

**TOWN OF ALTON  
ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT  
PUBLIC HEARING  
Thursday, December 2, 2021, at 6:00 PM  
Alton Town Hall**

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Thomas Lee, Chairman  
Paul Monziona, Vice Chair  
Frank Rich, member/clerk  
Paul LaRochelle, Selectman's Representative  
Tim Morgan, member – excused absence  
Mike Hepworth, alternate member

**OTHERS PRESENT**

John Dever, III, Code Enforcement Officer  
Jessica Call, Town Planner  
Janet Sienko, applicant  
John Goodrich, applicant  
Lisa Nicastro, applicant  
David Hayes, resident  
Maureen Calvin, resident  
Bruce Conrad, resident  
Bill Holway, abutter

Gary Brunelle, applicant  
Suzanne Brunelle, applicant  
James Hayden, White Mountain Survey &  
Engineering, Inc.  
Doug Dore, resident  
Ron Demato, resident  
Fred ????, resident  
Brad Jones, Jones and Beach Engineers  
Anthony Jones, Jones and Beach Engineers

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Lee called the meeting to order at 6:03PM.

**INTRODUCTION OF BOARD MEMBERS**

Roll Call was taken for the Board members and individuals present at Town Hall.

**APPOINTMENT OF ALTERNATES**

**Mr. LaRochelle made a motion to have Mr. Hepworth sit on the Board as a full member.  
Mr. Rich seconded the motion. Motion passed, 4-0-0.**

**STATEMENT OF THE APPEAL PROCESS**

The purpose of this hearing is to allow anyone concerned with an Appeal to the Zoning 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 that 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 have been or will be met.

### APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The Board reviewed the agenda. Jessica Call, Town Planner, added under Other Business, the minutes from the Site Walk of November 21, 2021.

**Mr. LaRochelle made a motion to approve the agenda as amended. Mr. Rich seconded the motion. Motion passed, 5-0-0.**

### CONTINUED APPLICATIONS

<b>Case #Z21-29</b> <b>John Goodrich, Lisa Nicastro,</b> <b>Owners</b>	<b>Map 9 Lot 33-2</b> <b>239 Henry Wilson Hwy.</b>	<b>Special Exception</b> <b>Residential Rural (RR)</b> <b>Zone</b>
--	---	--

A **Special Exception** is requested from **Article 400, Section 401 D. 17.** of the Zoning Ordinance to permit a Contractor's Yard as defined in the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Monzione stated he would be recusing himself from this case as he is an abutter.

Chair Lee read the public notice into the record and reopened the continued case from November 4, 2021.

Chair Lee opened the hearing to input from the public in favor of the application.

Bruce Conrad, resident, stated he still believes, after seeing the site and hearing Mr. Monzione's concerns, he thinks the concerns can be completely mitigated.

Maureen Calvin, abutter, stated she supports approval; she has seen the site and the operations and doesn't believe its offense to the spirit of the ordinance.

Chair Lee opened the hearing to input from the public in opposition of the application.

Mr. Holway, resident, New Durham Road, stated he is opposed to the special exception for the property; he is concerned about the noise, noting the people who live on Church Street don't hear the constant beeping of the trucks, unloading noises and slamming of a tailgate, daily at 6:00AM, and other residents don't understand the noise and disturbance his lots experience with this operation. He stated he's talked with Mr. Goodrich in the past; he's seen piles of stumps, loam, concrete blocks, and piles of materials.

Paul Monzione, abutter, stated he consulted with Steve Nicks, a surveyor and lawyer who specializes in land use and real estate; he explained the proper way to assess the situation is to stand at the boundary line and look from there. He stated he wants his property to maintain the value of his property and wants to be a good neighbor but doesn't want to give his property's equity away. Mr. Monzione stated he has worked hard on his property, invested a lot in it and wants to be able to maintain it. He stated the activity on the lot in question, is the far end extreme definition of a contractor's yard; he stated the business is an excavation business to be more specific. He stated if this special exception is granted, the activity will only increase; he

questioned whether the suggested mitigation measures will actually work. Mr. Monziona stated the burden is on the applicant to show their request won't adversely impact anyone or take away property values but they can't do that. He stated it's risky and potentially costly for abutters and tax payers; he reiterated the zone is rural residential. He stated the mitigation should be straightforward and provide confidence for everyone involved but there are simply too many moving parts. Mr. Monziona outlined the criteria for granting the special exception, noting there have been valid objections so that criteria is not met. He stated Mr. LaRochelle suggested the berm be placed near the piles of materials, but the applicants stated they don't want to block their view of enjoying their fields. Mr. Monziona stated evidence has been submitted to support values of surrounding properties being diminished due to the incompatible use. He stated the plans presented do nothing to mitigate the risk to property rights and values; he stated an excavator business does not belong in this rural residential zone.

