

**HUDSON ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
MEETING MINUTES
May 27, 2010**

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Seabury called this meeting of the Hudson Zoning Board of Adjustment to order at 7:00pm on Thursday, May 27, 2010, in the Community Development Meeting Room in the Town Hall basement. Chairman Seabury then requested Acting Clerk Martin to call the roll. Those persons present, along with various applicants, representatives, and interested citizens, were as follows:

Members

Present: Normand Martin, Jim Pacocha, Mike Pitre, Donna Shuman, and J. Bradford Seabury

Members

Absent: None (All present)

Alternates

Present: None (All excused)

Alternates

Absent: Kevin Houle and Marilyn McGrath (Excused)

Staff

Present: William Oleksak, Zoning Administrator

Liaison

Present: Ben Nadeau (Excused)

Recorder: Trish Gedziun

HUDSON ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT – Meeting Minutes May 27, 2010

II. SEATING OF ALTERNATES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

For the benefit of all attendees, Chairman Seabury noted that copies of the agenda for the meeting, as well as an outline of the rules and regulations governing hearings before the Zoning Board of Adjustment, were available at the door of the meeting room. He noted the outline included the procedures that should be followed by anyone who wished to request a rehearing in the event the Board's final decision was not felt to be acceptable. Chairman Seabury pointed out that the Board allowed rehearings only if collectively convinced by a written request that the Board might have made an illogical or illegal decision or if there were positive indications of new evidence that for some reason was not available at the hearing.

Chairman Seabury announced that Mr. Martin would assume the role of Clerk for this meeting as Mr. Houle was excused.

III. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

The following edits were made to the minutes of the April 22, 2010, meeting:

1. Page 1 – “Donna Schuman” was changed to “Donna Shuman” - Shuman
2. Page 4, 8th paragraph – “for the applicant to appear before the Board of Selectmen and return the related fees that were paid to the applicant” was changed to “for the applicant to appear before the Board of Selectmen and for the Town to return the related fees that were paid to the applicant.” - Seabury
3. Page 4, 8th paragraph, 2nd sentence – the word “requirement” was added to “there was a potential requirement that a revised site plan” – Seabury
4. Page 12, last paragraph – “to allow time for the abutters to examine the plans” was added to the sentence. - Seabury

Mr. Martin made a motion to approve the minutes from the April 22, 2010, minutes as amended by the Board.

HUDSON ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT – Meeting Minutes

May 27, 2010

Ms. Shuman seconded the motion.

Chairman Seabury called for a verbal vote and he then stated that all of the Board members were in favor of approving the minutes from the April 22, 2010, meeting as amended by the Board.

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS FOR SCHEDULED APPLICATIONS

1. **Case 204-011 (5/27/10): Tammy Williamson, 14 Pelham Road, Hudson, NH, requests a Variance to allow the existing dwelling to become a two-family dwelling without the proper amount of acreage; 43,560 square feet required, 9,748.9 square feet exists. [Map 204, Lot 011, Zoned R-2, HZO Article VII, Section 334-27, Table of Minimum Dimensional Requirements.]**

Acting Clerk Martin read aloud the posted notice, as recorded above.

Chairman Seabury asked Mr. Oleksak to explain why the matter was before the Board. Mr. Oleksak replied that the applicant did not have enough acreage for the existing dwelling to become a two-family dwelling and was present to request permission to do so.

Chairman Seabury asked who was present that wished to speak in favor with regard to the application.

Ms. Tammy Williamson, the applicant, addressed the Board and read aloud a portion of her application for a Variance as summarized as follows:

1. *Granting of the requested variance will not be contrary to the public interest because there are other duplexes in the surrounding neighborhood.*
2. *The proposed use will observe the spirit of the ordinance because I will not be changing the outside appearance as it is true to form right now.*
3. *Substantial justice would be done to the property-owner by granting the variance because there will be no alteration to the outside of the home as to what is standing there now.*

HUDSON ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT – Meeting Minutes

May 27, 2010

4. *The proposed use will not diminish the values of surrounding properties because there are other duplexes four houses away from mine.*
5. *Special conditions exist such that literal enforcement of the ordinance results in unnecessary hardship because I have owned my house and lived in Hudson for 30 years. The original house was built in 1930/1940 and the setback restrictions were not in existence at that point. The structure, is as is, I will not be altering it. My hardship is that I am a single parent and my intent is to rent so I can afford to keep the house.*

Chairman Seabury asked if there were anyone else present who wished to speak in favor with regard to the application. No one else came forward.

