

Call to order at 7:00 p.m. Present: Keith Chamberlain, Lyndon Avery, Marcella Perry, Timothy Morgan, Angela Bystrack, and Timothy Kinnon-Alternate, Kathy Menici, and Carolyn Schaeffner, Recording Secretary

Appointment of Alternates Timothy Kinnon

Approval of Agenda : Case Z05-31, Case Z05-32, Case Z05-33, Case Z05-34 continued to a time and date that will be determined later in tonight's meeting.

Motion by Timothy Morgan to approved the agenda as amended. Second by Lyndon Avery. Vote Unanimous.

NEW APPLICATIONS:

Case Z06-03

Map 21 Lot 5-6

**Motion For Rehearing
Hopewell Road**

Robert and Sandra Bahre

Application submitted by Alton Board of Selectmen for a Rehearing on Case#Z05-36 to present new evidence regarding the December 19, 2005, ZBA decision upholding the September 1, 2005, ZBA decision in an Administrative Appeal to overturn the decision of the Building Inspector and allow the issuance of a building permit in order to construct a building to store the property owners' antique and collectible automobile collection.

K. Menici: Stated this case was noticed in a newspaper of general circulation, The Laconia Citizen and all abutters were noticed by mail.

Timothy Morgan recused himself from this case.

Timothy Kinnon seated as an alternate.

M. Perry: Made a suggestion to the Board that they go into private session to review and discuss a letter from their attorney.

The Board, at this time went into private session.

M. Perry: Asked for discussion from the Board.

Motion by L. Avery to deny the rehearing of Case Z05-36 as presented by the selectmen and as part of the motion include for the ZBA attorney to have the consent to the consolidation of the three cases into one to save time and money and also for consent for the ZBA attorney to act on the Board's behalf for any minor procedural issues which might arise as long as there is no possibility that the outcome be jeopardized or affected. Second T.Kinnon. One Abstention, 4 approved.

M. Perry: The Chairman read a brief 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 gage 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 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.

Timothy Morgan resumed his seat on the Board.

Motion by T.Kinnon to amend the order of the agenda to set a date for Cases Z05-31, Z05-32, Z05-33 and Z05-34. Second by L.Avery, Vote Unanimous.

Case#Z05-33

Map14 Lot 21

Use Variance

New England Nominee Trust

486 East Side Dr. (NH 28A)

David J. Fenton Jr. Trustee

Application submitted by Industrial Communications & Electronics d.b.a Unicel on behalf of the property owner, New England Nominee Trust, David J. Fenton Jr. Trustee, for a Use Variance from Article 300, Section 301 and Article 200, Section 270, to construct a telecommunication tower outside the specified Telecommunication Overlay District. The property is located 486 East Side Dr in the Lakeshore Residential Zone.

M. Perry: Informed that on January 23, 2006 to review the qualifications the engineer firm that submitted bids for the technical review on Case Z05-31, Z05-32, Z05-33, and Z05-34 and at that time the Board chose Mark Hutchins of the firm CMA Engineering to represent the ZBA regarding the radio frequency coverage and safety issues and at that time the Board decided that they would set a date for a meeting for the review of those cases.

General discussion inquiring if the reports will be ready by the March meeting.

K. Menici: Explained that the first Monday has a conflict with the Board of Selectmen. She also stated that there have been two hold ups on the part of the engineer. She was informed the firm has requested data from the applicant and is waiting for this information. In addition, before the engineer can actually begin the review, the Town has to receive the payment in full for the engineering review, which will be escrowed and when the review is completed the Town disburses the payment to the consulting engineer. The Town has not yet received the payment from the applicant. She does have a call in to their attorney. She will remind the applicant's attorney that the engineer will need about 4 weeks from the time he gets the okay to begin from the Town (when the payment has been received.)

T. Kinnon: Suggested Monday March 13, 2006.

L. Avery: Suggested that if the information is still not in that this could be again continued; the Board could meet on the 13th and agree to continue the hearings.

