

**TOWN OF ALTON
ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
MINUTES
Public Hearing
October 6, 2011
Approved 11/3/11**

I. CALL TO ORDER

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

II. APPOINTMENT OF ALTERNATES

As there will be a need for an alternate for some of the cases on the agenda, Paul Larochelle was appointed as an alternate for this meeting, to be utilized only on an as needed basis.

III. INTRODUCTION OF PLANNING DEPARTMENT AND ZONING BOARD MEMBERS

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

John Dever, Building Inspector and Code Enforcement Officer
Tim Kinnon, Member
Paul Monziona, Member
Lou LaCourse, Member
Steve Miller, Member
Paul Larochelle, Alternate

IV. STATEMENT OF THE APPEAL PROCESS

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

V. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

S. Miller made a motion to approve the agenda as presented. L. LaCourse seconded the motion which passed with five votes in favor and none opposed.

VI. CONTINUED APPLICATIONS

Case #Z11-16 74 Rogers Street	Equitable Waiver Map 54 Lot 29	Bernard & Elizabeth Lucontoni Lakeshore Residential Zone
--	---	---

Suzanne McKenna, Esq., of Martin, Lord & Osman P.A. on behalf of owners Bernard and Elizabeth Lucontoni is requesting an Equitable Waiver of Dimensional Requirements (as provided by RSA 674:33-a) from section 327 A-3 to permit a setback of less than ten feet (10').

J. Dever read the case into the record. Attorney McKenna and Bernard and Elizabeth Lucontoni came forward to represent this request.

T. Morgan asked P. Monziona to chair, as her had chaired the previous meeting in T. Morgan's absence. P. Monziona asked P. Larochelle to serve as a member for this case; T. Morgan and L. LaCourse will not sit for the continuation of this hearing. P. Monziona, T. Kinnon, S. Miller, and P. Larochelle will hear this continuation, as they were present for the original hearing last month.

P. Monziona stated that this is a continuance of this case commenced at the September 1, 2011 meeting. Upon motion of the Board after a suggestion by a member and some discussion, the Board determined that it would be helpful and appropriate to continue this matter so the Board could seek advice from town counsel, Attorney Sessler. The members of the Board have had an opportunity to do so; they have obtained legal advice and discussed legal issues that were presented with regard to this application for equitable waiver. The Board is ready to proceed. He also recalled and sought confirmation from Mr. Dever and from the minutes, that the presentation had been concluded and that the matter had been closed to public input. Therefore, unless there is an objection from the applicant, the Board will continue where they left off, which was with deliberations.

Attorney McKenna, for the applicant, stated that was their understanding from the last meeting.

P. Monziona requested the worksheet for this case.

WORKSHEET

1. P. Larochelle stated that the violation was not noticed or discovered by any owner, former owner, owner's agent, or representative of municipal office until after the structure in violation had been substantially completed or until after a lot or division of land in violation had been subdivided by conveyance to be a bona fide purchase for value. T. Kinnon agreed, mainly because there was no evidence submitted contrary to that statement. P. Monziona agreed and added that the evidence that was submitted indicated that it was because of the purchase of this property by the current owner that the violation was discovered, and the current owner exercised his right to come before the Board for this waiver. S. Miller also agreed and added that the onus was actually on the previous owner and not on the current owner; therefore, this element is fulfilled.

2. T. Kinnon stated that the violation was not an outcome of ignorance of the law or ordinance, failure to inquire, obfuscation, misrepresentation, or bad faith on the part of any owner, owners' agent or representative, but was caused instead by either a good faith error in measurement or calculation made by an owner or owners' agent, or by an error in an ordinance interpretation or equitability made by a municipal office official in the process of issuing a permit over which that official had authority. As P. Monziona stated earlier, this was actually brought forward by one of the owners, when it was discovered, which was after the violation was completed. P. Monziona agreed; the violation was not the outcome of any of the items listed and it was not discovered until after construction had been completed. A town official had been present and had an opportunity to discover this, but apparently did not. S. Miller agreed; the Lucontonis' went into the purchase with eyes wide open. P. Larochelle also agreed.

P. Monziona explained that if these two conditions are satisfied, the Board can move on to additional findings to grant the waiver; those conditions have been satisfied, so the Board will move on to statement #3.

