The applicant is asking that they be allowed to use that basement area as living space. The cottage is not changed that much; the cottage has been jacked up and placed back down on a new foundation. The foundation is a big area they wanted to use right from the beginning, but it was never discussed at the meeting.

Mr. Mitchell explained that they have two children and grandchildren, and they are stepping over each other on the first floor. There are two bedrooms, a living room and a kitchen that are all crammed together. Their intent was to make an easier living space for all of them. They have been in Alton for several years and plan to move here upon retirement; Mr. Mitchell has been coming here since age 6.

T. Morgan explained that in consideration of the criteria applying to water and sewage, if those criteria are not addressed, they are assumed not to be changing. The condition was placed because those things were not addressed and no change was being made. Mr. Mitchell explained that they have a well, recently installed, and a 1,250 gallon septic system right now. Additionally, they have an approval for another septic system. He is going to be installing a central heating system and updating the electrical service and making this a year round home.

Mr. Varney stated that the state approved septic system had been submitted with the application; the approval came on May 10, 2011 which was five days after the hearing. P. Monziona explained that in the criteria T. Morgan had spoken about, they had to find that adequate sewage and utilities would be provided, and they had to find that there was adequate area for safe and sanitary sewage disposal and water supply. At the time of the application, the approval was not received for the new septic system; T. Varney agreed but added that at the time they submitted the application they submitted the septic plan to show that they had adequate room. P. Monziona went on to explain that septic system size is governed in part by the number of bedrooms in a dwelling structure. The approval received from the state is for a three bedroom cottage, per T. Varney. P. Monziona asked if the septic currently on the property is for three bedrooms; the applicant stated that it is. P. Monziona went on to ask why they submitted for a three bedroom septic if they already had one. T. Varney explained that under the Special Exception for expansion of use, there is one set of criteria. Under the state, whenever there is an expansion of a building, the septic plan is a requirement. He added that they also expanded up to three bedrooms because that is what the applicant wanted to do, and they have adequate land area to do that. That was in the preparation of the final plan. The cottage is currently a two bedroom; the expansion would add a third bedroom which would be in the basement.

P. Monziona again questioned the existing septic; he wanted to know if the current septic was approved for a three bedroom. T. Varney answered that the existing septic was not approved for anything. P. Monziona reiterated that to put three bedrooms in the cottage, the Board would not be able to answer that there is adequate safe and sanitary sewage disposal if the septic currently in place has not been approved by the state for a three bedroom. However, the applicant has received approval for a three bedroom septic design; is there a current plan to actually construct the three bedroom septic. In other words, the applicant is not going to take a special exception from the Zoning Board to have three bedrooms, and then construct the three bedrooms without installing the three bedroom septic. The applicant agreed to that statement. P. Monziona went on – the fact that a three bedroom septic design has been approved means that there is adequate land to accommodate the new design. T. Varney answered in the affirmative and added that the state approval had been granted without waivers.

There was discussion continuing concerning the septic. Mr. Mitchell explained that at one point there had just been a barrel in the ground for a tank; they had that replaced with a 1,250 gallon tank because they know that they eventually wanted to put in three bedrooms. P. Monziona asked if the leech field had been changed to accommodate the three bedroom design; Mr. Varney explained that the larger tank had been installed at the time of a repair to the system 8 years ago. This was not done under any permit or state design.

L. LaCourse asked the applicant if they intend to build the septic before they build the third bedroom. Mr. Mitchell answered that they are in the process of working on the basement level now. L. LaCourse asked if the septic would be in before the third bedroom. T. Varney answered that installing the new septic would not be required by the state, but if the Board requires it, they will do it. Mr. Mitchell added that the system is functioning now; it is not in failure. P. Monziona again brought up the point of whether there is adequate area for safe and sanitary sewage disposal; if the condition is removed and the third bedroom is built, and the current septic is not adequate under state law and the newly designed septic is never installed, the Board has allowed the third bedroom with an inadequate septic according to state law.

