

**TOWN OF ALTON  
ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT  
Public Hearing  
April 3, 2014**

**Approved as amended at the July 10, 2014 meeting**

**I. Call to Order**

Paul Monzione called the meeting to order at 7:01 pm

**II. Introduction of Code Enforcement Officer and Zoning Board Members**

Paul Monzione, Chair, introduced himself and the members of the Zoning Board of adjustment:

John Dever, Code Enforcement Officer  
Paul Laroche, Member  
Tim Morgan, Member  
Paul Monzione, Chair  
Lou LaCourse, Member  
Steve Miller, Member

**III. 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.

**IV. Approval of the Agenda**

P. Monzione noted for the record the approval of agenda has been altered to move the elections of Officers to the end of the applicants. S. Miller made a motion to change the agenda with P. Laroche seconded. All voted in favor, none opposed. The agenda was approved as amended unanimously.

**V. New Applications**

First case is a continued application.

**Case #Z14-06**  
**Jeffery D. & Janice L. Pauley**

**Map 4/Lot 12**

**Variance**  
**775 Frank C. Gilman Hwy**

Jeffery & Janice Pauley are requesting a Variance from Article 200 Definition of “Daycare Home” of the Zoning Ordinance to permit operation of a “Family Group Day Care Home” as defined in RSA 170-E:2, IV(b) less that 24 hours with up to 7 – 12 preschool and up to 5 children attending a full day school. This property is located in the Rural Zone.

P. Monziona read the case into the record.

The Board reviewed the application for completeness.

L. LaCourse made a motion to accept the application as complete with P. Larochelle seconded the motion which was passed with all votes in favor, none opposed and no abstentions. The application for Z14-06 has been accepted as complete unanimously.

P. Monziona asked the applicants to state their names prior to started and stated that the Board will not start any new applicants after 10:00 pm.

J. & J. Pauley approached the Board. They would like to expand their current day care license to a “Family Group Daycare Home”. Janice is the only license day car provider in Alton. Janice has been licensed for 9 years. The State has 2 definitions of day care, one being “Group Family” which allows up to 7 – 12 preschoolers at the home all day and then 5 after school children. The Zoning regulations only allow for 6 full time students and 3 that come after school. The property is itself is ok per the State. They have applied to the State and received a new driveway permit to allow increase usage.

S. Miller asked what the total capacity would be. J. Pauley stated 17, 12 during the day, preschool and up to 5 after school children. S. Miller asked if it would be the most due to the State license. Jeffery Pauley stated yes. He has brought the current state license regulations for the Boards review. S. Miller asked if he could show evidence that there is enough space to accommodate 17 children at the current residence. Jeffery Pauley stated yes they (State) told him what the square footage needs to be and they have fulfilled that without problem. Their septic system is a four and a half bedroom system. P. Monziona asked that in order to do the “Family Group Daycare Home” they needed to obtain appropriate licensing from the State beyond the license that you currently have? Jeffery states yes. In order to obtain the license we need to go through this process through the Town process and get approved. Then Janice will apply for the license. P. Monziona stated so you cannot operate the daycare that you are proposing with the expanded number of children until you are licensed by the State? Jeffery states yes. P. Monziona questioned if someone from the state in connection with this license come and inspect the facilities? Jeffery states Janice gets inspected by Code Enforcement, Fire Department as well as the State upon renewals in addition to impromptu inspections. P. Monziona asked if a determination has been made that the septic system that they have presently is

sufficient and approved for the expanded use that you're seeking to do now? Janice stated yes because 20 children and under only one bathroom is required. She has two. P. Monziona asks not the number of bathrooms but with regards to the size and design of the septic system. P. Monziona understands there is a four bedroom septic system on the property which also accommodates the primary residence. J. & J. Pauley stated correct. Jeffery states it has not been inspected but in 9 years it has been pumped twice, neither time has it been at capacity. P. Monziona is asking if it is Jeffery's understanding that the size of the septic he has now is appropriate for the number of children that you would have if this daycare is expanded. Jeffery stated they (State) would allow it with a three bedroom septic system; they just protected themselves and went with an oversized system. P. Monziona clarifies that a Family Group Daycare Home would be allowed by the State with a three bedroom system and they have a four bedroom system. Jeffery stated yes. P. Monziona asked if the Pauleys had an opportunity to see the Town of Alton staff review comments. The Fire Department through Deputy Chief Brown had concerns that the building need be NFPA 101 2009 Chapter 24.2.2.1 for number of egress. He recommends a hard wired smoke and CO2 with battery backup or battery only devices. Janice states they already have them. Jeffery states there are four exit doors. L. LaCourse asked about the minimum square footage per child. Janice replied 40 square feet and she has 1700 square feet.

