

1                                   **MINUTES OF THE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT**  
2                                   **MEETING JANUARY 9<sup>TH</sup> 2006**  
3                                   **MERIDEN TOWN HALL**

4   Zoning Board

5   Members Present:           Richard Colburn, Chair       Priscilla Eastman  
6                                   Margaret Cassedy           Peter Martin  
7                                   Ted Moynihan

8  
9           The meeting opened at 7:30pm. The December 12<sup>th</sup> minutes were approved as amended.  
10   The board reviewed photographs of the now constructed 343 Freeman Road cell tower 05-05. The  
11   false branches have not yet been installed, but should be in place by the end of the month.

12           **Case 2006-01 Mark and Sandy Horne:** Special exception request for Approved Business  
13   Project #34 to include the following uses: Storage, distribution, and a rental house. Mark Horne  
14   explained that this application involves merging two existing lots (map 107 lot 19,20) that the couple  
15   owns as well as annexing land from their new residence (map 240 lot 5)to correct the area  
16   deficiencies that were pointed out from the last application which included only the lot with the  
17   large commercial building. Now that the applicant has purchased the adjacent property, the  
18   possibility of locating the commercial building on a conforming lot exists. Once completed, the lot  
19   reconfiguration will result in the commercial building and the rental house being located on a 3.0 or  
20   more acre lot with road frontage on Route 12A. The storage portion of the project includes about  
21   100 lockers ranging from 8'X8' to 20'X30' which encompasses about 2/3 of the 20,000 square feet  
22   available in the building. The distribution business includes the arrival of a tractor trailer during the  
23   night. The truck is unloaded at the rear of the building where the load is broken into five or six  
24   smaller loads which are placed into vans that leave very early in the morning to make rounds to  
25   medical centers in the area. This cycle is repeated five times per week.

26           Board members felt that to properly evaluate the proposal the following additional  
27   information is needed: Access logs for both the storage business and the distribution business,  
28   information on any hazardous materials that are being stored on the premise, calculations about  
29   impervious area on the site so that the minimum lot size can be calculate number and size of vehicles  
30   operated from the site.

31           Chairman Colburn opened the discussion to abutters and members of the public present.  
32   General comments expressed concern about the size and scope of this proposal so close to the  
33   Village area. Others noted that this property has had a long history of “commercial” type uses that  
34   are more intensive than the current proposal. There was general agreement that, if approved, any  
35   decision by the Board would have to contain sufficient detail to insure that, if the intensity of the use  
36   increased, additional town review would occur. Mark Horne noted that this project is as large as they  
37   ever intend it to be. See case 05-07 for background.

38           Board members discussed both a site visit and a joint meeting with the Planning Board and  
39   determined that neither was immediately necessary. The hearing was recessed to the  
40   February meeting at which time the applicant will have prepared the requested information.

41                                   \*\*\*

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10

The January meeting adjourned at 9:00pm. The board's next meeting will be February 13<sup>th</sup> 2005.

Submitted,  
Stephen Halleran

Richard Colburn  
Chairman



1 day. Access records show that there are never more than two entries from 2am to 6am. The storage  
2 use involves about 14,400 sq feet of the available inside space or about 73%.

3  
4 Distribution Use:

5 Accounts for 80% of the traffic on the site, using 5,750 sq ft or 27% of the available space  
6 in the building. Seven cube vans and one tractor trailer are used for the businesses eleven total  
7 employees. Nearly all the onsite work takes place between 2:30am and 6:30am.

8  
9 Residential Use: A single family home located to the front of the property used as a rental.

10  
11 Mark Horne noted that the adjacent auction business had more than seventy cars on site for an  
12 auction earlier that day. These included cars, trucks, trailers and vans. Neighbors disagreed that this  
13 established use is more intensive than the proposed business project.

14  
15 Neighbors in attendance feel strongly that the proposed use does not satisfy the criteria for an  
16 approved business project. Hours of operation, type of activities, noise are all greater than would  
17 customarily be expected in a village setting.

18  
19 Jean Kennedy questioned if many of the comments where board members use the word approved  
20 indicated a bias toward the applicant. Member Priscilla Eastman noted that her municipal  
21 association training as a Zoning Board member taught her that the ZBA's job is to assist applicants  
22 achieve their objectives within the criteria established by the zoning ordinance.

23  
24 After being questioned by board members, Mark Horne added that the storage use is typically more  
25 active in the summer than during the winter, but typically involves periodic trips to a particular unit  
26 each month. The space now designated for Serenity Power Plus was previously used as sixty storage  
27 units.

