



TOWN OF HUDSON

Zoning Board of Adjustment



Gary M. Daddario, Chairman

Marilyn E. McGrath, Selectmen Liaison

12 School Street • Hudson, New Hampshire 03051 • Tel: 603-886-6008 • Fax: 603-594-1142

MEETING MINUTES – March 25, 2021 - approved

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Gary Daddario called the meeting to order at 7:02 PM and invited everyone to stand for the Pledge of Allegiance. Mr. Daddario welcomed everyone and read the COVID-19 meeting procedure that in conformance with the NH State of Emergency Order #12 confirmed the following: (a) providing public access to meeting by telephone and video access; (b) provided public notice on how to access the meeting; (c) mechanism to advise if there is a problem with accessing meeting and (d) should there be an issue with accessibility, the meeting will need to be adjourned and rescheduled; and (e) that voting would be by roll call vote. Mr. Daddario stated that the Board would go into recess so that the public could call in their questions or concerns during public testimony and added that if anyone cannot gain access, that the meeting would need to be adjourned. Mr. Daddario noted that specific instructions for meeting access was included in both the Applicant Notification and the Abutter Notification and were posted on the website.

Mr. Buttrick read the Preamble into the record, identified as Attachment A of the Board's Bylaws, which included the procedure and process for the meeting, and the importance of the 30-day time period for appeal.

Clerk Etienne took attendance. Members present were Gary Daddario (Regular/Chair), Brian Etienne (Regular/Clerk), Leo Fauvel (Regular) and Jim Pacocha (Regular/Vice Chair). Also present were Bruce Buttrick, Zoning Administrator, Louise Knee, Recorder (via remote access) and Kara Roy, Interim Selectman Liaison. Excused were Ethan Severance (Alternate) and Marilyn McGrath, Selectman Liaison.

Mr. Daddario stated that with one (1) Member excused and that there would be only four (4) Voting Members present and offered every Applicant the option of deferring their hearing until the April meeting with the hope that there would be five (5) Voting Members present.

II. PUBLIC HEARING OF SCHEDULED APPLICATIONS BEFORE THE BOARD:

1. **Case 198-079 (03-25-21):** Shawn Lussier, **18 Lorraine Street, Hudson, NH** requests a Variance to replace 2 existing sheds with one new 16' x 20' shed in a proposed location which encroaches 10 feet into the rear setback leaving 5 feet where 15 feet is required. [Map 198, Lot 079-000; Zoned Town Residence (TR); HZO Article

VII, Dimensional Requirements, §334-27, Table of Minimum Dimensional Requirements].

Mr. Buttrick read the Case into the record and referenced his Staff Report signed 3/16/2021. Shawn Lussier introduced himself and sat at the Applicant Table with his mask and stated that he resides at 18 Lorraine Street and currently has two (2) sheds a couple of feet from his back property line that are falling apart and rusting out and he would like to replace both with one larger shed (16'x20') to provide storage needs that his house does not provide. The new shed would be five feet (5') from the property line, encroaching ten feet (10') into the rear setback. Mr. Lussier addressed the five (5) criteria for the granting of a Variance and the information shared included:

- (1) *not contrary to public interest* – the shed will be new, safe and match in color and design of their home
- (2) *use will observe spirit of Ordinance* – shed will store lawn equipment, outdoor power equipment and storage for items that would otherwise be subject to weather or covered with unsightly tarps
- (3) *substantial justice to the property owner* – shed will provide much needed storage, allow maximum use of the property and add value to the property
- (4) *use will not diminish surrounding property values* – shed will replace two (2) existing less-appealing sheds and be behind their six foot (6') fence and no neighbors are not close to the proposed location
- (5) *hardship* – unique features of the property that existed when they bought the property include a sewer line in front yard that has a shallow line running down the left side of property and the land is quite wet; existing trees on the right side that will not allow shed on that site; underground water line going from the house to the back side of the garden and an AC compressor on the left corner of the house.