Motion by to continue case Z05-33 New England Nominee Trust, David J. Fenton, Jr. Trustee to March 13, 2006 at 6:30 p.m. at Alton Town Hall. Second by T. Kinnon. Voted Unanimous.

Case#Z05-34 **Map14 Lot 21** **Area Variance**
New England Nominee Trust **486 East Side Dr. (NH 28A)**

David J. Fenton Jr. Trustee

Application submitted by Industrial Communications & Electronics d.b.a Unicel on behalf of the property owner New England Nominee Trust, David J. Fenton Jr. Trustee for an Area Variance from Article 200, Section 228 to construct a telecommunication tower 120' in height. The property is located 486 East Side Dr in the Lakeshore Residential Zone.

Motion by T. Morgan to continue Case Z05-34 to March 13 2006 at 6:30 p.m. Second by T. Kinnon. Vote unanimous.

Case#Z05-31 **Map19 Lot 8-2** **Use Variance**
Robert's Knoll Campground, LLC **1439 Wolfeboro Highway**

Application submitted by Industrial Communications & Electronics d.b.a Unicel on behalf of the property owner, Robert's Knoll Campground, LLC, for a Use Variance from Article 300, Section 301 and Article 200, Section 270, to construct a telecommunication tower outside the specified Telecommunications Overlay District. The property is located 1439 Wolfeboro Highway and in the Rural Zone.

Motion by T. Morgan to continue Case Z05-31 to March 13, 2006 at 6:30 p.m.. Second by T.Kinnon, Vote unanimous.

Case#Z05-32 **Map19 Lot 8-2** **Area Variance**
Robert's Knoll Campground, LLC **1439 Wolfeboro Highway**

Application submitted by Industrial Communications & Electronics d.b.a Unicel on behalf of the property owner Robert's Knoll Campground, LLC, for an Area Variance from Article 200, Section 228 to construct a telecommunication tower 120' in height. The property is located at 1439 Wolfeboro Highway and in the Rural Zone.

Motion by T. Morgan to continue Case Z05-32 to March 13 2006 at 6:30 p.m. Second by T. Kinnon, Vote unanimous.

Case Z06-04 **Map 63 Lot 17** **Special Exception**
Terri McHugh **18 Railroad Ave.**

Application submitted by Simoneau Foundation Company, on behalf of the Terri McHugh, for Special Exception from the Town of Alton Zoning Ordinance 2005 Article 200, Section 220B. – Nonconforming Structure, Paragraph 2.(c) [Town of Alton Zoning Ordinance 2006 Article 300, Section 320B.2.(c)] to allow the construction of a foundation under an existing dwelling. The property is located at 18 Railroad Ave. and is in the Lakeshore Residential zone, the Town of Alton Shoreland Protection Overlay District, and the State of NH Shoreland Protection District.

K. Menici: Informed that the case was noticed in a newspaper of general circulation, The Laconia Citizen and all abutters were noticed by certified mail.

Steven Simoneau, Jim McHugh (husband of Terri McHugh) present for this application.

S. Simoneau: Stated he was applying for application to finish the foundation on the property to secure the structure to bring it up to code to be able to use this in the winter season. Presently there is only a foundation under half of the structure the remaining is sitting on dirt.

Motion by L. Avery to accept the application with the exception that questions that need to be answered. Second by T. Morgan. Vote unanimous.

S. Simoneau: repeated his previous statement describing his application.

L. Avery: Noted listing of height structure from sill line to the eaves of 16 ft plus or minus. Asked if the structure would be raised at all.

S. Simoneau: Confirmed approximately raised 6 inches.

L. Avery: Asked if this would be a poured full foundation.

S. Simoneau: Confirmed, and that they would like to eliminate the block foundation there now and the foot print will not change.

L. Avery: Stated he was concerned with height restrictions with the finished project that it would not rise more than 6 inches.