28  
29 Greg Davini questioned the proposed hours of operation for this use as compared to the new  
30 convenience store recently approved.

31  
32 Board members started their formal review of the criteria for an Approved Business project. The  
33 board worked its way down through the list found in section 3.5 of the Zoning Ordinance. The goal  
34 being to focus discussion by making a final pass through the regulations to see what if any additional  
35 information is needed from the applicant. At this point Chairman Colburn asked that the public  
36 allow the board time to work on the application. Lots of valued comments have been received,  
37 however, these comments are starting to be repetitive and the board needs to begin its discussion.

38 As is the custom of the board, the public hearing remained open, but the board focused on its  
39 deliberation. No additional information was requested from the applicant at this time. As expected  
40 the areas that were determined to need further board discussion and review included those criteria  
41 that concern the impacts the proposed uses will have on surrounding properties and the  
42 neighborhood in general. To gather more first hand information the board determined it would hold  
43 a site visit at the facility starting at 5pm on Monday February 20<sup>th</sup>. The public is welcome to attend,  
44 however, public comments will not be taken at the visit. The case was recessed to the time of the  
45 site visit, the public hearing was recessed until Monday March 13<sup>th</sup> at 7:30pm.

1 The being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:15pm.

2

3 Submitted,

4

5 Stephen Halleran

6

7

8

Richard Colburn  
Chairman

1 **MINUTES OF THE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT**  
2 **MEETING FEBRUARY 20<sup>TH</sup> 2006**  
3 **PLAINFIELD HEATED STORAGE 1044 ROUTE 12A**  
4

5 Zoning Board

6 Members Present: Richard Colburn, Chair Priscilla Eastman  
7 Margaret Cassedy Ted Moynihan  
8 Brad Atwater  
9

10 The Site Visit, as noticed, opened at 5:00pm at the Plainfield Heated Storage building. Village  
11 property owners Ronald Bailey and Joann Griffin were in attendance for the visit.  
12

13 Mark and Sandy Horne walked board members around the grounds of the facility and provided a tour  
14 of each of the three buildings (A,B,C). Buildings A, B are used for storage and made up of interior  
15 storage cubes with each building having some open floor storage as well. Renters provide their own  
16 locks and have 24/7 access to the building. Building C is used by Serenity Power Plus and includes  
17 loading docks to the rear of the facility. While all of building C is rented by the distribution  
18 business, only about one half of the space is used at this time. The two largest trucks leave the  
19 facility at approximately 7pm, arriving back on site at 3:00am. These two trucks are unloaded into  
20 the building and sorted into seven routes. The drivers of the small trucks arrive between 5:30am  
21 and 6:30am, finish loading their route and leave the property returning at approximately 4:00pm in  
22 the afternoon. Inside the loading area are two small office spaces used by Serenity workers for  
23 completing paperwork and making phone calls.  
24

25 Board members walked around the rear lot viewing the area that has been filled and graveled as part  
26 of the loading dock development. It was noted that access to the rear of the building is per an  
27 arrangement with the abutting River Valley School. Mark noted that he hopes to purchase some  
28 additional acreage behind the building to accommodate employee parking and perhaps some outside  
29 storage of large vehicles and trailers. Currently, the storage of these items takes place to the front  
30 of the building.  
31

32 The site visit ended at 5:40pm, the board will take up the application next on Monday March 13<sup>th</sup>  
33 at 7:30pm.  
34

35 Submitted,

36 Stephen Halleran  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

Richard Colburn  
Chairman



1 during night time hours and several small vans during daylight hours.

2 A discussion followed about outdoor storage at this location. Mr. Horne, when asked,  
3 responded that at this time there are three outdoor storage spaces being rented. The Horne's  
4 indicated that this proposal includes three to six outdoor parking spaces. In addition, employee  
5 parking for Serenity Power Plus at this time is proposed for the front of the lot.

6 Board members began an itemized review of the operational criteria for an Approved  
7 Business Project and the granting of a special exception.

8 Priscilla Eastman noted that in her view noise generated from the goings and comings of the  
9 trucks is the main issue with this application. Chairman Colburn responded that for him, he does  
10 not believe the proposed use is unreasonable for a state highway, the only question in his mind is  
11 whether or not the use as proposed, conducted in the middle of the night, is reasonable or  
12 unreasonable. Member Cassedy agreed noting that for her the night time activity is the issue. Brad  
13 Atwater noted that from living in the village his experience is that as proposed, the use does have  
14 negative impacts on the village. If done during daylight hours, many of these concerns would go  
15 away. He also questioned how changes in tenants and use of the space within the buildings (storage  
16 v. distribution would be handed). Chairman Colburn offered that initially these issues would be  
17 handled through the Zoning Administrator and then as needed the Zoning Board.