S. Miller asked if there is a definition of what a bedroom is; you can put in futons and sleeper sofas and that still constitutes a living room. J. Dever addressed the question stating that there is no definitive definition; he defines it as a room with a smoke detector, a window that meets egress requirements, and a closet. However, if the tax assessor walks into any room with a bed, it is a bedroom.

T. Varney reiterated that this issue had not been discussed at the previous meeting; T. Morgan voiced his understanding of that issue. Mr. Mitchell added that they had not been aware of any of this; they had planned on putting the well in, which they have done.

Process was discussed; there will be no need to go through a worksheet, as that has already been done in this case. The Board will need to make a motion to remove the condition and then vote accordingly.

S. Miller asked the Mitchell's if they are granted the special exception, will the bedroom they are creating have the smoke detector, egress window, and closet as mentioned by J. Dever. Mrs. Mitchell answered that they will have an egress window that meets code; her husband is a contractor and will make sure everything is done to the letter of the code. She is not sure about the closet, but it will meet all the safety requirements. They love the cottage and they are not changing the footprint. It used to belong to Mr. Mitchell's uncle and they have been going there for many years and hope that the grandchildren come to love it as they do.

L. LaCourse asked for a short discussion; he feels that if they remove this condition, they will have to add another to make sure that the septic is actually built within a certain amount of time. He is uncomfortable removing the condition with a septic that doesn't really exist; they just have it on paper. P. Monziona agreed but felt that instead of giving a specific amount of time in which to complete the septic, the Board should leave the condition that the basement will not be used as a bedroom will remain in effect until the septic is constructed, at which time the condition will be removed.

Mr. Mitchell explained that the tank is the size as approved for three bedrooms; the system is still operating and is not in failure. He asked if there are Title V inspections in NH to see if a system is still functional; J. Dever answered that there are not. P. Monziona explained that if the state uses the number of bedrooms as criteria for the size of the septic system, then under the state criteria the septic he has is a two bedroom septic. Mr. Mitchell disagreed; the 1,250 gallon tank is approved for a three bedroom. J. Dever agreed but added that it also determines the size of the leech field.

S. Miller stated that he does not feel that a time period is appropriate; he would be comfortable with having it be that once the bedroom is created as described by the Mitchell's for the record, that the septic system be equal to that three bedroom requirement.

There was further discussion concerning the septic currently in place; the 1,250 tank was placed with a leech field off the end of it when they removed the 55 gallon drum that used to be there. Since then, the laws have changed and it no longer meets the requirements for a three bedroom system. T. Varney explained that the tank is the right size for a three bedroom; the rest of the system has no approval; what they did back then was illegal.

P. Monziona suggested for discussion that the proper motion might be that upon the septic system meeting the state's criteria for three bedrooms, the condition is removed. Whether it meets it now or meets it later is not up to the Board; if they already have it, that's fine. However, the condition has to be that if this Board allows three bedrooms for a septic system that does not meet state requirements then they are not meeting the criteria for adequate disposal of sewage and they are making the wrong decision. He would propose that upon the septic system meeting state approval for three bedrooms, the condition would be removed. Mr. Mitchell questioned that; he felt that was unfair. P. Monziona explained that the condition would be removed once the state approved the septic for three bedrooms. The certificate of occupancy could be held until the three bedroom septic system was installed and approved.

P. Monziona made a motion in Case Z11-12 that the previous condition imposed on the granting of the Special Exception that the basement not be used as a living space or bedroom be removed once the applicant has satisfied the state's requirements for a three bedroom septic.

S. Miller requested an amendment, that being that the applicants should be limited to putting just a bedroom in there because he is not sure if that constraint is enforceable if they decide to have a den.

P. Monziona explained that the condition imposed on the approval had been that the basement not be used as living space.

S. Miller withdrew his amendment. L. LaCourse seconded P. Monziona's motion which passed with four votes in favor and none opposed.