3. P. Monziona stated that the physical or dimensional violation does not constitute a public or private nuisance nor diminish the value of other property in the area nor interfere with or adversely affect any present or permissible future uses of any such property. He added that it does not; there was no evidence before the Board to establish that there has been any diminution in the value of this property or any other property. In fact, the deck, which is the item in violation, enhances the value of the property and there has been no evidence to the contrary. S. Miller agreed; the value was in fact set as late as August of this year, and it was pegged right to the market. P. Larochelle and T. Kinnon both agreed.

4. S. Miller stated that due to the degree of past construction or investment made in ignorance of the facts constituting the violation, the cost of correction so far outweighs any public benefit to be gained, that it would be inequitable to require the violation to be corrected. He went on to say that is in fact true; it would cost a significant amount of money – he believed in excess of \$132,000 to correct this issue at this time. The whole benefit is to enjoy the home and the use of the deck, which is in fact, their only outside area, for comfort. P. Larochele and T. Kinnon both agreed. P. Monziona also agreed and added that he thinks that to require the current owner to do anything to tear down the building or try to correct this would be a cost that would far outweigh any public benefit to be gained, and that the equity that would apply to Mr. Warner when that circumstance was committed would also apply to the current applicant as well. That is what equity is all about and that equitable remedy should be available to them.

P. Monziona stated that in light of the above findings, he would entertain a motion in the case of application Z11-16.

S. Miller made a motion to grant the equitable waiver of Dimensional Requirements. P. Larochele seconded the motion which passed with four votes in favor (S. Miller, P. Larochele, T. Kinnon, and P. Monziona) and none opposed.

VII. NEW APPLICATIONS

T. Morgan resumed chairmanship of the Zoning Board of Adjustment.

Case #Z11- 18 71 Mount Major Highway	Amend Special Exception Map 34 Lot 33-16	Ronald and Susan Bell Residential Zone
---	---	---

On behalf of Ronald and Susan Bell, Roger Sample, B.M.S., is requesting to amend a previously approved project. He would like to reduce the second floor addition on the front 4 ft. from 72 sf to 24 sf and put the addition on the back over existing shed roof and put dormers on both north and south sides.

J. Dever read the case into the record. Roger Sample, agent for the Bell’s, came forward to present this application. This addition had been previously approved for the front; they would actually like to put it on the back and put in dormers to allow for egress windows.

T. Kinnon made a motion to accept the application for case #Z11-18 as complete. L. LaCourse seconded the motion which passed with five votes in favor and none opposed (T. Kinnon, T. Morgan, P. Monziona, L. LaCourse, and S. Miller).

Regular Board members (T. Kinnon, T. Morgan, P. Monziona, L. LaCourse, and S. Miller) are sitting on this case; the alternate is not needed.

Mr. Sample explained that the Bell’s want to change the addition previously granted last summer; they would like to put a smaller addition on the front, a large addition on the back, and dormer windows to replace existing windows that go from the floor and end up in the soffit. The size of egress windows is a consideration for the dormers; 5.7 sf is required for egress windows. If this is a double-hung window, that would mean that the bottom portion that slides would have to be 5.7 sf; a casement window that swings out simply needs to leave a 5.7 sf opening. Mr. Sample stated that a dormer that size would be unsightly; they are simply looking to put in larger windows, and get them up off the floor.

T. Kinnon clarified what the application is for this evening; Mr. Sample explained that it is to move the addition previously approved in the fall, and to add the dormers. P. Monziona asked about the addition; that was granted by Special Exception with 6 conditions noted in the Notice of Decision. This evening is to amend the previous decision; Mr. Sample explained that they are moving the addition approved from the front to the back of the cottage. The additional Special Exception is to add the dormers, which will not really add square footage. L. LaCourse noted that there will actually be square footage additional to what was previously approved; the 72 sf

addition is moving to the back, but there will be an additional 24 sf on the front. There will be a 6X12 addition on the back and a 2X12 addition on the back. Mr. Dever explained the original application, which included adding a full foundation and putting a 72 sf addition over the existing screened-porch. Now, the addition on the front, which was encroaching into the setback, is being reduced and added to the back, over an existing shed addition. The dormers will also be added, which will not change the ridgeline; this does not require an additional Special Exception. P. Monziona asked if it is Building Code that requires 5.7 sf for the egress windows; Mr. Dever answered that it is, and that there are ways to get to that point with window sizes. T. Morgan referred to the plans and clarified through questioning what the existing, previously approved, and new proposal consist of. The total roofline extension is eight feet – two in the front and six in the back.