P. Monziona opened the floor to public input. No one came forward in opposition to the application. At this time Walter Young came forward as an abutter. P. Monziona noted that this was not the application he wanted to speak to and the resident took a seat for later discussion. The Pauleys wanted to bring forward a letter from a parent. P. Monziona mentioned a letter from Deputy Brown. P. Monziona asks the questions referenced in the letter. In it he asks, what is the square footage of the rooms that will be used for child care? Jeffery states it is a modular home that is 28 foot wide and 64 foot long. The smallest bedroom on the first floor is 14 ft by 12 ft., bathroom is about 14 x 6 ft and mudroom is 6 ft x 14 ft. living room is approximately 14 ft by 14 ft with an open concept into the kitchen and dining room. There are two other bedrooms one of which is set up for a playroom and where they take naps but other than that they are in the main part of the house during the day. P. Monziona asked if the children are staying overnight. The Pauleys state no. They can only be open 12 hours a day. There is one full time helper and two alternate backups which are all registered with the State. P. Monziona asked what the staff to client ratio? Referencing NFPA 101 2009 chapter 17 referencing the letter P. Monziona questions what is the staff to client ratio? Jeffery states if this is approved there has to be two adult staff at all time. The letter indicates 2 staff per twelve clients. John D. explained the State regulations overrule that. T. Morgan stated that the NFPA is a recommendation and the State governs this regulation. Item number four within the letter read by P. Monziona states the staff to client ratio shall be permitted to be modified by the age. Where the additional safety measures to those specified to 17.6 are needed such as smoke alarms, fire extinguishers etc. Jeffery stated there are fire extinguishers which are inspected every year. P. Monziona continues reading the letter from Deputy Chief Brown asking is there a one hour fire resistance rated barrier separating the cellar and the child care area. The Pauley's do not know. The house met the requirements when it was built in 2005. P. Monziona asked by State inspection. Jeffrey responded yes.

S. Miller asked if there were any unresolved complaints or pending litigations. Jeffery stated none at all.

## **DISCUSSION**

**None**

## **WORKSHEET**

P. Larochelle stated that the variance will not be contrary to the public interest. Tim Morgan agrees stating that the public interest is child care and should be available. He thinks this is a matter of the State Statute being updated more recently than our Zoning Ordinances. P. Monziona agrees with T. Morgan that the variance will not be contrary to the public interest. It is allowed in the zoning regulations. The only difference is the number of children and our zoning regulations do not meet the State Regulations, simply because they may have not been updated. L LaCourse agrees. The business is current and the applicants are only asking for an expansion. Based on that L. LaCourse agrees it will not be contrary to public interest. S. Miller states it is in the public interest because of the Towns need for a daycare facility.

T. Morgan stated that the request is in harmony with the spirit of the Zoning Ordinance, the intent of the Master Plan and with the convenience, health safety and character of the district within which it is proposed. This use is allowed in this zone under our ordinances. It is just adding to the number of children. P. Monziona agrees and given the State inspections and the requirements imposed by the State that the convenience, health safety and the character of the district are also preserved. All agree.

P. Monziona stated by granting the variance, substantial justice will be done. The granting of the variance because it is in accordance with the regulation that justice will be done for the Town as well as for the applicant. L. LaCourse agrees because the applicants need State inspection and meet all requirements of the State it further proves that substantial justice will be done. All agree.

L. LaCourse stated the request will not diminish the value of the surrounding properties. No information has been given that any properties will be affected. All agree. P. Monziona adds that given the details in the application that there is nothing that will be done to this property that will have any adverse impact. All agree.