David Hayes, abutter, stated his property runs from New Durham Road to Route 11, along with a right of way which is used by the applicants to access their property. Mr. Hayes stated he hears noises and his main objection is that he is concerned about property values. He stated he is a real estate broker in Massachusetts so has experience with property values.

Chair Lee closed public input.

Chair Lee stated a Site Walk was done on November 21, 2021; he stated the parties have had representation from Chris Pomeranz, Esq., who will be representing the applicants. He stated many points have already been covered and presented at the last public hearing, the Site Walk and again tonight.

Chris Pomeranz, Esq., stated the applicants are not looking for an exception to run an excavation business; they are looking to do a contractors' yard. He stated it comes down to whether the noise and visual impact can be reasonably mitigated. He stated as the Board to consider whether the applicants can do so and noted suggestions were presented and they can't presume the applicants won't comply. He stated he doesn't think it would be difficult for the Code Enforcement Officer to enforce. Mr. Pomeranz stated he hasn't heard any suggestions from Mr. Monziona.

Ms. Nicastro stated they met with a representative from New Hampshire Department of Transportation this week and he sees nothing wrong with the driveway onto Route 11; the visibility is good and it's not too steep.

Mr. Goodrich explained this area is considered "limited access" by NH DOT on Route 11 and there is a 50' right-of-way.

Mr. Pomeranz stated in regard to the property value devaluation, no comparisons, formulations or studies have been done for these properties so it is just an opinion. He noted there was a recent property re-evaluation in Town and asked Mr. Monziona if his valuation went down.

Mr. Monziona stated across the board in Town, appraisals went up, but he isn't sure if the appraiser took into consideration the unlawful activities on the property abutting his; he

questioned whether the property is classified as commercial although it was not in the past.

Ms. Nicastro stated there is not constant noise; they are not working at the property during the day and trucks don't leave until 7:30AM. Mr. Goodrich stated the piles of materials are an accumulation over four years, much of which came from the property; he stated they are not running an operation but are only coming and going in the morning and afternoon. He stated there is not much noise at all.

Mr. Goodrich stated he reached out to Dunn Appraisal Group in regard to the concern about de-valuation; he stated he was advised that de-valuation can't be confirmed until there is an inspection and official appraisal done, which has not been done. He stated most of their business is local although they do take the trucks further to be worked on.

Chair Lee clarified there have been materials and stumps on the property; any equipment is being stored. He stated for the most part the vehicles are going off property during the day; at no time is anything being sold and no one comes to pick up or purchase materials. Mr. Goodrich confirmed that is correct; it is a contractors' storage lot for their own materials. It was confirmed no public comes onto the property. Chair Lee noted there were some suggestions on mitigation at the Site Walk, which included a berm closer to the machinery but the applicants don't want to do that. Mr. Goodrich stated it seems unfair to build a berm across the middle of their field. Chair Lee stated it would make sense to him to have the fencing and the berms near the machinery and it would help a lot with noise and view but clarified there is no sale of goods or materials on the property. Mr. Goodrich stated there are currently two dump trucks, a small dump truck, and four trailers. He stated there are also three excavators, but stuff comes and goes.

### ***Discussion Case Z21-29 – Special Exception***

*The Board must find that all the following conditions are met in order to grant the Special Exception:*

Chair Lee stated that a plat/plan **has** been submitted in accordance with the appropriate criteria in the Zoning Ordinance, Article 520.B. The Board agreed.