An aerial view of the site from 2020 was posted that showed the two (2) existing sheds along with a sketch for the new shed. Mr. Daddario asked and received confirmation that the existing underground water line prevents locating the shed out of the setback. Mr. Lussier stated that the current sheds are just a couple of feet from the property line and that his lot has an angle in the rear property line and the encroachment would be to the smaller section of the back property line. Mr. Etienne asked and received confirmation that Mr. Lussier would construct the shed in similar design to his home and that it would be painted the same as the house, including the white siding. Mr. Buttrick stated that a 16'x20' shed will require a Building Permit because it is greater than two hundred square feet (200SF).

Public testimony opened at 7:18 PM. No one present addressed the Board. Board took a five-minute recess for call-ins. Meeting called back to order at 7:23 PM. Mr. Buttrick reported that there were no call-ins. Public testimony closed at 7:24 PM.

Mr. Etienne made the motion to grant the Variance with no stipulations. Mr. Pacocha seconded the motion. Mr. Daddario asked to amend the motion with a stipulation that the Property Owner obtain a Building Permit to construct the shed. Agreed. Motion amended. Roll call vote was 3:1. Mr. Fauvel opposed. Variance granted with one stipulation. Mr. Buttrick noted the 30-day appeal period.

2. **Case 191-099 (03-25-21):** Karen Bastarache, **52 Belknap Rd, Hudson, NH** requests a Variance for the addition of a second story with no footprint increase to an existing non-conforming structure (house and garage). [Map 191, Lot 099-000; Zoned Residential-Two (R-2); HZO Article VIII, Nonconforming Uses, Structures and Lots, §334-31 A, Alteration and expansion of nonconforming structures].

Mr. Buttrick read the Case into the record. Karen Bastarache introduced herself as the Property Owner and her daughter, Anyssa Sevigny who would be speaking on her behalf. Both sat at the Applicant's table with masks on. Ms. Sevigny stated that she currently resides at 52 Belknap Road and is looking to add a second-story to the house with no increase in footprint to create additional room for her family.

Ms. Sevigny addressed the five (5) criteria for the granting of a Variance and the information shared included:

- (1) *not contrary to public interest* – the second floor addition is to accommodate our growing family while continuing to live in the family home built in 1970 by my great grandparents and be updated with new siding and not be contrary to public interest
- (2) *use will observe spirit of Ordinance* – intent is to preserve and enhance quality of life and add value to the property
- (3) *substantial justice to the property owner* – will provide room to grow as a family with two small boys while staying in the family built home and add value to the property
- (4) *use will not diminish surrounding property values* – the value of the home will be greatly improved with new siding and updated features which will not diminish surrounding property values
- (5) *hardship* – the addition will not encroach any further into the setback as they are just wanting to add a second floor and there will be no increase in the building's footprint.

Public testimony opened at 7:31 PM. No one present addressed the Board. Board took a five-minute recess for call-ins. Meeting called back to order at 7:36 PM. Mr. Buttrick reported that there were no call-ins. Public testimony closed at 7:37 PM.

Mr. Buttrick posted an aerial view showing approximately half the house into the front setback and the addition of a second story is considered an expansion of a non-conforming structure. Mr. Buttrick referenced his Staff Report signed 3/17/2021 and provided a history of the site noting: a Building Permit was issued on 4/27/1984 for the screen porch; Code Enforcement action taken on 9/8/2010 for pool installation without Permit that was subsequently corrected; and even though the Assessor's record shows the structure changing from a one-family to an in-law apartment (ADU) there was no documentation found and no Code Enforcement action regarding the ADU. Mr. Buttrick stated that the Property Owner has been made aware of the ADU and since submitted a letter stating that the property was turned over to her in 2016 by her late grandmother and the Assessor records shows the change to an ADU in 2012 and that she has removed the sink and other ADU elements and has been instructed to contact the Assessor's Office to have the checked and the code corrected from 108 to 101.

Mr. Pacocha questioned the fifty foot (50') setback and Mr. Buttrick stated that it was a thirty foot (30') setback when the house was constructed and since then Belknap

Road became reclassified as a Collector Road with an increase front setback to fifty feet (50') that rendered the house an existing (legal) non-conforming structure. Mr. Etienne asked and received confirmation that the second house down is also a two-story building.