S. Miller read the Hardship criteria; for purposes of this subparagraph, “unnecessary hardship” means that, owing to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area: S. Miller stated that is true. There is a hardship condition, that the amount of time and difficulty to start a competing daycare from scratch and that it is in the best interest of this community to have a daycare facility in the community at this time and that the proposed use is a reasonable one for all the reasons that have been

mentioned. P. Larochelle agrees. T. Morgan agrees and stated that the proposed use is the same use it is currently being put to and there is no fair and substantial relationship between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application to the property and they will be complying with a more recent State statute. P. Monziona agrees. The special conditions are that this property is already a fully lawful daycare that will simply expand in the number of children that will attend. And thinks that distinguishes it from other property and thinks the proposed use is reasonable. All agree. The first two criteria have been met under hardship.

S. Miller motioned to approve the application with L. LaCourse second. In discussion P. Monziona wonders if Mr. Miller would consider an amendment that it be granted on condition that the applicants review the concerns of the Fire Department and satisfy those that the State requires. S. Miller agreed with the amendment and L. LaCourse second the motion, which passed with all votes in favor, none opposed and no abstentions.

**P. Monziona stated the application was approved and granted unanimously.**

**Case #Z14-07**

**Map 43/Lot 37**

**Variance**

**Amanda & Jonathan Norton**

**348 Trask Side Rd**

On behalf of Amanda and Jonathan Norton, Andy Smith from Northern Estate and Home Management is requesting a Variance from Article 300 Section 327 of the Zoning Ordinance to permit the extending of a 3 season room addition and replacement deck into the 10' property line setback and the 25' right-of-way setback. This property is located in the Lakeshore Residential Zone.

P. Monziona read the case into record.

The Board reviewed for completeness.

T. Morgan made a motion to accept the application as complete and P. Larochelle seconded who passed with all votes in favor, none opposed and no abstentions. The application has been accepted as complete.

Andy Smith approached the Board. The applicants would like to put on a three season room with a deck. He has brought a rendering of the new addition. It was difficult to have the plan accommodate the A frame style home. He states part of the home today is in the setback. The corner of the existing house to the property line is 7.9 ft. and the current deck is 7.1 ft to the line. He is proposing that the back side along the property line to extend just a few more inches into the setback with the new addition and the deck. So it will bring the property line 6.6 ft. to the eave corner of the three season room and 8 ft. to the corner of the deck. On the roadway side the structure would be 14 ft. from the right of way line, as opposed to the 25 ft. The deck will be 45 ft. from the road. The current roadway is way to the other side of the right of way not in the middle. S. Miller asked for clarification to the 45 ft. P. Monziona asked if Trask Side Rd. was in the right of way. A. Smith stated yes. P. Monziona asked if the right of way went from the north side to the other side (pointing to maps). There was much discussion about the right of way. A.

Smith states Trask Side Rd. is all the way on the other side of the right of way compared to the applicant's property line. A. Smith noted the closest neighboring structure is about 73 ft to the garage. The house is on the other side of the garage. P. Laroche questions about the stone wall or the parking area, if it is on the property line? A. Smith states the property comes right in the middle of the parking area. There is an agreement on using this area. S. Miller questions if he should be recuse due to being friend to an abutter. P. Monziona asked if the abutters are in the room tonight. They were not. P. Laroche also asked about recusing due to having done work on the next door property. L. LaCourse also questioned if he should recuse due to having made a purchase from the applicant but never met the applicant. P. Monziona explains the recusal process. There were no objections within the Board. There were no objections from the public to the Board members continuing on this application. The Board continues with the application. P. Monziona asks if the property is in the right of way setback and property line set back currently. P. Monziona also questions the corner of the deck is the property line, 10 ft setback. A. Smith states correct by 2.9 ft. P. Monziona questions that the proposed three season room would also be in the property setback on that right side by how many feet total? A. Smith states 3.4 ft. P. Monziona states slightly more than a foot would be added. He asks if the current deck is in the setback. A. Smith states yes. P. Monziona asks how far is the current deck at its greatest point into the right of way setback. A. Smith states 3.1 ft. P. Monziona asks about the room to be constructed and how far into the setback. J. Dever states the room will not be in set back, the deck will. P. Monziona asks how far into the setback will the new deck would be? J. Dever states 11 ft. There was much discussion about the square footage and property lines. P. Monziona questions the Article and Section this application has been opened under and reads the subsections of the article. J. Dever explains the current deck will be torn down. P. Monziona clarifies that the eave of the house is in the setback. The deck will not be converting into living space but removed and the structure that is applied for is not the deck at all, it is the house and questions that A. Smith wants to expand this non conforming house by putting a three season room and a deck onto the non conforming house. A. Smith states correct. P. Monziona states that it is a nonconforming house due to the eave. T. Morgan states there is no definition of living space. S. Miller states the Fire Department determines if it is living space, whether it has egress, windows etc. J. Dever states not normally, that it is a subjective definition, is it habitable space, is it enclosed etc. P. Monziona states he is not expanding the deck but the house. The Section is discussed again. P. Monziona states this is a straight variance and the application was brought forward appropriately. P. Monziona asks the Board for any other questions. There were none.