Mr. Rich stated the specific site **is not** an appropriate location for the use. He stated this is a residential/rural section of the Town; the Master Plan specifically designated the area as such; the applicants purchased the property knowing this zoning designation. Mr. Rich stated even though contractors' yard is permitted by Special Exception, there is overwhelming evidence this is not an appropriate location; he reiterated this has nothing to do with the business integrity of the applicant. Mr. LaRochelle stated he disagrees; the location is over 6 acres, it is on Route 11 and has adequate storage area and he believes it's an acceptable use through this zone. He stated he believes that with the proper mitigations in place, it is an appropriate location. Chair Lee agreed.

Mr. Hepworth stated that actual evidence **is** found that the property values in the district will be reduced due to incompatible land uses. He stated two letters have been submitted from professionals in the real estate industry; facts have been proposed that there are differences in the value of the property before and after; he stated a full 25% of the lot is being used to store

equipment and vehicles and believes it certainly reduces values. Mr. Hepworth stated an assessment was not done before the vehicles were there or after so the values can't be determined. Mr. LaRochelle stated he disagrees and believes more than a couple opinions are needed; more in-depth comparisons and factual valuations are needed. Chair Lee stated he believes there is enough evidence to support that the value of personal property will be reduced. He stated if he was an abutter, he would be very concerned about the value of his property. Mr. Rich stated the burden of proof that values will not be diminished is on the applicant; the applicant chose not to get appraisals that substantiate the values one way or the other; he stated the evidence submitted, finds property values will be reduced due to incompatible land uses.

Mr. LaRochelle stated there **is** valid objection from abutters based on demonstrable fact. He stated abutters have legitimate concern with noise and views; there is valid objection. He stated he doesn't believe the objection to values is substantiated as that would take time to make a determination. Mr. Hepworth noted there were three valid objections by abutters. The Board agreed.

Chair Lee stated 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. He stated the applicants met with NH DOT and indicated there are no concerns by NH DOT. The Board agreed.

Mr. Rich stated adequate and appropriate facilities and utilities **will** be provided to insure the proper operation of the proposed use or structure. The Board agreed.

Mr. Hepworth stated there **is** adequate area for safe and sanitary sewage disposal and water supply. He stated there is no evidence the systems are not adequate. The Board agreed.

Mr. LaRochelle stated the proposed use or structure **is** consistent with the spirit of this ordinance and the intent of the Master Plan. He stated this is allowable by Special Exception if it meets all criteria in the rural/ residential zone. He stated if done properly, it can stay within the Master Plan. Chair Lee stated he disagrees; there is specific language for a contractors' yard but takes to heart the concerns of abutters and the intent of the Master Plan is to ensure the ordinances are followed. Mr. Rich stated he agrees the use is not consistent with the Master Plan; he stated he doesn't believe it is in the spirit of the ordinance; it is a rural residential area, which was designated by the Town as such and he believes it would not do justice. Mr. Hepworth stated he agrees it is not consistent with the Master Plan; he stated it's on the far end of the commercial use with heavy equipment, and materials.

**Mr. Rich made a motion to deny the request for a Special Exception for Case #Z21-29. Mr. Hepworth seconded the motion. Motion passed, 4-0-0.**

Mr. Rich left the meeting at 7:22PM.

#### **NEW APPLICATIONS**

<b>Case #Z21-30</b> <b>Gary &amp; Suzanne Brunelle,</b> <b>Owners</b>	<b>Map 23 Lot 8</b> <b>59 Rustic Shores Road</b>	<b>Special Exception</b> <b>Rural (RU) Zone</b>
---	---	--

A **Special Exception** is requested from **Article 300, Section 320 J.** of the Zoning Ordinance to permit replacement of an existing shed that encroaches into the side (7.9') and ROW (5.6') setbacks as defined in the Zoning Ordinance.

Chair Lee read the public notice into the record. The Board reviewed the application for completeness.

**Mr. LaRochelle made a motion to accept the application for Case #Z21-30 as complete. Mr. Monziona seconded the motion. Motion passed, 4-0-0.**

Suzanne Brunelle, stated they are looking to replace an existing shed; she stated there is no other place on the lot than the current location. She stated the replacement shed will be smaller by 20 square feet to 120 square feet. Ms. Brunelle confirmed a survey was done; she stated the property does not have a garage; there is no increase in the nonconforming aspect of the property; due to the unique nature of the property, there is no other location on the lot for a shed. She stated they are using Reeds Ferry for the removal and install of the new shed. Photos were presented of the existing shed.