T. Morgan opened the floor to public input; there was none. Public input was closed.

P. Monziona feels that all of the findings made on the previous worksheet back in December, 2010, are no different than the criteria to be met this evening. T. Morgan added that all of the prior conditions on the original Notice of Decision should also apply to this application, as well as a condition to address the concern about the window openings.

WORKSHEET

All members agreed that a plat has been accepted in accordance with Town of Alton Ordinance 520-B.

All members agreed that the specific site is appropriate for the use; the use is not changing.

All members agreed that there is no factual evidence that property values in the district will be reduced due to incompatible uses; the use is the same as it has always been and is compatible with the uses in the area. The Bells' are trying to make this property look more like others in the neighborhood, which will increase values if there is any change at all.

All members agreed that there were no objections from abutters based on demonstrable fact.

All members agreed that there would be no nuisance to pedestrian or vehicle traffic including the location and design of access ways and off street parking; this issue is controlled by the landowner, and none of the changes proposed will have anything to do with pedestrians or vehicles.

All members agreed that appropriate and adequate facilities and utilities would be provided to insure proper operation of the structure. One of the conditions on the previous approval was that the septic had to be certified as adequate by NH-DES prior to issuing the new building permit; that condition and all others will remain in force.

All members agreed that there is adequate area for safe and sanitary sewage disposal and water supply, also addressed in the prior application. Again, the same conditions required previously will also be required here.

All members agreed that the proposed use of the structure is consistent with the spirit of the ordinance and the intent of the Master Plan; the use is residential and always has been which is consistent with the spirit of the ordinance and the intent of the Master Plan.

P. Monziona made a motion to grant the application for Special Exception and for amendment on the conditions that all of the original conditions set forth in the Notice of Decision on December 10, 2010 be applicable to the granting of this application, with consideration to the granting of the amendment, and that as an additional condition the construction comply with the requirement for the appropriate size of the egress windows. L. LaCourse seconded the motion which passed with five votes in favor and none opposed (T. Kinnon, T. Morgan, P. Monziona, L. LaCourse, and S. Miller).

Case #Z11-19 9 School Street	Variance Map 27 Lot 19	W & W Inglewood Trust LLC Residential Commercial Zone
---	-----------------------------------	--

W & W Inglewood Trust LLC is requesting a Variance to Section 602 C-1 Lot Coverage. Their storm water drainage plan is to use SC-310 Storm-Tech which is a drainage system using Storm-Tech drainage chambers instead of using traditional run-off plans, detention ponds, or using porous asphalt which requires a tedious and constant schedule of maintenance.

Case Z11-19 was read into the record by J. Dever; the variance request is to Article 602, Section C-1 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Scott Williams of W & W Inglewood Trust LLC, and Matthew Moore of Matthew Moore Engineering came forward to present this case.

S. Miller made a motion to accept the application as complete; L. LaCourse seconded the motion which passed with five votes in favor and none opposed (T. Kinnon, T. Morgan, P. Monziona, L. LaCourse, and S. Miller).

Mr. Williams explained the plan, showing the location of the Post Office with the proposed addition, a proposed 4,500 sf commercial building that will house a 1,500 sf Laundromat as well as additional retail space. The parking is not going to be increased greatly. Mr. Williams went through the points of the Master Plan relevant to this project which include addition of light industrial/commercial to the village and bay areas, promotion of the rural character of the town and addition of business along the corridor roads of Routes 28 and 11, encouraging of business expansion and a central business district with a walker-friendly design and ample area parking.

This proposal will allow for traffic flow between the Fiddleheads and Post Office parking lots. It will also add to the downtown services of the area and develop the downtown area and allow for people to park at one place and walk between several businesses without having to enter and exit several sites on the street.

When the aquifer overlay district was designed, the thought process was to retain runoff on the surface and then permeate down to recharge the aquifer. Now, the design is to infiltrate runoff back into the ground; the system he is proposing will capture the runoff and send it to a catch basin where sediment will fall into a two foot space in the bottom. There will also be a grease and dirt filter which needs to be maintained on the same schedule as the manhole, which is biennial but will be done sooner and more often until it is known how the site will perform.