A. Smith noted they have looked at the structure and other alternatives. P. Monziona questions the architectural design of the house and that this was a way to meld the addition to the current structure. A. Smith states this plan is the best way to have the addition placed due to the eave and in keeping of the roof line. P. Laroche questions the new roof line of the existing structure. It was determined that the height of the structure was conforming. S. Miller questioned moving the house back 15 ft. A. Smith stated it was cost prohibitive. L. LaCourse asked about moving the deck to the north. A. Smith stated it would look ok but that would decrease the size of the deck. S. Miller questioned how many bedrooms the septic system is for and will the addition be a

bedroom. A. Smith stated no it won't, it will be a three season room only. P. Larochelle questioned after the addition, how wide the new addition and the deck would be. A. Smith states the sunroom width is 18 ft and he was not sure of the width of the deck. P. Larochelle asks if the deck could be brought back and that would make it more conforming. To reduce the size of the new deck 2 ft. on the property setback line to the south of the deck. The ROW encroachment of the deck would be 11 ft. A. Smith was asked if decreasing the size of the deck would be acceptable to the property owners. He thought it would be. P. Monziona questioned if there is a decrease of size by 2 ft off of the side of abutters' setback line and if that change were made, the deck from the property setback line would be more conforming. P. Monziona states yes if that were made it would not encroach in to the boundary line setback but still be 11 ft into the right of way setback. A. Smith states correct. P. Monziona states because the three season room architecturally to attach that in a meaningful, appropriate way to the current structure, it would have to be to the dimensions that are depicted in the rendering shown. P. Monziona questioned if that would be acceptable to the applicant. P. Monziona stated that the Board does not typically redesign construction projects by they can impose conditions on variance and would that be acceptable by the applicant. A. Smith stated yes.

P. Monziona opened the floor to the Public. No one was in favor or opposed to the application being granted.

P. Monziona closed Public input.

## **DISCUSSION**

P. Monziona noted he was glad the suggestions were made and the applicant was agreeable. Trask Road is a paved road and they are making a judgment on the current road location.

## **WORKSHEET**

T. Morgan stated the variance will not be contrary to the public interest. The public interest here is to avoid over crowding and interfering with other owner property rights but with the amendments proposed it will not be. All agree.

P. Monziona states the request is in harmony with the spirit of the Zoning Ordinance, the intent of the Master Plan and with the convenience, health, safety and character of the district within which it is proposed. The building is permitted in the current regulation that is grandfathered in with a nonconforming deck. This addition does very little because the ROW setback is 45 ft from the roadway. And this request is in harmony. S. Miller states it is a minimal request. It is a residential home that is just being expanded in a residential zone that it is in spirit with the ordinance. All agree for all the reasons stated.

L. LaCourse states by granting the variance, substantial justice will be done. The current design of the structure limits what can be done to match it. The three season room will be a nice addition. S. Miller agrees that substantial justice will be done and states there is a

significant amount of restraints to alternatives. P. Larochelle agrees. T. Morgan agrees, that substantial justice is done because the benefit to the applicant out ways any detriment to the rest of the community. P. Monziona agrees for all the reasons stated. All agrees.

S. Miller states the request will not diminish the value of the surrounding properties. There has been no testimony or evidence presented to the contrary. All agree. L. LaCourse states if anything it will increase the values.