Chairman Seabury asked if there were anyone present who wished to speak in opposition or neutrally with regard to the application.

Mr. Chris Layman, 15 Pelham Road, an abutter, addressed the Board and stated that he was opposed to the request because the applicant already had an illegal apartment on the property for over five years and the police had been called numerous times to the property because of the tenants in that illegal apartment.

Chairman Seabury asked if there were anyone else present who wished to speak in favor, opposition or neutrally with regard to the application. No one else came forward.

Chairman Seabury asked if there were any members of the Board who had questions or comments.

Mr. Pitre asked when the addition was completed. Ms. Williamson replied that the addition was completed in approximately 2006/2007.

Mr. Pitre asked how many electrical boxes were on the property. Ms. Williamson replied that there were two electrical boxes on the property but that only one was functional.

Mr. Pitre asked what types of rooms were in the addition. Ms. Williamson replied that there were two full bedrooms with one full bathroom on the upper level. Ms. Williamson further replied that the lower level consisted of a dining room, a sitting room, a living room, and that the kitchen “flowed” from the original structure into the addition.

HUDSON ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT – Meeting Minutes

May 27, 2010

Mr. Pitre asked what separated the original structure and the addition. Ms. Williamson replied that there was a glass French door separating the two but that there would be a solid wall installed if her request were approved.

Mr. Pitre asked if the property was serviced by town water and sewer. Ms. Williamson replied that it was.

Second Round of Testimony

Chairman Seabury asked the applicant to address the opposing abutters concerns.

Ms. Williamson stated that she had had issues (that did not concern the land or the use of the property) with the abutter since 2005.

Chairman Seabury asked if there were anyone else present who wished to speak in favor, in opposition or neutrally with regard to the application. No one else came forward.

Chairman Seabury declared the matter before the Board.

Mr. Oleksak stated that, if the request were approved, the town would have to ensure that the dwelling had the appropriate number of egresses as well as a fire wall separating the original dwelling from the addition.

Chairman Seabury commented that he did not see what the hardship on the land was. Chairman Seabury further commented that he felt the applicant had a financial hardship and not a hardship on the land.

Mr. Martin made a motion to deny the request for a Variance.

Mr. Seabury seconded the motion.

Mr. Martin, speaking on his motion, stated that, while he was sympathetic to the applicant's financial hardship, he did not see the hardship on the property as far as land/use was concerned. He further stated that he felt the property was already being overused.

Mr. Seabury, speaking on his second, stated that the basic purpose of the Zoning Board of Adjustment was to provide relief, if warranted, to someone hurt by the literal

HUDSON ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT – Meeting Minutes

May 27, 2010

interpretation of the ordinance. He further stated that he did not see any special conditions on the property which warranted a Variance.

Mr. Pitre commented that he felt the Zoning Board of Adjustment created the hardship by allowing the addition to be built in the first place.

VOTE: Chairman Seabury asked Acting Clerk Martin to poll the Board on the motion to deny the request for a Variance, and to record the members' votes, which were as follows:

Mr. Martin	To deny
Mr. Seabury	To deny
Mr. Pitre	Not to deny
Mr. Pacocha	Not to deny
Ms. Shuman	To deny

Chairman Seabury declared that the decision having been three votes to deny the request for a Variance, and two votes not to deny the request for a Variance, the motion had carried.

2. Case 182-122, (5/27/10): George and Paula LaRocque, 46 Central Street, Hudson, NH, requests the following:

A. A Home Occupation Special Exception to allow a law office to provide legal services to the public within the existing dwelling. [Map 182, Lot 122, Zoned TR, HZO Article VI, Section 334-24, Home Occupations.]

B. A Variance to allow an additional employee. [Map 182, Lot 122, Zoned TR, HZO Article VI, Section 334-24, Home Occupations.]

Acting Clerk Martin read aloud the posted notice, as recorded above.

Chairman Seabury asked Mr. Oleksak to explain why the matter was before the Board. Mr. Oleksak replied that the applicant had expressed interest in operating his law office out of his home and he was told that a Home Occupation Special Exception would have to be obtained from the Zoning Board of Adjustment. Mr. Oleksak further replied that the applicant had also expressed interest in hiring an additional employee to work from his proposed home office on a part-time basis.

HUDSON ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT – Meeting Minutes

May 27, 2010

A. Discussion with regard to the request for a Home Occupation Special Exception

Chairman Seabury asked who was present to speak in favor with regard to the application.