18 Priscilla Eastman acknowledged that this building has existed on the site for many years and  
19 has had many different types of uses. For her, as proposed, the use would be the maximum intensity  
20 allowed for this building during night time hours. If approved, she would encourage that minimizing  
21 night time noise be a priority.

22 At this time, Peter Martin moved to conditionally approve the application (see attached  
23 materials) within a very narrow scope of operational criteria that would require additional board  
24 review for any significant changes to the businesses as currently described. In making this motion  
25 Peter acknowledged the expressed concerns both from abutters and board members and indicated  
26 that he felt approving the use with conditions that create a clear record of what is expected and what  
27 will require additional review is necessary to insure proper enforcement. The motion was seconded.  
28 A broad discussion followed about the exact details of Peter's motion. Member Cassedy asked for  
29 clarification on several points concerning the outdoor storage and employee parking, Brad Atwater  
30 asked for additional information on how enforcement would be handled and Priscilla Eastman  
31 advocated for additional language in the final decision to encourage noise abatement whenever  
32 possible. Peter responded that he would draft a final decision including the details brought out in  
33 this discussion. His motion is intended to approve the Approved Business Project to include a  
34 storage use, a distribution use and a residential rental use as they currently exist. Any expansion of  
35 any of the uses, might trigger a Zoning Board review, but in particular the distribution use is to be  
36 absolutely limited to the current operational intensity.

37 A vote on the motion was called, those voting yes 2, those voting no 2, Chairman Colburn  
38 cast the deciding vote in favor of the motion as presented. The application was approved on a 3 to  
39 2 vote. Martin will draft a decision for board members review.

40 There being no other business the meeting adjourned at 10:40pm.

41 Submitted,

42  
43  
44 Stephen Halleran

Richard Colburn, Chair ZBA

45





1 The focus of the discussion on whether or not to grant a rehearing settled on the issues  
2 presented in #6 and #10 which were understood to be as follows:

3 Based on the clarification provided by Diane MacDonald concerning the rationale for #6  
4 (required application form was not filed) it was determined that this issue concerns the discussion at the  
5 end of the last meeting about the outside storage spaces, which had not previously been identified in  
6 the application materials but came up as part of the ZBA's review of the case.

7 Concerning reason #10, as part of these deliberations board members acknowledged that in  
8 hindsight the approved decision could have been written in a format that covered hours of operation  
9 in the same manner as the case in 1999-07. However, in the format that was used the hours of trucking  
10 activity reflect what the board approved that evening.

11 Most of the remaining discussion on whether or not to grant the rehearing because work done  
12 at the final hearing on the case concerning the outside storage areas on the property should have been  
13 reviewed more thoroughly and involved more opportunity for abutter comment. Two board members  
14 felt that it should have been, two board members felt that this work was part of the natural evolution  
15 of the application and was covered thoroughly, particularly given that most of the discussion on the  
16 application and abutter concerns were centered on the new distribution use, not the existing storage  
17 use.

18 Member Brad Atwater moved to grant the request for a rehearing finding changes like the issue  
19 of outside storage that came up during the last meeting on the case procedurally should have involved  
20 more discussion and review. Member Cassidy seconded the motion. The motion was then discussed.  
21 Peter Martin explained that he felt further review of the case would only result in a repeat of the  
22 previous hearing and as there was no new information presented tonight and no material defect in the  
23 existing decision, that decision should stand. Member Atwater indicated that he felt more dialogue with  
24 abutters was needed concerning the outside storage areas and the impact that the overall use has on the  
25 surrounding neighborhood. The vote on the motion was a tie 2 to 2 (Atwater, Cassidy in favor, Martin  
26 and Eastman against). Acting Chairman Moynihan cast the deciding vote in favor of the motion to  
27 grant a rehearing noting the complexity of the case warrants every opportunity for public and board  
28 input.