Mr. Fauvel made the motion to approve the Variance with the stipulation that the removal of the ADU be verified through Assessor inspection. Mr. Pacocha seconded the motion. Mr. Fauvel stated that the proposed addition would not increase the nonconformance of the lot/existing front setback encroachment, that it fits the character of the neighborhood and will increase property value and the proposal is reasonable. Mr. Pacocha stated that the request satisfies the criteria, there is no harm to the public and no diminution of property values and that the hardship criteria is satisfied because the front setback requirement changed/increased after the house was built. Mr. Daddario read Section 334:31 A, Alteration and expansion of nonconforming structures, into the record. Roll call vote was 4:0. Variance granted with one stipulation. Mr. Buttrick noted the 30-day appeal period.

3. **Case 197-174 (03-25-21):** Richard L. Garland, **3 Spruce St., Hudson, NH** [Map 197, Lot 174-000; Zoned Town Residence (TR)] requests the following:

- a. An **Equitable Waiver of Dimensional Requirement** per RSA 674:33-a: to allow an existing 15' x 7' shed to remain in its current location which encroaches into the side and rear yard setbacks 9' and 3' respectively, where 15 feet is required as shown on the Proposed Plot Plan dated July 16, 2020. [HZO Article VII, Dimensional Requirements, §334-27, Table of Minimum Dimensional Requirements].

Mr. Buttrick read the Case into the record. Richard and Rayanne Garland introduced themselves and sat at the Applicant's table with masks. Mr. Garland stated that they purchased the property on July 12, 2012 with the shed at its current location and they recently, on March 1, 2021, while reviewing their plan for an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) with the Zoning Administrator discovered that it encroached the setbacks. They would like to leave the shed in its present location. Mr. Garland referenced that 2010 GIS Map that shows the shed in its current location, noted that it has been there for over ten (10) years and that to-date there has been no Code Enforcement taken. The cost to remedy could be thousands of dollars as they would have to either demolish and rebuild or hire a company to come with equipment to move the shed as well as prep a new stable area. The shed is used for storage of yard equipment and kids' bikes and the opening of the shed faces towards the interior of the yard. Since purchasing their home they have had neighbors over and none have filed or stated any complaints regarding the shed. Mrs. Garland stated that a Building Permit was issued in 1978. Mr. Buttrick confirmed, noted it was Permit #128-79 dated 9/26/1978, for a tool shed with a five-foot (5') setback, which may have been the setback then and added that it becomes estoppel.

Public testimony opened at 7:53 PM. No one addressed the Board. Recess taken for five minutes for public to call-in or contact through website. Meeting called back to order at 7:58 PM. Mr. Buttrick reported that there were no call-ins and that two (2) individuals are on line.

- (1) Elaine Graves unmuted herself and stated that she is in favor to leave the shed where it is, especially if it has been there for so long and there prior to the Garland's purchasing the property.
- (2) Brenda was also on line and muted. Unable to unmute. Mr. Daddario advised the caller to dial the help line at (603) 594-1155

While waiting, Mr. Buttrick stated that he received a letter in an email.

- (3) James Gardner, 2 Spruce Street, sent a letter dated 3/20/2021, stating that he was unable to attend the meeting and has no objection to leaving the shed where it stands and supports the ADU Variance.

Mr. Buttrick checked the Go-To-Meeting screen and Brenda was no longer on-line and confirmed that no calls were received on the help line. Mr. Daddario closed Public Testimony at 8:03 PM.

Mr. Pacocha made the motion to grant the Equitable Waiver. Mr. Etienne seconded the motion. Mr. Pacocha stated that the request satisfies the requirement criteria, that it has existed for more than ten (10) years and that it does not appear to cause a nuisance and there has been no Code Enforcement action. Mr. Etienne concurred and added that there would be a high correction cost to relocate the shed and the neighbors have no issue with its' current placement. Roll call vote was unanimous at 4:0. Equitable Waiver of Dimensional Requirement granted.