Mr. Monziona asked how far the current shed is located into the side setback. Ms. Brunelle stated it is 2' from the line which abuts the association beach. Mr. Dever explained the size is reduced so the encroachment will be reduced by 2'. It is unclear when the shed was originally put in place. Mr. Monziona asked if a nonconforming shed was put in place and whether it can be replaced. Mr. Dever stated there has never been a complaint about the location or brought to the attention of the Town until this point; it is no fault of the current owner as they purchased the property with the shed. It was confirmed all abutters were notified. Nothing was received from the association. Chair Lee noted the replacement structure will not be more conforming; the overall size is also being reduced.

Chair Lee opened the hearing to input from the public in favor of the application. None was indicated.

Chair Lee opened the hearing to input from the public in opposition of the application. None was indicated.

Mr. Dever noted a letter was received from Mr. Johnson, an abutter, via email.

Chair Lee closed public input.

***Discussion – Case #Z21-30***

*The Board must find that all the following conditions are met in order to grant the Special Exception:*

Chair Lee stated that a plat/plan **has** been submitted in accordance with the appropriate criteria in the Zoning Ordinance, Article 520.B. The Board agreed.

Mr. Monziona stated the specific site **is** an appropriate location for the use. Mr. Monziona noted the use is not changing; there has been a shed on the location for many years. The Board agreed.

Mr. Hepworth stated that actual evidence **is not** found that the property values in the district will be reduced due to incompatible land uses. It is a residential area and garages are consistent with the use of the surrounding lots. The Board agreed.

Mr. LaRochelle stated there **is no** valid objection from abutters based on demonstrable fact. No abutters came forward and no letters or communications in opposition were received. The Board agreed.

Chair Lee stated 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. There is adequate parking. The Board agreed.

Mr. Monziona stated adequate and appropriate facilities and utilities **will** be provided to insure the proper operation of the proposed use or structure. He stated the use is not changing. The Board agreed.

Mr. Hepworth stated there **is** adequate area for safe and sanitary sewage disposal and water supply. The Board agreed.

Mr. LaRochelle stated the proposed use or structure **is** consistent with the spirit of this ordinance and the intent of the Master Plan. He stated this is typical of a small lot. The Board agreed.

**Mr. LaRochelle made a motion to grant the request for a Special Exception for Case #Z21-30. Mr. Monziona seconded the motion. Motion passed, 4-0-0.**

<b>Case #Z21-31</b>  <b>White Mountain Survey &amp; Engineering, Inc., as Agent for Laura E. Ogonowski-Michaud Family Trust, Owner</b>	<b>Map 38 Lot 23</b>  <b>51 Keewaydin Drive</b>	<b>Special Exception</b>  <b>Lakeshore (LR) Zone</b>
--	---	--

A **Special Exception** is requested from **Article 300, Section 320 J.** of the Zoning Ordinance to permit the demolition of two existing nonconforming structures and replace them with a more conforming structure composed of a single-family home and attached garage.

Chair Lee read the public notice into the record. The Board reviewed the application for completeness.

**Mr. LaRochelle made a motion to accept the application for Case #Z21-31 as complete. Mr. Hepworth seconded the motion. Motion passed, 4-0-0.**

James Hayden, White Mountain Survey & Engineering, Inc., as Agent for Laura E. Ogonowski-Michaud Family Trust, owner, stated the applicant is looking demolish and replace two existing, nonconforming structures with a single-family home. He stated the home is 90' from the shoreline; .7' over the westerly boundary line. The proposed replacement home with attached garage will be 52' from the shoreline and .6' from the boundary line. The existing home has a primitive sewage disposal system, which encroaches on the westerly abutting property; it will be

replaced with onsite sewage disposal system. Storm water mitigation measures will also be installed, where none are currently in place.