Mr. George R. LaRocque, the applicant, addressed the Board and read aloud a portion of his application for a Home Occupation Special Exception as summarized as follows:

- 1. Please explain, in detail, the nature of your home business. George R. LaRocque, Jr. is an attorney and sole practitioner. My office hours are weekdays, generally from 8:00am – 5:00pm. I provide legal services and meet with clients or others involved with my cases. Appointments are well spaced and not excessive. I anticipate relatively low vehicle impact.*
- 2. In the home occupation secondary to the principal use of the home as the business owners' residence? My wife and I use the property as our primary residence. We expect to routinely have family members, relatives and friends coming and going. The home occupation is secondary to our residential use and most of the home is devoted to residential use.*
- 3. Will the home occupation business be carried on within the residence and/or within a structure accessory to the residence? Except for client arrival and departure, I expect that all business will be conducted within the residence. I have no plans to use any accessory structures and foresee no need for it.*
- 4. Other than the sign(s) permitted under Article XII, will there be exterior display or other exterior indications of the home occupation? Except for any allowed signs, I expect that in all other respects, the residence will reveal no indications of a home occupation. Exterior maintenance and appearance of the home will be as normally done for residential upkeep.*
- 5. Will there be exterior storage and will it be screened from neighboring views by a solid fence or by evergreens of adequate height and bulk at the time of planting to effectively screen the area? I have no need for any exterior storage. I have ample space in that portion of the main floor that would be committed to business use.*

HUDSON ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT – Meeting Minutes

May 27, 2010

6. *Will there be noise, vibrations, dust, smoke, electrical disturbances, odors, heat or glare produced? I see no reason for any of these to be produced by my business operation within the residence. My business, by nature, does not involve or create such potential issues.*
7. *Will the traffic generated by the home occupation activity be substantially greater in volume that would normally be expected in the neighborhood? I expect traffic generated by my business will be nominal and perhaps limited to an average of 1-5 cars per day.*
8. *Where will customer/client parking for the home occupation be located? My existing driveway accommodates about four vehicles, and I do not expect that there would be more than two customer vehicles parked in my driveway at any given time.*
9. *Who will be conducting the home occupation? George R. LaRocque, Jr., co-owner of the property is a sole practitioner and will conduct the business.*
10. *Will there be a vehicle for the home occupation? I will have no vehicles for the business. My wife and I each own a vehicle for our personal use.*

Chairman Seabury asked if there were anyone else present who wished to speak in favor with regard to the application. No one else came forward.

Chairman Seabury asked if there were anyone present who wished to speak in opposition or neutrally with regard to the application. No one came forward.

Chairman Seabury declared the matter before the Board.

Mr. Pitre asked the applicant what the intended hours of operation of the proposed business would be. Mr. LaRocque replied that the hours of operation would be Monday through Friday between 8:00am and 5:00pm.

Mr. Pitre asked the applicant where the client parking would be located. Mr. LaRocque replied that the intended client parking would be in his driveway.

HUDSON ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT – Meeting Minutes

May 27, 2010

Mr. Pitre made a motion to approve the request for a Home Occupation Special Exception for a conditional-use law office within the existing dwelling or secondary building in accordance with the plan shown to and described to the Board by the applicant at this meeting, subject to the following stipulations:

1. That a non-intrusive inspection shall be performed by the Zoning Administrator or the Zoning Administrator's delegate approximately six months following the posting of the decision, with the Zoning Administrator to provide a report back to this Board with respect to any findings, that this initial and any future subsequent examinations shall be performed by the Town at its' convenience on or after the dates specified, with no impact on the applicant's continuation of business, until such time as this Board receives and responds to any reports (with the understanding that this Board may withdraw this Home Occupation Special Exception or terminate it at that time in the event that any inspection shows a lack of compliance and/or suggests that the operation of this business had produced or was producing damage or potential damage to the environment or to the property values of the surrounding neighborhood.)
2. That a similar inspection shall be performed six months later (i.e., one year following granting of this approval) by the Zoning Administrator or the Zoning Administrator's delegate, and then annually thereafter, until such time as some future Zoning Board of Adjustment declares that these inspections are no longer necessary for this site.
3. That this Conditional-Use Special Exception shall terminate upon sale of the premises to any other party, or in the event that the current applicant becomes a resident of any other dwelling, in or out of Hudson, or following a period of twelve months of non-operation of this business, with the business not to be continued by any other person except by the granting of a new Conditional-Use Special Exception by the Hudson Zoning Board of Adjustment specifically to that person following processing of a new application submitted by that person, including the weighing of the balance of all factors made known to the Board during the hearing(s) pertaining to that process.
4. The hours of business, as specified by the applicant, shall be from 8:00am to 5:00pm, Monday through Friday.