IX. OTHER BUSINESS

- A. Previous Business: None
- B. New Business: Request of rehearing in the case of George Makso, 9 Mission Path, Special Exception.

Mr. Makso had been before the Board in June requesting that he be allowed to put a full basement under his cottage at the Christian Conference Center. In his plans, he also shows that he wants to expand up and out and use the foundation he is going to build as living space. The cottage is very small; it is only about 500 square feet. Part of the expansion of living space is septic capability; currently, the septic that serves that part of the Christian Conference Center needs to be reviewed. It was installed 20 years ago; there have been a number of additions made over the years that were not subject to any oversight. At this point, the condition was put on the approval that Mr. Makso could replace the full foundation; this is for a failing foundation only and is not to be used as living space. Any future expansion of living space will require further Zoning Board review and approval.

Mr. Makso feels that in the course of the discussion, and this was also discussed with Attorney Sessler, he felt that the Board did not disagree that he could expand up and down and that he wanted 14' walls. The Board specifically said what they were granting did not include expansion of living space, and the Board specifically addressed the lack of sanitary facilities. Mr. Makso wanted to revisit and reconsider raising the ridgeline by adding 14' walls rather than the standard 8' walls as they stand. L. LaCourse asked if that would make it more non-conforming; J. Dever answered that at this point it would.

P. Monziona asked if this was a timely application for rehearing; J. Dever answered that it was within the timeframe. P. Monziona confirmed through questioning that the only thing being decided at this meeting was whether or not to grant the rehearing, and then to hear the arguments at a later time if granted. P. Monziona also clarified that in granting the rehearing, the Board would have to find that an error had been made and that the rehearing would give the Board a chance to correct that mistake.

P. Monziona commented that this Special Exception had been granted based on the designs that were provided with the application; this is the problem with submitting plans that are different than what the applicant really wants to do. In this case, the plan showed 12' and the applicant talked about 14'. L. LaCourse specifically remembered separating this and that the application was for the foundation and had nothing to do with the 14' walls. Members reviewed the minutes of the June meeting. S. Miller stated that the Board can only rule on what is in the plans; J. Dever pointed out that the plans submitted depict the entire renovation, but the request was to replace the failing foundation. S. Miller pointed out that the applicant can come in any time for another Special Exception, and that the Board should suggest that he do just that.

P. Monziona questioned L. LaCourse's point that when Mr. Makso referenced 12 – 14 foot walls, that was the height of the walls he was going to replace on the foundation. L. LaCourse stated that had been his understanding; the first step was to get the foundation and then he would come back later and get the walls. He explained that was the reason he had specifically asked if the foundation was split out and he had asked Mr. Makso if the application was specifically for the foundation, to which Mr. Makso had replied that it was. P. Monziona asked if anywhere in his application the applicant had been seeking to build a bigger building by virtue of 14' walls; the application limited itself to the dimensions of the foundation. S. Miller again suggested that the applicant should just apply for an additional Special Exception and go forward. It may be an economic burden but if you change the criteria in the middle of the process, that is what you have to do.

L. LaCourse noted that Mr. Makso stated on June 2 that bedrooms would be added in the future but at present the cottage would not have any additional living space. He also referred to J. Dever's comment that the request presently was to put in the foundation and not be able to use it. P. Monziona noted that his agreement had been based on the modification and safer foundation as described and demonstrated in the application would not extend into any living space or use until such time as other approvals have been met with regard to the septic. T. Morgan pointed out that he may have stepped out a little to far in his comment concerning the applicant having "talked about putting a second floor on but not finishing out the second floor; he thinks as long as there are no bedrooms or bathrooms added that construction of the walls is still appropriate."

P. Monziona reiterated that he does not think the application had anything except replacement of the foundation; it did not talk about walls. J. Dever referenced the Notice of Decision which included the comment that expansion of the living space would require further Zoning Board approval. P. Monziona agreed and affirmed that the only thing the Board had considered in that application was the foundation. If they were wrong in that decision, there is something in his plan that depicts 14 foot walls and that was indeed part of the application. The application itself was reviewed; reconstruction is shown in the plans, as he goes forward. He wants to add a deck which will require a variance and approval from the state.