M. Perry: Asked about the block wall.

S. Simoneau: Confirmed that it was approximately 7.6.

T. Morgan: Asked about location of Railroad Avenue and abutters with regard to changing views.

S. Simoneau: Informed the road was behind the structure. There was a leech field between the house and Railroad Ave with a steep grade and the property owners own the property on the other side of Railroad Avenue.

A. Bystrack: Asked how many feet are from border to the other house for room for equipment between houses.

S. Simoneau: Confirmed there is approximately 17 feet plus to the home and it would be adequate.

M. Perry: Asked how close the structure is to the lake.

S. Simoneau: Informed 19-20 feet.

K. Menici: Informed the Board there is a sketch with this information on it. It is 19.5 ft.

S. Simoneau: All work would be done from the back the side of the structure moving everything into the existing driveway.

M. Perry: Asked for any other questions. Open up to the public. In favor – none heard. In opposition – none heard. Continued to the Board for deliberations.

M. Perry: Asked the Board to refer to Special Exception Worksheet:

K.Chamberlain: Read 1. A plat has been accepted by the Planner in accordance with Alton Zoning Ordinance Section 420 b. and a recommendation has been made. All Board members agree.

L. Avery: Read 2. The specific site is an appropriate location for the use. All Board members agree.

T. Morgan: Read 3. Factual evidence is not found that the property values in the district will be reduced due to incompatible uses. All Board members agree.

L Avery: Read 4. There is no valid objection from abutters based on demonstrable fact. All Board members agree.

A. Bystrack: Read 5. There is undue nuisance or serious hazard to pedestrian or vehicular traffic, including the location and design of access ways and off-street parking. All Board members agree.

L. Avery: Read 6. Adequate and appropriate facilities and utilities will be provided to insure proper operation of the proposed use or structure. All Board members agree.

T. Morgan: Read 7. There is adequate area for safe and sanitary sewage disposal. All Board members agree.

A. Bystrack: Read 8. The proposed use or structure is consistent with the spirit of this ordinance and the intent of the Master Plan.

Motion by L. Avery to approve Case Z06-04, Map 63, Lot 17 for the Special Exception based on the findings of fact. Second by A. Bystrack, Vote unanimous.

CONTINUED APPLICATIONS:

Case Z06-01

Map 5 Lot 31

Special Exception

Aaron L. Robidas

694 Suncook Valley Road (NH 28)

Special Exception from Article 300, Section 301, to allow the operation of a retail business for the sales of new radio-controlled vehicles scooters, mini-bikes, go-carts, and youth ATVs; and used ATVs, mini-bikes, motorcycles, watercraft, snowmobiles, and yard tractors. The property is located at 694 Suncook Valley Road and is in the Rural zone. Continued from January 5, 2006 meeting.

Mr. Aaron Robidas present and representing himself.

M. Perry: Summarized that this case was heard on January 5, 2005 for a home business to sell recreational vehicles. At that the Board questioned the location, parking area and safe sight distance in both directions, entering and leaving the property and a motion was made to continue the case for deliberation until February 2, 2006 meeting.

Timothy Morgan recused himself from this case

Timothy Kinnon is seated as an alternate

M. Perry: Read Special Exception. A special exception is a use that would not be appropriate generally or without restriction throughout a particular zone but which, if controlled as to the number, area, duration, location, or relation to the neighborhood would promote the public health, safety, and general welfare. Noted to the Board this is a special exception that Mr. Robidas is requesting and asked for input from the Board.

A. Bystrack: Stated that she checked into question from last meeting. She checked with the State regarding the driveway distance needed. They could not be specific because it is merited on each case individually. She notified Fish and Game and regarding the issue of 4-wheelers on the main road and liability. If a private property owner is on your property and an accident occurs the private property owner is not liable for the accident but conversion of a piece of property to a business there are circumstances in which the property owner could become financially liable for accidents.

M. Perry: Also referred to the Special Exception guidelines that parking areas and lighting should be buffered in such a way as not to adversely impact abutting properties (from Section 313). She feels that from the drawings this is a concern.