- b. A **Variance** to allow the construction of a 420 sq. ft. Accessory Dwelling Unit to encroach 4 feet into the front yard setback leaving 26 feet where 30 feet is required. [HZO Article VII, Dimensional Requirements, §334-27, Table of Minimum Dimensional Requirements].

Mr. Buttrick read the Case into the record and posted the Plot Plan prepared by Michael J. Grainger, PE, dated 7/16/2020 on the screen. Richard and Rayanne Garland were still seated at the Applicant's table. Mr. Garland addressed the five (5) criteria for the granting of a Variance and the information shared included:

- (1) *not contrary to public interest* – granting the Variance will allow for the continued look of a single family home and keep in character of the neighborhood – if not granted, the ADU addition would be set back and will need a large and distinct walkway in the front of their home
- (2) *use will observe spirit of Ordinance* – the spirit is observed by maintaining the appearance of a single family home in keeping with the character of the neighborhood – the plan is only four hundred twenty feet (420 SF) which is much less than the seven hundred square feet (750 SF) allowed
- (3) *substantial justice to the property owner* – will allow keeping the appearance of a single family home and allow keeping the front yard setting maintaining curb appeal versus having to create a large and distinct walkway to the back of the house
- (4) *use will not diminish surrounding property values* – will actually increase property value and keep the appeal of the current neighborhood setting
- (5) *hardship* –enforcing the Ordinance would result in unnecessary hardships as it will increase the expense of the small 420 SF ADU due to the elevation

of the back yard and shed and force the creation of a large and long walkway affecting the front yard and curb appeal and look of a single family home and impact neighbors from enjoying their back yards.

Public testimony opened at 8:11 PM. No one present addressed the Board. Board went into recess for five minutes. Meeting called back to order at 8:16 PM. Mr. Buttrick reported that there were no calls and two individuals were on line.

- (1) Elaine Graves stated that she is in favor of the application, the architectural design will enhance the appearance of the house and both the addition and the new siding proposed will increase the property values of the neighborhood
- (2) Brenda – no longer online – given telephone number to connect with the Board if the cause is technical difficulties

Mr. Buttrick addressed his Staff Report signed 3/16/2021 and Zoning Determination #20-102 dated 9/9/2020. Mr. Buttrick stated that the proposal would demolish the existing screen porch and add a two-story 30' x 14' addition to the west side of the property with the upper level providing a dining room and sitting area for the home and the ADU on the lower level. One of the requirements for an ADU is to not have a separate front door and the extension into the front setback would allow an entrance on the side from the front walkway. The house just meets the front setback line.

Mr. Daddario asked and received confirmation that if the addition was pushed back out of the front setback, there could not be a front entrance to the ADU because of the ADU requirements and a two-family home is not allowed in the TR Zone.

Discussion ensued. Mr. Etienne stated that the Ordinance is clear and asked about an ADU entrance at the back of the property. Mr. Garland stated that placing an entrance at the rear encounters elevation issues as the land rises and would require additional excavation for a walkway and once the addition is built there will be only seven feet (7') between it and the shed. A picture of the house showed the lower elevation at the driveway level and land elevated on both sides of the driveway to match the main living floor of the house. A retaining wall exists on both sides of the driveway. Mr. Garland stated that the second egress for the ADU is proposed to be a cut through the basement wall providing entry to the basement of main house, not seen by the general public. Mr. Etienne asked if it was legal to have a second egress through a basement and noted that would not be a proper fire exit to street level. Mr. Buttrick stated that he has not seen the building plans but once submitted with a Building Permit application, the plan would be reviewed by the Building Inspector and it would have to satisfy the Building Code and the Fire Code and noted that it is possible that a window could be considered a second access point.

Mr. Garland clarified his misuse of the word 'basement'. The house is a raised ranch and the front entry is into his 'basement' which is a finished off area and is at ground level and does have windows

Mr. Daddario questioned the patio in the backyard. Mr. Garland stated that it was there when they bought the property, that it measures approximately 14' x 8' and added that it is landscaping blocks.