Mr. Monzione confirmed the existing structure encroaches on an abutting property; the proposed will still encroach on the side boundary setback by .6'. Mr. Dever stated it will be wholly on the owners' property instead of encroaching on the abutter. Mr. Monzione noted there is a right of way on the lot and asked where the structure is located in relation to that. Mr. Hayden stated the proposed structure and corner of the garage will be about 25' from the right-of-way. He stated the abutting lots have higher elevation so there won't be any obstruction of the view of the lake. The lot lower, is a beach area. The existing structure is two bedrooms, and the proposed structure will remain two bedrooms. Mr. Hayden stated they do not have a NH DES approved septic design yet. The footprint in the front setback will be reduced and the proposed structure will be completely within the building envelope. Chair Lee confirmed two-bedroom structures may be replaced; there is no increase in nonconformity, but it is actually becoming less nonconforming by being wholly within the building envelope.

Chair Lee opened the hearing to input from the public in favor of the application.

Ron Demato, abutter, stated he is on the Board of the Keewaydin Association; they aren't in favor or opposed to the project but have questions about the project. He stated notification was received on Friday and the Board has not have an opportunity to look at the plans. Mr. Demato stated some questions are in regard to when the construction would take place as it abuts association land; where the equipment will be parked, explaining the roads are private and the applicant is not a member of the association.

Doug Dore, resident, stated there are two families in the association which use the beach and the docks; he stated it's very busy and a concern is that the building of the structure should take place between Labor Day and May 30 so there is less congestion as there is very limited parking. Mr. Dore asked the Board to table a decision until the association board has had a chance to review the plans.

Fred ????, resident, stated he isn't opposed to the project, he is just concerned with the time of year they do the project due to the busyness of the area.

Chair Lee opened the hearing to input from the public in opposition of the application. None was indicated.

Chair Lee closed public input.

Chair Lee stated there is the opportunity to have this case continued to next month, due to concerns by abutters; he asked Mr. Hayden what he would like to do. Mr. Hayden suggested approval be contingent on review of the Keewaydin association board. Mr. Monzione stated within the association itself, there is a problem with Mr. Dore's name and address receiving the association's mail so there has been a delay in notices getting to the association board of directors. He stated the association needs to ensure the proper addresses are on file. Mr. Dore stated he is a full-time resident, whereas most board members live in Massachusetts; he stated

board members change every two years so they keep his address on file. Mr. Monzione stated the criteria for the applicant is to provide notice to abutters based on the public address on file, so the legal requirement has been met. He stated abutters don't have sufficient information to determine whether they have a valid objection, noting the logistics of how the project will occur is something to be resolved between the residents and association, noting he isn't sure the Board can control the time of year the construction takes place.

Mr. Monzione stated it may be beneficial for a continuance so more information can be presented and abutters be provided with the plans as well. Mr. Hayden stated the applicants want to move forward on the project as soon as they receive the shoreline and septic approvals; he stated they intend to have it ready to use in the summer. He stated they understand the roadways are private rights-of-way and that vehicles and equipment cannot impede those. Mr. Dore reiterated the Keewaydin board of directors haven't seen the plans; they want a chance to review but he doesn't anticipate there being any problems from their side.

Mr. Dever stated they are also checking with Scott Kinmond, Highway Director, on the bonding process as well for the private and town roads.

The Board agreed a continuance would be allowed. Mr. Monzione stated they don't have enough information to move forward, and they need to allow all abutters to have a full and fair opportunity to review the plans. Mr. Hayden stated the applicant is not opposed to a continuance.

**Mr. Monzione made a motion to grant the request for a continuance for Case #Z21-31 to January 6, 2022. Mr. Hepworth seconded the motion. Motion passed, 4-0-0.**

Case #Z21-32	Map 40 Lot 37	Variance
Jones & Beach Engineers, Inc., as Agent for Gail Naylor,  Owner	Cathy Lane (Archie Lane)	Lakeshore (LR) Zone

A **Variance** is requested from **Article 300, Section 327, A 2.** of the Zoning Ordinance to permit a 28' x 50' building envelope set 5' from the front property line, where 25' is the minimum setback requirement.

Chair Lee read the public notice into the record. The Board reviewed the application for completeness. Mr. Dever confirmed Archie Lane is now on record with the town as a road.