P. Larochelle states for the purposes of the subparagraph “unnecessary hardship” means that owing to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area: no fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purposed of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property and the proposed use is a reasonable one. It is the best location and solution to this unique circumstance. T. Morgan agrees that the proposed use is a reasonable one. This is an unusual shaped piece of property and that almost drives this decision. P. Monziona agrees and the special condition of the property is that ROW setback. The ROW setback unduly burdens this property. The hardship criteria have been met. All agree. P. Monziona states in light of satisfying the two criteria the summary statement is not necessary. T. Morgan motioned that the Board grants the application with the understanding that the agent for the applicant has made a representation that the deck as constructed the width differs slightly than the proposed drawings in that it will be drawn back from the abutter property line. P. Monziona seconds. S. Miller proposes an amendment. There is a request from the Fire Department that the building meets Chapter 24.2.1 for numbers of egress and that smoke detectors shall be hardwired with a battery backup or battery only device. T. Morgan accepts that amendment. The motion as amended is seconded by L. LaCourse. The application is granted unanimously.

**Case #Z14-08**  
**Edgar Russell**

**Map 49/Lot 7**

**Special Exception**  
**Rand Hill Rd**

On behalf of Edgar Russell, CNA Holdings, Inc. is requesting a Special Exception from Article 400 Section 401, 12 of the Zoning Ordinance to permit a boat storage. This property is located in the Rural Zone.

P. Monziona read the application into the record.

The Board reviewed for completeness.

T. Morgan made a motion to accept the application as complete and P. Larochelle seconded with all votes in favor, none opposed and no abstentions. The application was unanimously accepted as complete.

Andrew Kearsted approached the Board. He is the owner of CNA Holdings and on behalf of Edgar Russell here proposing to allow a boat storage building in a rural zone. There is

a building onsite currently that is being used for boat storage. The proposed building will be located behind the current building. There is quite a bit of vegetation that would obscure the building. S. Miller questions how deep the vegetation is to the property line. How large is the buffer. A. Kearsted states its all wooded and would be approximately 5 feet on the back of the property and 20 feet on the side. He would like to use fill to create a berm. There are trees all the way down the hill towards Mr. Russell's property.

P. Monziona noted a Special exception was granted initially back in 2007 and was glad to see the screening with trees were planted as discussed at that time. A. Kerstead noted that they did put up a fence behind the trees as well. He had a wetlands scientist look at the land and there weren't any wetlands. He went on Google earth yesterday and the land was dry.

P. Monziona opened the floor to public input.

Steve Dahl approached the Board. He owns the property adjoining Mr. Andrews's property and wants to say there will be no impact to his property and the vegetation is fine between them. A. Kerstead comes and goes twice a year and that's the last he sees of him. He has no problems at all. Ron Kesler approached and noted he is an abutter and wouldn't even know A. Kerstead was there. He has no problem and thinks this would be good. Ed Russell has the land right behind and has no problem at all. In opposition, Walter Young, who is an abutter across the street. He finds there is a lot of noise. He has 4 or 5 springs which run off of the springs on the proposed property. He is concerned with the view. P. Laroche questioned about any contamination. A. Kerstead states no he hasn't. He is concerned about the possibility. P. Laroche asks about culverts under the street. A. Kerstead states there are two. P. Monziona questions the applicant where the proposed building would be placed in relation to the current building and about the dimensions. A. Kerstead states it will be behind the present building and the dimension is to be 100' x 120'. P. Monziona clarifies that the application is for 100' x 120'. He asks about toxic or hazardous material, if he has any DES issues. A. Kerstead states just boats and will go to the Planning Board if this application is granted. He has no issues with the DES. L. LaCourse questions if fluids are drained prior to storage. A. Kerstead states just water is drained no fuel. He states the building is closed with a concrete floor. Some boats have been temporarily stored outside. P. Monziona asks J. Dever is this application for use only which is allowed by Special Exception. J. Dever states yes but they have discussed the possibility of merging the lots. J. Dever noticed the proposed building would be 18' from the property line in the back. A new lot of record now is 20' setback. P. Monziona notes that there are two separate lots of record created before 2003 and the setback is 10'. If the lots are merged now they it will become a new lot of record which would have a 20' setback and the proposed back building would be only 18' setback. This would be an opportunity to change the representation of the setback. A. Kerstead states yes, there will be 20' from the rear setback. L. LaCourse questioned if there would be any facilities. A. Kerstead states no, just electric.

P. Monziona closed the floor to public input.

## **DISCUSSION**

**No discussion**

## **WORKSHEET**

P. Monziona stated that a plat has been accepted in accordance with the Town of Alton Zoning Ordinance Section 520 B. All agree.