HUDSON ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT – Meeting Minutes

May 27, 2010

In addition, the applicant expressed understanding that the sign permitted for this business, if requested, would be no greater than three square feet, located at least 15 feet behind the front lot-line, with only the basic information and the street address (no additional banner work).

Mr. Pacocha seconded the motion.

Mr. Pitre, speaking on his motion, stated that he felt the applicant had met all of the criteria for a Home Occupation Special Exception and approving the request was within the spirit of the ordinance.

Mr. Pacocha, speaking on his second, stated that he also felt that the applicant had satisfactorily met all of the criteria for a Home Occupation Special Exception.

VOTE: Chairman Seabury asked Acting Clerk Martin to poll the Board on the motion to approve the request for a Home Occupation Special Exception, with the noted stipulations, and to record the members' votes, which were as follows:

Mr. Pitre	To approve
Mr. Pacocha	To approve
Ms. Shuman	To approve
Mr. Martin	To approve
Mr. Seabury	To approve

Chairman Seabury declared that the decision having been five votes to approve the request for a Home Occupation Special Exception, with the noted stipulations, the motion had carried.

B. Discussion with regard to the request for a Variance

Chairman Seabury asked Mr. Oleksak to explain why the matter was before the Board. Mr. Oleksak replied that Mr. LaRocque, having obtained a Home Occupation Special Exception (discussion above), wished to hire an additional employee, who did not live in the residence for a staff position.

Mr. George R. LaRocque, the applicant, addressed the Board, stating that his business would be difficult to operate without a part-time support staff person. He further stated that this position would remain part-time for the foreseeable future.

HUDSON ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT – Meeting Minutes

May 27, 2010

Mr. LaRocque stated that the proposed employee's coming and going would be minimal, it would only benefit his business, and he said he did not feel that the request was contrary to the spirit of the ordinance.

Mr. LaRocque also stated that he felt if his request for an additional employee were denied that he would be denied the very same benefit that surrounding businesses had.

Chairman Seabury asked if there were anyone else present who wished to speak in favor with regard to the application. No one else came forward.

Chairman Seabury asked if there were anyone present who wished to speak in opposition or neutrally with regard to the application. No one came forward.

Chairman Seabury declared the matter before the Board.

Mr. Pitre asked the applicant what the intended hours of the proposed employee would be. Mr. LaRocque replied that he already had an employee and that the hours would be between five and twenty hours per week.

Mr. Martin commented that the Zoning Board of Adjustment had granted many Home Occupation Special Exceptions in the past (without granting permission for additional employees) and that if the applicant's request for an additional employee were granted, it would set a negative precedent.

Mr. Martin made a motion to deny the request for a Variance.

Mr. Pacocha seconded the motion.

Mr. Martin, speaking on his motion, stated that he did not feel a non-residential employee was appropriate and if the law firm was busy enough to warrant an additional employee then he felt the applicant should not have a home-based business. He also stated that he did not feel the criteria for hardship had been met.

Mr. Pacocha, speaking on his second, stated that he felt the addition of an employee would constitute a business and not a home occupation and none of the criteria was met.

VOTE: Chairman Seabury asked Acting Clerk Martin to poll the Board on the motion to deny the request for a Variance and to record the members' votes, which were as follows:

Mr. Martin

To deny

HUDSON ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT – Meeting Minutes

May 27, 2010

Mr. Pacocha	To deny
Mr. Pitre	To deny
Ms. Shuman	To deny
Mr. Seabury	To deny

Chairman Seabury declared that the decision having been five votes to deny the request for a Variance, the motion had carried.

- 3. Case 223-039 (5/27/10): John and Kathleen Greenleaf, 14 Tanglewood Way, Merrimack, NH, requests an extension of an un-activated Variance previously granted by the Zoning Board of Adjustment on May 28, 2009, to allow construction of a single-family dwelling on property located at 5 Gregory Street, Hudson, NH, without the required amount of frontage. 150 feet of frontage required, 25.70 feet of frontage proposed. [Map 223, Lot 39, Zoned R-2, HZO Article VII, Section 334-27, Table of Dimensional Requirements.]**

Acting Clerk Martin read aloud the posted notice, as recorded above.

Mr. Martin, prior to hearing any testimony, stated that the Board had originally granted the variance on June 27, 2007. Mr. Martin further stated that the above referenced date of May 28, 2009, was the date that the Zoning Board of Adjustment granted the first request for a one-year extension.