T. Kinnon: Shared that his main concern is the location of structure on property. Feels it is a curiosity factor create hazard for travel on Route 28.

M. Perry: Noted that the abutters testified last meeting that traffic slowed down going past this property continually.

L. Avery: Feels there is inadequate off street parking.

T. Kinnon: Stated the lot is large enough (5 acres). But the specific area is too close to the road.

M. Perry: Felt the plat did not clearly portray the actual physical character of the lot and the location of the roadway to the parking area.

L. Avery: Indicated he does not feel this has safe entry and exit for parking.

M. Perry: Suggested that this could be done differently on this piece of property but not the way it is presented. Asked if the Board was ready to go over the Special Exception Worksheet.

T. Kinnon: Read 1. A plat has been accepted by the Planner in accordance with Alton Zoning Ordinance Section 420 b. and a recommendation has been made. All Board members agree.

A. Bystrack: Read 2. The specific site is not an appropriate location for the use. All Board members agree.

K. Chamberlain: Read 3. Factual evidence is (1 agrees) is not (4 agree) found that the property values in the

district will be reduced due to incompatible uses. 1 member feels factual evidence is found; 4 members agree factual evidence is not found.

A. Bystrack: Read 4. There is valid objection from abutters based on demonstrable fact. All Board members agree.

T. Kinnon: Read 5. There is undue nuisance or serious hazard to pedestrian or vehicular traffic, including the location and design of access ways and off-street parking. All Board members agree.

M. Perry: Read 6. Adequate and appropriate facilities and utilities will not be provided to insure proper operation of the proposed use or structure. All Board members agree.

K. Chamberlain: Read 7. There is adequate area for safe and sanitary sewage disposal. All Board members agree.

M. Perry: Read 8. The proposed use or structure is (4 agree) is not (1 agrees) consistent with the spirit of this ordinance and the intent of the Master Plan.

Motion – by T. Kinnon to deny Case Z06-01 due to unsafe and inadequate area for entrance and egress to the property and for safe operation of the retail business proposed. Second by L.Avery. Vote unanimous.

Timothy Morgan resumed his seat on the Board.

K. Menici: Asked the Chair, on behalf of the applicant, would it worth the applicant's time to revisit the layout and come back with a different configuration?

M. Perry: Indicated that in discussion and going over the worksheet this had been suggested that there may be some different areas that he might look at and felt that the Board would look at this again.

K. Chamberlain: Asked the Chair to address the Town Planner. He express his understanding of special exceptions or submitting a plan to the ZBA, if the plan was denied the applicant could not come back in front of the Board unless the new plans were substantially different from their old plans. Also that the Planner should not be telling the applicant that he could go ahead and submit another plan.

M. Perry and K. Menici: Agreed with his understanding but both felt that the Town Planner did not tell the applicant that statement and M. Perry agreed that the Board was aware of this and the Planner will do her responsibility seriously.

OTHER BUSINESS:

1. Approval of Minutes of the following meetings: June 2, 2005, August 4, 2005, August 25, 2005, November 3, 2005, December 1, 2005, and January 5, 2006.

Discussion of Minutes of June 2, 2005, No questions from T. Kinnon: K.Chamberlain stated he had no comment at this time.

Motion by M. Perry to approve the minutes of June 2, 2005, Second by T. Kinnon. 2 affirmative (Perry and

Kinnon), 2 abstentions (Chamberlain and Avery). Motion did not pass.

Discussion of Minutes of August 4, 2005. Discussion that only two people present tonight (Kinnon and Chamberlain) and the third person at that meeting is no longer a Board member. Discussion on how to proceed. K. Menici will ask Town Counsel how to proceed.

Discussion of Minutes of August 25, 2005. Discussion, no comments or concerns.

Motion by M. Perry to approve the minutes of August 25, 2005. Second by L.Avery, Vote unanimous.