Mr. Williams feels that this proposal meets the spirit of the 60% lot coverage set forth in 1995 with getting the water back into the ground, which is what the state now wants. He cited several more excerpts from the Master Plan to support this proposal, including the need for business in Alton while maintaining the residential and commercial uses, and to create a central business district which encourages revitalization and development. Mr. Williams added that the Town Planner is actually preparing to put forth a proposal to change the Aquifer Overlay District on the March ballot in order to bring the runoff issues more in line with current state requirements.

Mr. Moore explained how the system will be used to meet the spirit of the ordinance; the system is called a Storm-Tech. It is a plastic chamber with crushed stone on the sides and between the chambers. It is similar to a septic in that it catches the runoff in catch basins. There is a silt catch and a sock that will be maintained so that the system will continue to catch oil and grease and not require replacement. These units are not new; they allow the drainage from the lot above and road runoff to enter into the storm ducts. S. Williams added that this will be a better situation post-construction; presently any oil or grease from cars goes untreated. S. Williams further explained the sock or snout, which needs to be flushed with water when the system is maintained. This

is a passive filter; it does not move the impurities, it simply catches them. The runoff from cleaning the snout will be captured via vacuum and disposal.

S. Miller asked about the waste from the Laundromat; Mr. Williams explained that the waste from the Laundromat goes to a completely different system and does not enter this system at all.

P. Monziona asked how much this lot coverage is going to exceed the allowed 60%; Mr. Williams explained that it will be 82%. P. Monziona complimented Mr. Williams on his presentation but explained that he is struggling with the hardship criterion. This discussion went on between Mr. Williams and several of the members. Mr. Williams explained that there are several other properties which have exceeded the lot coverage requirement; he is desirous to be on the front of this. He also feels that this meets the new State requirements. P. Monziona asked for clarification of the uniqueness of the property that distinguishes it from other properties in the area. Mr. Williams again pointed out the desire of the town to have better access as well as shared walkable areas for downtown businesses. He feels that the project meets the spirit of the 60% lot coverage and that they are in keeping with the Master Plan.

T. Morgan revisited the issue of the unnecessary hardship criterion; this has recently been recodified which makes it far more difficult to meet. He requested further guidance and suggested a future meeting for more information. Mr. Williams would like to get the project off the ground this fall; L. LaCourse pointed out that under the ordinance, they have reasonable use as the property stands right now.

T. Kinnon spoke about the fact that the project, placed where it is, makes it unique. It is downtown and part of the sidewalk system. There is already a post office, a restaurant, and grocer there, so it is an existing point of interest. That makes it unique. There is already foot and vehicular traffic there and this will enhance the existing location. Mr. Williams added that part of the hardship would be the fact that the residential/commercial zone is covered almost completely by the Aquifer Overlay District. That has created a hardship for businesses to exist; they are asking for relief of that hardship. The spirit of the 60% coverage requirement was to provide proper groundwater recharge; they are going to do that. Without that, the hardship is that they can not enjoy the full use of their property.

P. Monziona stated that this application more than satisfies all the criteria; he is only concerned about the hardship criterion. The proposal will create a congregation of businesses in the downtown where people can park and walk to different stores and businesses. Mr. Williams spoke about how their property and the Fiddleheads property are working together to help create this downtown area; Fiddleheads shares some of their parking and in the future would like to expand the unused portion of their property as well.

The floor was opened to public input.

Tom Hoops came forward to speak in favor of this proposal. He explained that the reason for the Aquifer Protection Plan was to protect the river and the lake. This area is at least 20' above the river level; the soil is also very sandy. The Planning Board feels that this is a good way to deal with surface runoff and they are impressed with the two different water disposal systems; the machines in the Laundromat are front loading and use very little water. The concept of the distance from the location to the river is at least 1,000 feet with just pure sand in this area. The percolation rates are unbelievable!

Roger Sample stated that it is important to note that the hardship of this is the location within the aquifer; if this were being done at his house, he would not even have to be here because he is not in the aquifer. The only reason he is here is because he is in the aquifer and that is a hardship.

Bill Curtin came forward and related that when the applicant came before the Planning Board it was not discovered until well into the process that this was even in the Aquifer District. Additionally, when there was a leak from a 2 inch line, it didn't show up for over 1 ½ days because of the percolation.

Mr. Williams added that when he purchased the property, the Aquifer zone did not exist.

Public input was closed.