Chairman Seabury asked Mr. Oleksak to explain why the matter was before the Board. Mr. Oleksak replied that applicant was present to request an additional one-year extension the un-activated Variance.

Mr. Oleksak commented that he was concerned that the applicant's property could not be accessed without crossing the wetland buffer.

Chairman Seabury commented that he was generally not in favor of granting multiple extensions.

Chairman Seabury asked who was present to speak in favor with regard to the application.

Attorney John G. Cronin, from Cronin & Bisson, P.C., representing the applicants, Mr. John Greenleaf and Mrs. Kathleen Greenleaf, addressed the Board stating that there had

HUDSON ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT – Meeting Minutes

May 27, 2010

been some interested parties that wanted to build on the lot but were unable to do so because of the moratorium resulting from the new pavement.

Attorney Cronin stated that the applicant had continued with their efforts to market the property but were unsuccessful due to economic conditions.

Attorney Cronin, addressing a portion of the application for a Variance, stated that (a) the only reasonable use for the parcel was for a single-family use, (b) Gregory Street was not laid out or constructed the way roads would be required to be built and documented by the Planning Board today, and (c) it was also a piece of land that was remote and different in size as a by-product of the states taking of the larger part of the street to accommodate the circumferential highway.

Attorney Cronin stated that when the case was initially before the Board there was an opposing abutter (Mr. Ledoux) that had some concerns. Attorney Cronin further stated that the applicant had the land surveyed at their own expense and had made efforts to negotiate some type of accommodation but that it unfortunately did not work out.

Attorney Cronin said that the opposing abutter (Mr. Ledoux) had recently sold his property and had the “ill will” to put a covenant in the deed which prevented the new owners from resolving any of the access issues with the applicant.

Attorney Cronin stated that it was his understanding from the engineer that a driveway could be constructed without interfering with the wetland buffers.

Attorney Cronin commented that he felt the applicants request would be the last request for an extension.

Chairman Seabury asked if there were anyone else present who wished to speak in favor with regard to the application. No one else came forward.

Chairman Seabury asked if there were anyone present who wished to speak in opposition or neutrally with regard to the application.

Mr. Jared Mansur, 4 Gregory Street, an abutter, addressed the Board and stated that there was no right-of-way leading to the property. Mr. Mansur commented that he already loved the way his property looked and was opposed to the proposal. Mr. Mansur further stated that he felt that the Greenleaf’s should donate the land to be used as conservation land.

HUDSON ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT – Meeting Minutes

May 27, 2010

Chairman Seabury asked if there were anyone else present who wished to speak in opposition or neutrally with regard to the application. No one else came forward.

Attorney Cronin stated that he felt any abutter would rather not see an adjacent lot be developed. Attorney Cronin further stated that people who did not want to see lots developed had the opportunity to purchase those lots.

Chairman Seabury declared the matter before the Board.

Mr. Oleksak stated that any driveway plans would have to be approved by the Town Engineer.

Mr. Martin made a motion to approve the request for a one-year extension of the un-activated Variance.

Mr. Pacocha seconded the motion.

Mr. Martin, speaking on his motion, stated that he felt all the criteria had been met in previous testimony and there were safety mechanisms in place with regard to the actual building and the installation of the driveway.

Mr. Pacocha, speaking on his second, stated that the property had not been developed due to economic conditions and he felt all the criteria had been met.

VOTE: Chairman Seabury asked Acting Clerk Martin to poll the Board on the motion to approve the request for a one-year extension of the un-activated Variance, and to record the members' votes, which were as follows:

Mr. Martin	To approve
Mr. Pacocha	To approve
Mr. Pitre	To approve
Ms. Shuman	To approve
Mr. Seabury	To approve

Chairman Seabury declared that the decision having been five votes to approve the request for a one-year extension of the un-activated Variance, the motion had carried.

HUDSON ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT – Meeting Minutes

May 27, 2010

4. **Case 254-037 (5/27/10):** William A. Stanewicz, 1 Ponderosa Drive, Hudson, NH, requests a Variance to allow a shed to be placed to the front of the main building. [Map 254, Lot 037, Zoned R-2, HZO Article VII, Section 334-27.1(C), General Requirements.]

Acting Clerk Martin read aloud the posted notice, as recorded above.

Chairman Seabury asked Mr. Oleksak to explain why the matter was before the Board.