29 If case 2006-01 is not withdrawn by the applicant, Halleran will notice a rehearing of the case  
30 for the June meeting. At this time it was disclosed to board members and the abutters that Mark and  
31 Sandy Horne filed a lawsuit against the town concerning case 05-07, notice to the town of this was on  
32 January 30<sup>th</sup>. Since case 06-01 had already commenced and potentially could resolve the entire matter  
33 the lawsuit was left active, but tabled until the current case was finalized. Halleran with discussions with  
34 counsel determined that to insure that the board could not be accused of taking the lawsuit into  
35 consideration in the current case, there was no value in discussing the lawsuit with board members or  
36 the public unless specifically asked. All this being the case, and given the fact that Serenity has vacated  
37 the building, it is possible that the applicant's will decide to withdraw case 02-01 and simply move  
38 forward with the lawsuit on the first case.

39  
40 The meeting adjourned at 9:45pm. In follow up to previous procedural discussions, Halleran  
41 will set up a board session with Town Counsel Barry Schuster to discuss the board's existing rules of  
42 procedure and how they apply to things like e-mail.

43  
44 Submitted,

45  
46 Stephen Halleran

47 Ted Moynihan, Acting Chair  
48 ZBA

1  
2 **MINUTES OF THE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT**  
3 **MEETING JUNE 12TH 2006**  
4 **MERIDEN TOWN HALL**

5 Zoning Board

6 Members Present: Richard Colburn,Chr Ted Moynihan  
7 Priscilla Eastman Margaret Cassedy  
8 Peter Martin Brad Atwater, alternate  
9

10 The meeting opened at 7:15pm. The May minutes were approved as amended. Richard Colburn  
11 announced that for this evening's meeting the five members of the board will be sitting on the case  
12 and the board's alternate may participate in the discussion, but will not be voting on the case.  
13

14 **Rehearing Case 2006-01:** Chairman Colburn opened the rehearing by reading the posted notice.  
15 Attorney Don Gartrell representing Mark and Sandy Horne asked that Mr. Atwater consider recusing  
16 himself from this process as his mother, Judy Atwater has been a vocal critic of the application.  
17 Attorney Gartrell was informed that Brad Atwater is the board's alternate and will not be voting this  
18 evening.

19 Chairman Colburn indicated for the purpose of this hearing, testimony and board review will  
20 be limited to the issues that the rehearing was granted on, it will not be a full rehearing of the original  
21 case. The rehearing was granted to allow the board to more fully discuss the outside storage spaces  
22 that were brought up at the final April meeting just prior to the final motion for approval.

23 Board members commenced their discussion of the outside storage spaces which were  
24 covered in the Zoning decision as follows: "**Storage business** shall be limited to that outlined by the  
25 applicant with the submitted material supporting the application, specifically the page headed  
26 "Storage Information" (attached), except that a total of six outside spaces for commercial vehicles  
27 or vehicle storage adjacent to the warehouse on the current impervious surface shall be permitted."  
28 Board members worked on developing a measurable standard for the use of the outside parking,  
29 noting that the details of screening would be covered by the Planning Board as part of the necessary  
30 site plan review.

31 Based on concerns expressed by member Ted Moynihan, the board decided to clarify its  
32 original intention that a condition of the approved decision is that the agreement between the Hornes  
33 and River Valley School for the Horne's use of a portion of the school's land to access the rear of  
34 the storage building must continue to exist and ideally would be formalized.

35 Prior to hearing from the applicant and and the petitioners, Chairman Colburn reminded all  
36 present that testimony is limited to the reasons for the rehearing, this is not a rehearing of the entire  
37 case. Mark Horne explained that outside storage is done on the concrete pad and the gravel drive  
38 leading to the pad. The current approval and practice has no more than six vehicles.

39 Diane MacDonald questioned the lack of information about the concrete pad and the  
40 appropriateness of limiting testimony. She and other abutters wish to express additional opinions  
41 on the overall adverse impacts of the project.

42 At this time Mark and Sandy Horne stated that they wished to withdraw case 06-1. Because  
43 of the rehearing, it is the Horne's position that the original decision in the case has not gone into  
44 effect. The tenant for the distribution business has moved away and the storage portion of the use  
45 has been in place for years. Therefore, the Hornes decided it was time to just end this particular

1 application. In their view this withdrawal effectively returns the property in its original configuration  
2 as an existing established nonconforming use of storage. The applicants and attorney Gartrell left  
3 the room. The Zoning Board noted that they concur that due to the withdrawal case 06-01 is now  
4 moot.

5

6

The meeting adjourned at 9:00pm.

8

Submitted,

10

Stephen Halleran

Richard Colburn, Chair

12

13

14

15

16



The September 11<sup>th</sup> ZBA meeting adjourned at 9:30pm.