T. Kinnon reiterated that the uniqueness of the property is the location and the existence of the businesses that are already there. This could not be built at any other location downtown; people will be drawn to this area because of the other services already there. The configuration of the lot also makes it unique. P. Monziona added that he is not troubled by any of the criteria except the hardship. He also noted that the more difficult part of the hardship criterion is only in play if the first part of the criterion is not met. T. Morgan stated that he is in agreement with Mr. Kinnon that the congregation of businesses in the area is what will distinguish it from other properties in the area; he is satisfied he can vote that way.

WORKSHEET

All members agreed that the variance will not be contrary to the public interest. If anything, the variance will be in favor of the public interest. P. Monziona added for the record that this applicant is a member of the Planning Board and the Fire Chief; the status of the applicant has no bearing on his decision making. The design and effectiveness of the system as designed will not be contrary to anything the ordinance was designed to protect.

All members agreed that the request is in harmony with the spirit of the ordinance and the intent of the Master Plan and with the convenience, health, safety, and character of the district within which it is proposed. The spirit is to promote downtown business and to interconnect the Village District with the Bay, and to preserve the beauty of the district, which this system will help do.

All members agreed that by granting the variance substantial justice would be done. This will be for the builder, for the businessmen, and for the town. The benefit to the public far outweighs any detriment to the public.

All members agreed that there would be no diminution of value of surrounding properties. If anything, surround values will be increased by the influx of business within walking distance from many homes. Additionally, there has been no testimony to the contrary. Also, this is being done in a manner that does not diminish the quality of the town and allows for returning cleaner runoff to the aquifer.

For purposes of this sub-paragraph, unnecessary hardship means that owing to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area (it is distinguished by the congregation of businesses in the area) that no fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purposes of the ordinance and the specific application of that provision to the property. All members agreed with this statement. The point of the ordinance is to gather runoff; this system is simply an alternative means of doing that. Finally, the proposed use is a reasonable one; all members agreed with this as well. Several points were remade in this criterion; the congregation of businesses, the aquifer location and the limited opportunities in the Village District. T. Kinnon applauded the input of other Board in making this decision.

S. Miller made a motion to approve the variance for Case Z11-19; L. LaCourse seconded the motion which passed with five votes in favor and none opposed (T. Kinnon, T. Morgan, P. Monziona, L. LaCourse, and S. Miller).

Case #Z11-20 Suncook Valley Road/Rt. 28 S.	Amend Special Exception Map 8 Lot 49	Robert H. Carlton Rev. Trust Rural Zone
---	---	--

On behalf of Robert H. Carlton Rev. Trust, Tyler Phillips from Horizon Engineering is requesting amendments to previously approved Special Exceptions to reflect changes to project plans for the Turtle Kraal RV Park (formerly referred to as the Alton Campground).

J. Dever read the case into the record; there has been a shift of the park boundaries and movement of items within the park, so this amendment is necessary to recognize those changes. Mr. Robert Carlton came forward to present this case.

T. Kinnon recused himself from this proceeding as he was not present when the original case was heard. P. Larochele was present at the original case, so he has been appointed a member for this case. Members sitting for this case are T. Morgan, P. Monziona, L. LaCourse, S. Miller, and P. Larochele.

P. Monziona made a motion to accept the application for Case #Z11-20 as complete. S. Miller seconded the motion which passed with five votes in favor and none opposed (T. Morgan, P. Monziona, L. LaCourse, S. Miller, and P. Larochele).

In Department Head Comments, the Conservation Commission commented that they felt that they had incomplete information; since that comment, the Planner and Code Enforcement have met with the Chairman of the Conservation Commission and it is felt that they are satisfied with letting the application go forward.

Mr. Carlton explained that there had been a misunderstanding concerning the wetlands setbacks; his engineer had thought they would be 20 feet based on the age of the lot. Everything was designed on that information but Town Counsel ruled that the wetland setback had to meet the current law, which is 25 feet, so everything was redesigned with that new measurement. Also, the peninsula was originally part of the planned area, but the state conservation staff felt that there is a lot of wildlife there and they were concerned that they would be disturbed with people walking around there. Mr. Carlton decided to remove the peninsula from the plan and move that area to the other side of the property. He showed plans which indicate the area movement from the peninsula to the other side of the project which still satisfies the Planning Board need for conservation land.