Discussion of Minutes of November 3, 2005. Discussion noted to go back and review November 3 tapes to check on Chuck Weston name listed as a having input but not listed as being present. Board feels this is an error. K. Menici will check the tapes to be corrected. Also noted a correction on Page 2, middle of page, para 5, 2nd sentence wording should be changed to “view” sheds. Also noted a correction on Page 2, the last sentence should be “given to us”.

Discussion of Minutes of December 1, 2005. Discussion. Noted correction on Page 3, para 2, listing under 1. “The proposed location has a very high tree canopy about 40 feet higher than the tower.” M. Perry indicated that this is not what was said. K. Menici to check the tape for correction. Also noted correction on Page 7 and 8, K. Menici noted there was a secretary filling in that night and had a problem with the minutes. Also correction noted on Page 7. regarding a motion should state second by Tim Kinnon to continue the case. On Page 8, Case Z05-31 Tim Kinnon made the motion and Second by Angela Bystrack. Also on Page 8, Tim Morgan pointed out that one of the long term members is not present and therefore requested that the election be continued and a motion was made by Marcella Perry and Seconded by Angela Bystrack to continue.

Motion by Tim Kinnon to approve the Minutes of December 1, 2005 as corrected. Second by M. Perry. 1 abstention (Avery), 3 approved (Kinnon, Perry, and Bystrack).

Discussion of Minutes of January 5, 2005. Discussion. Mr. Chamberlain wanted to point out that after he left the meeting, Mr. Kinnon proposed to vote for officers and he feels that in the minutes that the Agenda was approved as written and the vote for officers was not amended in the agenda and states he feels the vote for officers technically does not exist. M. Perry stated that this item fell under “Any other business that comes before the Board.” L. Avery, in referring to the minutes, noted that K. Chamberlain made a statement regarding the need to still elect officers and felt that he was ready to do this also. K. Chamberlain still felt that this should have been amended into the agenda. K. Menici stated that this is not listed under the By-Laws. She also discussed this with Town Counsel stated this was not a problem. Discussion on whether the ZBA follows “Roberts Rules of Order.” K. Menici was asked to check with Town Counsel again to confirm that this vote was indeed correct in its procedure. L. Avery noted that it would have to have been a vote for the Board to follow Roberts Rules of Order and then it would have to be listed in the By-Laws. K. Menici confirmed this. Also noted correction on Page 14, Item 11, it say K. Chamberlain, should be L. Avery. Also noted on Page 17, last para, should be “everyone” not anybody.

Motion by M. Perry to approve the minutes of January 5, 2006 as corrected. Second by T. Kinnon. 2 abstentions (Morgan and Chamberlain), 3 approved (Kinnon, Bystrack, and Perry). Motion passed

2. Old Business: Review of application forms

T. Kinnon: Stated that one of the cases tonight was a good illustration of what K. Menici was speaking of from the meeting of January 23 that some cases require certain amounts of information and some require others and this was a special exception that has come before the Board in the past and the amount of information that was submitted with this application was far less than what has been allowed in the past.

K. Menici: Stated that conceptual consultation is within the purview of the Planning Board. What the Board could have done in this situation tonight was to continue the discussion the acceptance of the application to next month's meeting and instruct the applicant on what additional information is necessary to complete the application.

T. Kinnon: feels the Board needs to be consistent on what needs to be required.

General discussion in applications with inadequate information.

K. Menici: Stated that the ZBA is stepping into the shoes of the Planning Board with height issues in a special exception application. Referred to the commercial case this evening. Stated the Board will be reviewing that for site plan review. Felt the applicant did a very good sketch, provided the information clearly and complete, but it was his own measurement and the Board knows this will not be exact. There is couple of ways to do things and the Town of Alton has chosen to have people come to the ZBA to get a variance or special exception before going to the Planning Board. Other communities do other ways. Feels the process that the Town of Alton chooses to do speeds up the process for applicants but also feels there needs to be better guidelines. Asked the Board to look at the McHugh application where a sketch is included in current application packet and feels it does not provide with a lot of detail and indicates it can be hand drawn. With the kinds of applications that are coming before the Town now, she feels there needs to be more clarity on what is being turned in. Applicants only want to provide exactly what they are asked even if it is not clear. Usually attaches the check list from the Planning Board application but there is no language that describes or instructs people that they have to provide this information. Without that it makes it difficult in the Department to get people to submit anything more. The Board has to approve any changes to the application packet. She suggests to the Board that she go back and pull different types of applications and special exceptions and put together a suggested list of submission requirements and have the Board act on that. She will also go back through the minutes and see what concerns have been raised on those application that could have been addressed by better submission materials. Feels this will help set standards and guidelines for the department.