2

3

Submitted,

5

Stephen Halleran

7

8

Richard Colburn, Chair

1 **MINUTES OF THE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT**  
2 **MEETING SEPTEMBER 25TH 2006**  
3 **MERIDEN TOWN HALL**

Zoning Board

Members Present:

Richard Colburn,Chr Ted Moynihan

6 Priscilla Eastman Peter Martin

7 Margaret Cassedy Brad Atwater, alternate

8

The meeting opened at 7:00pm.

10

11 Chairman Colburn noted that this purpose of this meeting is to have a procedural discussion  
12 concerning a request by several Plainfield Village residents/landowners (see attached copy) to have  
13 the ZBA review the Planning Board's decision on the approved Townline Equipment Site Plan  
14 Review. This public meeting is not a public hearing on the matter. At this time Chairman Colburn  
15 recused himself from the discussion, noting that he is an abutter to the project. Arriving just after  
16 the discussion started, Brad Atwater also noted that since a family member is one of the names listed  
17 on the appeal he also has recused himself. Vice Chairman Ed Moynihan chaired the remainder of  
18 the meeting.

19 The remaining board members discussed how they wished to proceed. It was determined that  
20 the board would first consider town counsel's recommendation that the appeal was procedurally  
21 flawed since it was filed late. Based on the outcome of that discussion the board would then decide  
22 if discussing any of the details of the appeal was appropriate.

23 Member Martin noted that he has reviewed town counsel's logic in making this determination  
24 and concurs with the finding. RSA 676 requires the appeal to be made within a "reasonable time."  
25 The board's rules of procedure established fifteen days as the time period. The Planning Board's  
26 decision was made on August 7<sup>th</sup>, this appeal to the ZBA was dated September 5<sup>th</sup>, clearly beyond the  
27 fifteen day limit. Consequently, Peter feels the board has no jurisdiction to hear the case.

28 The other members of the board seeming to agree with counsel's recommendation, member  
29 Peter Martin made the following motion: I move that the Zoning Board deny the appeal of  
30 petitioners in the case of Townline Equipment, Inc., in which the Plainfield Planning Board, on  
31 August 7, 2006, conditionally approved Townline's Site Plan for an expansion.  
32 The denial is based on RSA 676:5(III) in which such an appeal must be filed "in a reasonable time."  
33 Further, Plainfield's ordinance (March 2005 edition) 5.5 states that such an appeal must be filed  
34 within 15 days. The appeal was received in the town office on September 6, well after the deadline,  
35 and therefore cannot be heard. The motion was seconded and voted in the affirmative by a vote of  
36 4 to 0. A letter to the appellants will follow.

37

There being no other business on the agenda the meeting was adjourned at 7:45pm.

39

40

41

42

Submitted,

44

Stephen Halleran

Ed Moynihan  
ZBA Vic Chair

1                                   **MINUTES OF THE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT**  
2                                   **MEETING OCTOBER 10TH 2006**  
3                                   **MERIDEN TOWN HALL**

Zoning Board

Members Present:               Richard Colburn,Chr               Ted Moynihan  
6                                   Priscilla Eastman               Peter Martin  
7                                   Margaret Cassedy               Brad Atwater, alternate  
8

The meeting opened at 7:00pm.

9  
10  
11  
12 The September 25<sup>th</sup> meeting minutes were approved as amended.

13  
14       The board took up a “Motion for Reconsideration to Plainfield Zoning Board, Townline  
15       Equipment” filed by Attorney William Clauson on behalf of a group of Plainfield Village  
16       residents. Chairman Colburn and Alternate Atwater again recused themselves from these  
17       discussions.

18       Vice Chairman Moynihan took over the running of the meeting.

19       In September the ZBA had declined to hear an appeal, from this group, of the Planning Board’s  
20       decision to approve a site plan review for Townline Equipment. The denial was on on procedural  
21       grounds as the board found the appeal was not filed in a timely manner.

22 The board reviewed the reconsideration motion, reading through the entire document. Discussion initially  
23       focused on the term “Zoning Permit” which appears in the zoning ordinance, see #4 of the  
24       motion. It was determined that as, commonly used any appealable action or decision is in effect  
25       a zoning permit, whether it be a decision of the Zoning Administrator, a building permit or an  
26       approval by the Planning Board.