L. LaCourse reiterated that the application was only for the foundation; it had been specifically split off that way and was the only thing decided on. P. Monziona pointed out that the narrative describes the present condition with regard to all parts and systems – foundation, walls, floors, electrical, plumbing, etc. The application includes the whole lot and all improvements on it and describes the entire parcel including landscaping. J. Dever pointed out that the landscaping benefits the owner, which is the Alton Bay Campmeeting Association.

P. Monziona read from the narrative "we would like to start overhauling from the bottom up and thus this request to finish the foundation and to move the one bedroom below and open the small space above to become a living room, kitchen, and eating area. We would like to make the walls as high as 14' (open ceiling rafters) so that future expansion may be possible on the second floor if permission is not granted under this appeal." That makes it seem like the 14' walls would be required in the future if this were not granted. It is understandable with all that he included in the description of his application why he feels that 14' walls were part of it. L. LaCourse surmised that the 14' walls would allow for a good 6-7 foot knee wall above once the first floor walls and ceilings were in place.

P. Monziona made a motion to deny Mr. Makso's request for rehearing in Case Z11-08, specifically on the grounds that the Board in its decision made it very clear to the applicant, even in light of a very broadly described decision of the property, that the Board was basing its decision and reviewing the criteria solely on the request to reconstruct the foundation, and therefore there is no error for the Board to correct and a rehearing would not be productive. He would add that the applicant is free to submit any additional applications he deems appropriate to address the other areas of construction he wants to do in the future, as described in some of his narratives. L. LaCourse seconded the motion which passed with four votes in favor and none opposed.

C. Zoning Amendment Committee Volunteers

K. McWilliams is looking to have a couple of members from the Zoning Board involved in review of proposed zoning amendments for the coming election. Some of the items that need to be addressed are new and some are those that were discussed but not acted on last season. Meetings would be once or twice a month beginning right away; public hearings begin in November. Meeting times are not known at this time.

T. Morgan, P. Monziona, and L. LaCourse all stated that they would be able to review materials and submit written responses, and would attend what meetings they could, but none of them could commit to all meetings that might be scheduled. S. Miller is unable to commit at all due to demands of the Budget Committee. J. Dever stated that a schedule of meetings will be forthcoming from K. McWilliams.

D. Minutes: April 07, 2011, May 5, 2011, and June 2, 2011

April 7, 2011 – On page 2 of 6, third line from the top of the page, “e” was added to the letter “H” to make it “He.”

S. Miller made a motion to approve the minutes of April 7, 2011, as amended. L. LaCourse seconded the motion which passed with four votes in favor and none opposed.

May 5, 2011 –

S. Miller made a motion to approve the minutes of May 5, 2011, as presented. L. LaCourse seconded the motion which passed with four votes in favor and none opposed.

June 2, 2011 –

On page 2 of 25, third paragraph, first line, the word “whether” should be changed to “rather.”

On page 3 of 25, item #1 of the Variance Worksheet, second line, the word “bring” should be changed to “make.”

On page 9 of 25, the last paragraph, second line, the “s” should be removed from the word “founds” making it “found.”

On page 16 of 25, the third paragraph, fourth line, “a swell” should be “as well.”

L. LaCourse made a motion to approve the minutes of June 2, 2011, as amended. P. Monziona seconded the motion which passed with three votes in favor, none opposed, and one abstention (S. Miller).

Board members discussed a document that the fire and police departments use to locate every address in town. The town hall is the beginning point and the turn by turn directions go from there to all lots and structures. J. Dever has one and will run copies for the Board.

X. ADJOURNMENT

P. Monziona made a motion to adjourn. L. LaCourse seconded the motion which passed four votes in favor and none opposed.

The meeting adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

The next regular ZBA meeting will be held on August 4, 2011, at 7:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary L. Tetreau
Recorder, Public Session