**Mr. Monzione made a motion to accept the application for Case #Z21-32 as complete. Mr. LaRochelle seconded the motion. Motion passed, 4-0-0.**

Brad Jones, Jones and Beach Engineers, stated the lot is part of an 11 lot subdivision but it was never built on, likely due to the steepness of the lot. Mr. Jones stated Archie Lane is a private road and part of the association which connects 10 lots to a well. He explained the well radius takes up much of this lot. They are working on a septic design and setback relief is needed due to the steepness of the lot. Mr. Jones stated if they met the side setbacks, the house would be pushed further into the well radius. He stated then they would have to build it taller which would exceed the height restrictions and retaining walls would be needed as well. It was confirmed

three letters were submitted in agreement with the proposed plans. Mr. Jones stated they are in the process of a subsurface design and submitting a shoreline permit.

Mr. Monziona noted there is a small structure in the photographs. Mr. Jones stated that is the home behind the property; the view of that house would be blocked if they moved the proposed house back further. It was confirmed there is no structure on this lot at this time. The variance is to allow a structure to be built in the front setback, 5' from the property line. Mr. Dever stated that is considered a right-of-way. Mr. Monziona suggested this lot is grandfathered so the size and setbacks are protected; he stated the lot is considered buildable and is a legal lot as it was created before zoning. The Board reviewed and discussed Section 320.K.2 in regard to nonconforming lots and it was confirmed it can be buildable and therefore no variance is needed for the size and nonconformity. Mr. Monziona confirmed the only variance needed is for the 25' right-of-way setback.

Chair Lee opened the hearing to input from the public in favor of the application. None was indicated.

Chair Lee opened the hearing to input from the public in opposition of the application. None was indicated.

Chair Lee closed the public hearing.

### ***Discussion Case #Z21-32***

*The Board must find that all the following conditions are met in order to grant the Variance:*

Chair Lee stated granting the variance **would not** be contrary to the public interest. He stated the property will be improved overall. The Board agreed.

Mr. Monziona stated the request **is** in harmony with the spirit of the ordinance and the intent of the Master Plan to maintain the health, safety and character of the direct district within which it is proposed. He stated ultimately the structure will be far enough from the private right of way that the concerns of encroachment on the setback, will not be a problem. The Board agreed.

Mr. Hepworth stated that by granting the variance, substantial justice **will be** done. The Board agreed.

Mr. LaRochelle stated the values of surrounding properties **will not be** diminished. He stated there are no objections indicated from any abutters. The Board agreed.

Chair Lee stated that for the purposes of this subparagraph, "*unnecessary hardship*" means that, *owing to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area:*

- i. *No fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property;*
- ii. *The proposed use is a reasonable one.*

Mr. Monzione stated to deny this variance would impose a hardship; the use is reasonable. He stated the lot size poses challenges which set it apart from other lots. The Board agreed.

**Mr. Monzione made a motion to grant the request for a Variance for Case #Z21-32 with the condition the applicant obtain the appropriate approvals from New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services for a shoreline permit. Motion passed, 4-0-0.**

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

### **1. Previous Business:**

- a. Master Plan Update -None
- b. ZAC Update – Mr. Dever stated the first public hearing will be next Thursday.
- c. Alternative Housing Committee – Mr. Dever that will become a study committee for the short-term rentals; he stated the Planning Board voted to allow non-resident property owners to participate in committees for this issue due to the amount of interest.

### **2. New Business:**

- a. Approval of Meeting Schedule for 2022 – The Board reviewed the proposed meeting schedule.

**Mr. Monzione made a motion to approve the schedule as presented for 2022. Mr. Hepworth seconded the motion. Motion passed, 4-0-0.**

- b. Tom Lee and Tim Morgan are up for reelection in 2022. January 19<sup>th</sup> through January 28, 2022 is the timeline to file with the Town Clerk.

### **3. Approval of Minutes:**

Meeting of November 4, 2021 – **Mr. LaRochelle made a motion to approve the minutes as amended. Mr. Hepworth seconded the motion. Motion passed, 4-0-0.**

Site Walk of November 21, 2021 - – **Mr. LaRochelle made a motion to approve the minutes as amended. Mr. Hepworth seconded the motion. Motion passed, 4-0-0.**

### **4. Correspondence: None.**

## **ADJOURN**

**Mr. Monzione made a motion to adjourn. Mr. LaRochelle seconded the motion. Motion passed, 4-0-0.**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

*Jennifer Riel*

Jennifer Riel, Recording Secretary