General discussion regarding the application packet.

K. Menici: Wanted to note that there is a new Planner Assistant. Her name is Monica. Stated that she is very impressive, comfortable leaving her with responsibility, very familiar with plan use law and zoning regulations. Feels that she is going to help the Department tremendously.

General discussion on suggestion for physical site review for Board members and how pictures were taken of the sites in the past. Due to the Department work load this has not been able to be done.

Discussion on the possibility of changing submission deadlines. Agreed to talk about changing submission deadlines at next month's meeting on March 2.

Kathy will try to get applications to the Board on the 22nd or 23rd of February for them to review them.

T. Morgan felt that different check lists for the different applications might be more taxing on the Department when dealing with the applicants. He suggested a general check list, it may mean they might have to submit a couple more pieces of paper.

K. Menici: Suggested have them go through a waiver process like the Planning Board does. She will check with Attorney Sessler if this will be acceptable at the ZBA level. At the Planning Board they get the full check list and the applicant can submit a letter asking for a waiver for some of the requirements because it would be overly burdensome or it does not apply to their particular application.

K. Menici: Asked if the Board feels they need a survey or engineer drawing. There is a substantial difference in costs.

L. Avery: Feels that requiring an engineer drawing will drive the cost far beyond the scope of the application.

K. Menici: State the typical plot plan can be done for approximately \$300 - \$500 depending on the detail.

T. Kinnon: State that using the Site Review Check List and the Board modifies that somewhat, over time you see what the Board wants to see.

K. Menici: Made a copy of the check list for Board to review and distributed to the Board. She confirmed that this check list is included with the packet currently. Maybe a review of this checklist some items can be modified.

Noted that 7.2.9 Survey Accuracy is something that they would not have to provide. The ZBA would not be asking them for a survey and suggested that this be removed for the ZBA. Also removal of 7.2.10 Subdivision Purpose at it is not applicable. Removal of 7.2.11 Certification. All three off for a ZBA check list.

K. Chamberlain: Interjected that he would like to point out to the Board to read the Board of Adjustment of New Hampshire book, on page 26. This discusses subsequent applications, plot plan recommendations, etc. This book has helpful information regarding what the Board is discussing regarding engineer stamps and seals. Stated that judgment should be used in applying requirements. It may not be necessary in simple situations. Also stated that to change the whole application process to have applicants do the same procedure when cases vary so widely, he said the Board should think about waiting until the case comes before the Board and then tell them what they need and come back another month.

T. Kinnon: Felt this promotes attitudes towards the Board. He stated that applicants should come to the Board with an application packet as complete as possible and they are looking towards the Land and Use Office for guidance.

M. Perry: Added that if enough information is requested ahead of time, then the applicant can know what to expect.

T. Kinnon: Added that having a checklist such as the one they are working on, and the applicant reviews this and comes to the Land Use Office and asks if all these items are needed, they can help them with what would be necessary.

K. Menici: Stated that is how they work with the applicants coming before the Planning Board. Obviously, there are many different applications coming before the Board and all of the information is not necessarily required for the Board to make an informed decision and you don't want to make the cost of applying to a Land Use Board prohibitive.

T. Kinnon: Stated that even leaving the check list as it is would also work, simply because when they are obtaining their paperwork they can be informed of what would be needed for their particular situation and if it is required then, at least, it is on the check list.