27       The board was unable to locate Article 1K of the site plan review regulations as called out in #5  
28       of the motion for reconsideration. Judy Atwater indicated that 1K was an error in the motion that  
29       should read roman numeral IX, or article 9. Unsure of whether to proceed with a discussion  
30       about 1K as written or article 9 as verbally corrected, the board decided to discuss article 9  
31       which talks about site plans with conditions. Halleran noted that the letter stating the terms of  
32       the approval by the Planning Board was drafted by him, reviewed by the board. In his view,  
33       having attended the meeting the Planning Board approved the site plan on August 7<sup>th</sup>, with no  
34       expectation of seeing the project back before the board unless a substantive change occurred.  
35       Prior to the issuance of any permits to start construction the Planning Board asked that the  
36       applicant’s engineer share with the town’s engineer, who was not at the August 7<sup>th</sup> meeting, a  
37       drainage enhancement (several berms) that was proposed at the meeting to address an abutters  
38       concerns over surface runoff rom the site. If the town’s engineer was in agreement with the  
39       prescribed change the approval would become final. The town’s engineer reviewed and  
40       accepted the changes onsite August 11<sup>th</sup>. Unclear on the policies and procedures of how the  
41       Planning Board operates the Zoning Board membership felt it would be appropriate for the  
42       Planning Board to review all of its regulations, the Zoning ordinance, the Site Plan Review  
43       Regulations and the Subdivision Regulations to insure consistent terminology and time lines  
44       through out the three documents.

45       Turning to the issue of whether the Planning Board’s decision was final prior to August 23<sup>rd</sup>,



1 Zoning Board members were unable to determine the significance of that date, the following  
2 Planning Board meeting having been August 21st.  
3 The Zoning Board completed its review of the motion and finding neither new information nor  
4 any error in procedure by the Zoning Board Peter Martin moved to deny the request for  
5 reconsideration. The motion was seconded and voted in the affirmative by a vote of 4 to 0.  
6 Returning to a full board, the Zoning Board indicated that in November work would continue on  
7 updating the board's rules of procedure.

8  
9 The meeting adjourned at 8:15pm.

10  
11  
12 Submitted,  
13  
14 Stephen Halleran  
15  
16

Ed Moynihan  
ZBA Vic Chair

1 **MINUTES OF THE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT**  
2 **MEETING DECEMBER 11<sup>TH</sup> 2006**  
3 **MERIDEN TOWN HALL**

Zoning Board

Members Present: Richard Colburn, Chr Ted Moynihan  
6 Brad Atwater Stephen Sheehan-alt  
7 William McGonigle

8 The meeting opened at 7:00pm.  
9

10 Due to the lack of a quorum of those members in attendance in October, the review of the October meeting  
11 minutes was deferred until the January meeting. Halleran noted that one application for the  
12 January meeting has been received. The case involves a request to establish an accessory  
13 apartment in a newly constructed residence on Tallow Hill Road in the Rural Residential Zone.  
14

15 The Board acknowledged the years of service provided to the board by Priscilla Eastman, who decided last  
16 month to resign after nearly ten years on the board.  
17

18 Alternates Brad Atwater agreed to take the membership vacancy on the board and residents Stephen Sheehan and  
19 William McGonigle have been appointed by Moderator Stephen Taylor as alternates to the  
20 Zoning Board.  
21

22 The Board spent the remainder of the meeting discussing the project to update the Rules of Procedure. Most of  
23 the grammatical and factual changes have now been made. Things like meeting location, time,  
24 places of posting notices have all been updated. This being the case, the board spent most of the  
25 evening working on Article 7 which deals with the procedures to be followed during public  
26 hearings. It was determined that the rules will be amended to include after the presentation by  
27 the applicant a completeness review by the board. Also, an opportunity for final public input  
28 will be added after board deliberations on the case, but before the board takes up motions to  
29 approve or disapprove the application. This public input session will be reserved for new  
30 information or concerns that might have risen out of the board's deliberations. It will not be an  
31 opportunity for interested persons to repeat previously stated concerns or objections.  
32

33 Board members also expressed a desire to see appeal periods made as clear and standardized as possible.  
34 Currently, rehearing appeals of the ZBA must be filed within 30 days of the date of the decision,  
35 RSA 677:2. Section 5.5 of the Zoning Ordinance requires that Appeals of Administrative  
36 decision be filed within 15 days yet section 7.1 seems to allow for 30 days. Halleran will confer  
37 with counsel on this matter. It was suggested that 7.1 simply be amended to 15 days to be  
38 consistent with section 5.5 of the Zoning Ordinance.  
39

40 The meeting adjourned at 9:00pm  
41

Submitted,

42 Stephen Halleran

Richard Colburn, Chair

44

45

1  
2  
3