L. LaCourse stated the specific site is an appropriate location for the use. There had been a Special Exception previously granted in 2007 which is the building right in front of the proposed building with the same use. All agreed

S. Miller stated factual evidence is not found that the property values in the district will be reduced due to incompatible uses. This is an expansion of the use. There is no testimony or evidence presented that property values would go in either direction. The assessed value will go up. All agree.

P. Rochelle states there is no valid objection from abutter based on demonstrable fact. There was no factual evidence that would be damage to abutters. People spoke tonight in Favor of this application. T. Morgan stated one resident was opposed due to water quality but this business has been going on for a number of years with no determent to water quality. The nature of the business is in which there is no facilities it is not a substantial determent to quality impact. P. Monziona agrees. There was a concern regarding boats being stored there but there have been boats being stored there now. L. LaCourse agrees and notes any noise from the building behind, the existing building will mitigate that noise. S. Miller agrees.

T Morgan stated there is no undue nuisance or serious hazard to pedestrian or vehicular traffic including the location/design of access ways and off street parking. There will be no nuisance or hazard due to only employees with be there. All agree.

P. Monziona stated that adequate and appropriate facilities and utilities will be provided to ensure proper operation of the proposed use of the structure. The representation from the applicant is that there will be no facilities in terms of septic or sewerage. All agree.

P. Larochelle stated there is adequate area for save and sanitary sewage disposal and water supply. There is no plumbing just electricity. All agreed

S. Miller stated the proposed use or structure is consistent with the spirit of this ordinance and the intent of the Master Plan. A boat storage in this rural district was in approved in 2007 and this is just an extension and to say no based on intent would veto a prior decision. P. Larochelle agrees. T. Morgan agrees and states boat storage around the lake is appropriate and is in the spirit of the ordinance. P. Monziona agrees the ordinance permits this use by Special Exception. L. LaCourse agrees.

S. Miller moved that Special Exception to Z14-08 be granted with possible amendment. On the prior case in 2007 there were a number of stipulations. Do we want to carry those forward to this case? P. Larochelle seconded the motion. P. Monziona asks to identify what the conditions are. S. Miller states one is that there be adequate space for access to the backside of the property. P. Monziona states the conditions in 2007 were that the building be constructed in accordance with the plat and that the construction of the building satisfies the conditions and the concerns of the Alton Fire Department and there would be no valet type storage at the facility. S. Miller makes a motion to approve with the conditions mentioned. All in favor, no opposed, motion granted unanimously. The Special Exception is granted with the same conditions articulated and set forth on the other Special Exception.

### **Other business:**

Elections                      Paul Monziona – Chair  
   Tim Morgan – Vice Chair  
   Lou LaCourse - Clerk of Works

### **Previous Business**

New Business: Review meeting schedule, footprint discussion, Zoning Amendments

- Footprint definitions. J. Dever addressed RSA 320 and how shall the “footprint” be defined. Would it be square footage, foundation area, drip edge etc? S. Miller asked how the public would be notified when the definition is defined. P. Mansion stated it would go to the Zoning Amendments. Most examples found are the outline of the building. J. Dever states sometimes the angles of the building make it difficult to define. P. Larochelle stated usually it’s from the foundation, outside to outside.
- Amendments for 2015, solicit for Board Members. The meeting is the 23<sup>rd</sup> of April. Discussion of Day Care, living space, inhabitable space. P. Monziona stated the need for definitions. J. Dever is looking for commitment for the ZAC P. Monziona and P. Larochelle stated they would. Another subject is agriculture, temporary trailers on property for family members and will need to solicit alternates in the newspaper.

### **Minutes: March 6, 2014**

Page 4 third paragraph should read “two separate lots with a single dwelling”

Page 6 under discussion, 8 lines down instead of coding issue should read “an enforcement issue”.

Page 7 should be T. Kinnon” T. Morgan was not at the meeting.

Spelling of P. Larochelle’s name to be corrected.

Page 7 three lines from bottom should read “the applicant” moved into Lake Shore residential zone. Four lines from the bottom should read “in accordance with the zone” not “of the zone”

Motion was made by S. Miller to accept the minutes of March 6, 2014 as amended with P. Larochelle seconded. One abstention, with four in favor.

Correspondence: There is an invitation to the Spring Planning Zoning workshops.

### **Adjournment**

**Motion to adjourn made by P. Larochelle at 7:30 PM seconded by T. Morgan. All in favor.**