L. Avery: Added there are items on the check list which can definitely be made as a basic minimum.

M. Perry: Added that 7.2.24 could also probably be removed. Also, 7.2.30, 7.2.4 Subdivision name,

T. Morgan: Added that 7.2.33 could be simplified as well.

K. Menici: Added that 7.2.29 Future Development (outside the purview of this Board),

L. Avery: Added Public Use and Substandard Lot, 7.2.19 Location Road or Highway Coordinates,

T. Kinnon: Added 7.2.32 Reserved areas

9:03 p.m. – recess

9:10 p.m. – reconvene

K. Menici: Reviewed the numbers that the Board has decided to remove from the check list.

Remove 7.2.4 Subdivision name, 7.2.9 Survey accuracy, 7.2.10 Subdivision purpose, and 7.2.11, modify 7.2.19 (to read: road or high map or other suitable location plan), inquired about having meets and bounds descriptions. 7.2.24 Soils, 7.2.25 Substandard lot, 7.2.28 Public Use, 7.2.29 Future Development, 7.2.30 Flood Plain Data, 7.2.32 Reserve Areas, modify 7.2.33 Wetland to read: all wetlands boundaries (all other language taken off). Under Project Narrative – none is applicable. Also remove 7.2.34. Leave number one of section 3, Timing is redundant, Describing Significant Features is related more to if it is a subdivision with common lands, open space areas and would not be applicable. 7.3.1 will what is applicable for this Board.

K. Menici: Asked the Board if they want to talk about the application form itself? The way it is right now, Board members have complained periodically that they find working with the current application packet is a little confusing. Felt this was due to all the different types of cases that the Board would hear are together in

just one application packet and have to jump around to find where to respond to the different questions.

T. Kinnon: Likes the way they are separated; each specific application has its own packet, form and instructions. Feels this will help for the Board as well as the applicant.

K. Menici: Recommended that the Board look these over and make recommendations for the next meeting. She will have cases pulled as stated before and will modify the check list. Stated it would be nice to have these packets revised for use no later than the May meeting.

General discussion that this would be agreeable with the Board and they will be ready to come back to the next meeting with comments on applications.

K. Menici: Confirmed with the Chair her responsibilities for the next meeting:

1. Check with the attorney on the election of officers.
2. New applications by hopefully April or May.
3. Comments on current applications from the Board.
4. Review the minutes that were not approved, one needs to be re-typed and two need to be checked with the attorney because of the number of people that are still on the Board that here at those meetings.

3. New Business: None.

4. Correspondence. None.

5. Any other business that comes before the Board.

M. Perry: Asked if the Planner was able to find out about the taping of the last Bahre hearing. She informed that she discussed this with Mr. Bailey and he was unaware that this meeting was taped. He had not heard any discussion and he had the same opinion as the Planner that the young man filling in for Mr. Longabaugh, when he left he did not turn the camera off. The Selectmen's Meeting was taped prior to the Bahre hearing and they figure that this was just not turned off because the regular person taping was not here.

Tim Kinnon, Lyndon Avery, Angela Bystrack and Marcella Perry would like copies of this tape.

K. Chamberlain: Stated that three years ago the ZBA voted to not have the meetings video taped and may be this should be voted on this again.

T. Kinnon: Agreed but feels that before they do this the Board needs to find exactly how they ended up being video taped that evening. He added that a letter from the Selectmen with a simple apology that the ever having occurred and that they would endeavor to see that it doesn't happen again would suffice him. Either from the Board of Selectmen or the person videotaping or who authorized this to air.

General Discussion as to whose responsibility it was for this taping and airing. It was agreed by the Board for M. Perry to contact Bob Longabaugh to get an explanation why this was taped and who authorized this to air. Also the Town Planner to put this on the Agenda for the next regular meeting to discuss whether the Board wants to be filmed or not for a vote.

Motion by T. Kinnon to adjourn. Second by L. Avery. Vote unanimous.

Adjournment

Marcella Perry, Chairman

Respectfully Submitted,

Carolyn B. Schaeffner
Recording Secretary