Mr. Oleksak explained that the zoning ordinance did allow for sheds to be placed in the front portions of properties and the applicant was present to request that the existing shed be able to remain in the front-yard.

Chairman Seabury asked who was present who wished to speak in favor with regard to the application.

Mr. William Stanewicz and Mrs. Debbie Stanewicz, the applicants, addressed the Board and read aloud a portion of the application for a Variance as summarized as follows:

1. *Granting the requested variance will not be contrary to the public interest because it does not affect any neighbors, block any views or public way.*
2. *Substantial justice would be done to the property-owner by granting the variance because we cannot financially afford to level behind the house.*
3. *The proposed use will not diminish the values of surrounding properties because the shed is of top quality and makes the property look better. The shed was also placed in an area that does not obstruct any views of the main building.*
4. *Special conditions exist such that literal enforcement of the ordinance results in unnecessary hardship because:*
 - a. *The backyard (behind the house) is not level and is completely ledge.*
 - b. *The right side (from the street) can't be blocked to access the well. It is also not level.*
 - c. *The left side (from the street) has a smaller shed with a water problem.*

**HUDSON ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT – Meeting Minutes
May 27, 2010**

- d. Need an area to easily access snow blower and generator.*
- e. Checked around the neighborhood and there are sheds along the sides and fronts of houses.*
- f. We were told that because the permit would take a few weeks we could put up the shed prior to obtaining the permit.*

Mr. Martin commented that he had driven by the applicant's property and noticed that there were approximately six other properties that had sheds which were visible from the street.

Mr. Martin further commented that he felt the applicant's shed looked very nice and there was no other reasonable place to put it.

Mr. Oleksak commented that the property had a significant water drainage problem.

Chairman Seabury asked if there were anyone else present who wished to speak in favor with regard to the application. No one else came forward.

Chairman Seabury asked if there were anyone present who wished to speak in opposition or neutrally with regard to the application. No one came forward.

Mr. Martin made a motion to approve the request for a Variance.

Mr. Pacocha seconded the motion.

Mr. Martin, speaking on his motion, stated that he felt the applicant had testified that the shed was built in the only level place in the yard, the criteria had been met and the amount of ledge created a hardship on the land.

Mr. Pacocha, speaking on his second, stated that he agreed with everything Mr. Martin had said.

VOTE: Chairman Seabury asked Acting Clerk Martin to poll the Board on the motion to approve the request for a Variance, and to record the members' votes, which were as follows:

HUDSON ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT – Meeting Minutes

May 27, 2010

Mr. Martin	To approve
Mr. Pacocha	To approve
Mr. Pitre	To approve
Ms. Shuman	To approve
Mr. Seabury	To deny

Chairman Seabury declared that the decision having been four votes to approve the request for a Variance and one vote to deny the request for a Variance, the motion had carried.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

1. **Case 177-012: Joseph Brunelle, 55 Kimball Hill Road, Hudson, NH, requests a Variance to allow the existing shed to remain to the front of the main building. [Map 177, Lot 012, Zoned G, HZO Article VII, Section 334-27.1(C), General Requirements.]**

Acting Clerk Martin read aloud the posted notice, as recorded above.

Chairman Seabury stated that Mr. Oleksak had informed the applicant that prior to the Zoning Board of Adjustment hearing the case, a survey of the property had to be completed.

Chairman Seabury then read aloud a letter from the applicant dated May 18, 2010, as summarized as follows:

I, Joseph M. Brunelle at 55 Kimball Hill Road, Hudson, NH, am requesting a continuance for the placement of my shed and plot plan.

Mr. Martin made a motion to defer the case, date specific, to the July 22, 2010, meeting.

Ms. Shuman seconded the motion.

VOTE: Chairman Seabury asked Acting Clerk Martin to poll the Board on the motion to defer the case, date specific, to the July 22, 2010, meeting and to record the members' votes, which were as follows:

Mr. Martin	To defer
------------	----------

**HUDSON ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT – Meeting Minutes
May 27, 2010**

Ms. Shuman	To defer
Mr. Pitre	To defer
Mr. Pacocha	To defer
Mr. Seabury	To defer

Chairman Seabury declared that the decision having been five votes to defer the case, date specific, to the July 22, 2010, meeting the motion had carried.

V. ADJOURNMENT

All scheduled items having been processed, Mr. Martin made a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Mr. Pacocha seconded the motion.

VOTE: All members voted in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Seabury declared the meeting to be adjourned at 10:01pm.

Date: June 7, 2010

J. Bradford Seabury, Chairman

Recorder: Trish Gedziun