The Conservation Commission had been concerned about river access, if there is going to be any. Also, they wanted to know if the pond was going to be used for kayaking or boating. Mr. Carlton explained that the pond is going to be used for swimming and fishing. The water line is still going to bore under the river, but it will be moved more to the south, coming out at Barnes Avenue for water access. The Conservation Commission also asked about guardrails on the access across the wetlands; Mr. Carlton explained that it is designed such that a guardrail is not required.

Mr. Carlton explained in more detail the state's position on the use of the far end of the peninsula; there is an area there where the turtles lay their eggs. Using the peninsula was not forbidden, but he felt that it would be a better move not to oppose the state on this issue. The right of way still goes across the peninsula, but it does not affect the part of the peninsula the state is concerned about. The emergency access is not going to be affected and will be maintained just as it is now. There will be a gate with a Knox box on that road; the Fire Department will have access.

The three issues that created the need for the adjustment to the approval were the movement of the water line, the change in the wetlands buffers, and shifting the conservation land from the peninsula to the other side of the project. The layout of the sites is not changing except that they are moving in five feet; there are no additional structures nor are there any additional sites.

P. Monziona mentioned the conditions that were attached with the original application; he asked if any of the amendments being requested will affect his ability to meet the conditions of the original approval. Mr. Carlton answered that they would not; J. Dever agreed that nothing is changing that will affect the conditions and no relief is needed.

The floor was opened to public input; there was none. Public input was closed.

WORKSHEET

All members agreed that a plat had been accepted in accordance with Alton Zoning ordinance 520B.

All members agreed the site is an appropriate location for the use; nothing has changed since the last visit so the reasons stated in the previous record of this Special Exception still apply.

All members agreed that no factual evidence has been found that property values in the district will be reduced due to incompatible uses; this had also been previously determined in the prior application.

All members agreed that there is no valid objection from abutters based on demonstrable fact; there were no abutters present this evening.

All members agreed that there is no undue nuisance or serious hazard to pedestrian or vehicular traffic, including the location/design of access ways and off street parking; this includes all the reasons stated when the previous application was granted provided that the same conditions would apply here.

All members agreed that adequate and appropriate facilities and utilities will be provided to insure proper operation of the proposed use or structure; this is information already decided previously, and that met all the needs. The changes that are part of the application make it appropriate to reconsider this application, but all of the previous reasons given still apply here.

All members agreed that there is safe and adequate area for sewage disposal and water supply; no changes have been presented from the previous plan, and as long as there are no additional units or customers expected. The water supply issue was addressed in this application and the area in which the supply come in changes, but that does not change the adequacy of the supply. Again, all conditions previously imposed would remain in place.

All members agreed that the proposed use or structure is consistent with the spirit of the ordinance and the spirit of the Master Plan; this is not changing anything in the Master Plan, and it continues to be a good idea and a good project within the spirit of the Master Plan.

L. LaCourse made a motion to approve the Special Exception for Case Z11-20 with conditions of the prior approval to be still in force here. P. Monziona seconded the motion as long as the previous conditions are included in this approval. The vote on this motion was unanimous with five votes in favor and none opposed (T. Morgan, P. Monziona, L. LaCourse, S. Miller, and P. Larochele).

VIII. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Previous Business: None

B. New Business:

Members discussed the time meetings end; currently the policy is that no new cases are begun after 10:00 p.m. It was suggested that going forward, there will be an announcement at the beginning of the meeting that the meeting will end at 10:00 p.m., and that some cases may not be heard on a long agenda. Special meetings could be scheduled to meet the needs of applicants with a time commitment. The agenda is never limited; if the application is in prior to the deadline, it is on the agenda in the order it comes through the door.

C. Minutes: July 7, 2011 and September 1, 2011

The minutes of the July 7, 2011 meeting were tabled until a future meeting.

Two errors were noted in the minutes of September 1, 2011. On page 11, in the third paragraph, sixth line from the bottom, the word "his" should be "him." On page 20, in the fourth paragraph, sixth line from the top, the word "cone" should be "come."

S. Miller made a motion to approve the minutes of the September 1, 2011 meeting as amended. Motion was seconded by L. LaCourse and passed with all votes in favor.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

Paul Monzione made a motion to adjourn. Steve Miller seconded the motion which passed with all votes in favor.

The meeting adjourned at 9:20 p.m.

The next regular ZBA meeting will be held on November 3, 2011, at 7:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary L. Tetreau
Recorder, Public Session