Mr. Pacocha inquired if they intended to add more paving for parking. Mr. Garland referenced the retaining wall to the right of the driveway, noted that the bushes are no longer and that his intent is move the retaining wall and pave up to the corner of the house. Mr. Daddario inquired if the Town Engineer submitted any comment. Mr. Buttrick stated that when the Building Permit and Driveway Permit applications are submitted, they would undergo in-house review that would include the Town Engineer, the Fire Department and the Building Inspector.

Mr. Fauvel asked if there was a foundation under the patio room. Mr. Garland stated that the patio/sunroom is their dining room, that it was converted before they purchased the house and that he did check and discovered that there is a poured foundation under and would be removed when the excavation happens. Mr. Fauvel asked if consideration was given not to extend four feet into the setback and making the addition wider. Mr. Garland responded that the ADU requirements do not allow two front doors and the four foot extension is to accommodate a 3'x6' door on the side, perpendicular to the front door of the house.

Motion made by Mr. Pacocha to grant the Variance. Mr. Etienne seconded the motion. Mr. Pacocha stated that granting the Variance is not contrary to public interest, does not pose harm to the public, meets the spirit of the Ordinance and does not threaten safety or public rights and will be located in the most beneficial position and the Variance is needed for the ADU entrance because the house is at the front setback line. Mr. Etienne stated that hardship criteria is met because of the geotechnical issues the land presents that prevents positioning the ADU out of the setback. Mr. Daddario concurred and added that the patio prohibits the ADU from sliding back out of the front setback and adding a door to the side for the ADU would make it more visible that the house has a second unit and require excavating the hill and that presents another obstacle. Mr. Daddario asked that two (2) stipulations be added to the motion, specifically that the Property Owner obtain a Building Permit and a Driveway Permit approved by the Town Engineer. Both Mr. Pacocha and Mr. Etienne agreed. Roll call vote on granting the Variance with two (2) stipulations was 4:0. Mr. Buttrick reminded the Applicants of the 30-day appeal period.

4. **Case 129-094 (03-25-21)**: Roger A. Chopelas, **11 St Laurent Dr., Hudson, NH** requests a Variance to construct an 874 sq. ft. Accessory Dwelling Unit where 750 sq. ft. maximum is allowed. [Map 129, Lot 094-000; Zoned Residential-Two (R-2); HZO Article XIII A, Accessory Dwelling Units, §334-73.3 H, Provisions].

Mr. Buttrick read the Case into the record. Roger Chopelas introduced himself as the Property Owner living at 11 Laurent Drive and sat at the Applicant's table. Mr. Chopelas stated that this ADU exists and was approved in 2019 complete with a Certificate of Occupancy (CO) with (six hundred ninety four square feet 694 SF) in a small section of the basement of his home. In order to obtain the CO, Mr. Chopelas

was required to build two (2) partition walls that effectively blocked off half of the basement from the main house. Mr. Chopelas stated that the wall prevents him access to the HVAC room from inside his home, he has to leave his house and reenter from another door, and the request tonight is to ask permission to remove the partition walls.

Mr. Chopelas addressed the criteria for the granting of a Variance and the information shared included:

- (1) *not contrary to public interest* – there is no threat to public safety or rights of others – property is existing and currently in use and ADU was approved and granted a CO – property was in poor condition when purchased four (4) years ago and today adds value to the neighborhood – there is no change to the footprint or driveway or front face of the home
- (2) *use will observe spirit of Ordinance* – a two-family home is allowed in the R-2 Zone, ADU requirement restricts occupancy to two (2) people, there will be no more than two (2) people living in the ADU – the basement was finished when purchased and he basically updated the kitchen to code (Building Code) and added a bedroom - the spirit is observed
- (3) *substantial justice to the property owner* – having to construct partition wall essentially blocked off access to the storage area and HVAC room to the Property Owner and could only be accessed by going outside, in all weather, which is a substantial injustice to the Property Owner - home is in current partial use and approving the Variance will benefit the Property Owner
- (4) *use will not diminish surrounding property values* – will not diminish surrounding property values – see attached opinions from Carol Griffin, ReMax Realty, and Matt LaFleur, loan officer with Evolve Bank & Trust – lot and house were in poor condition when purchased – had Zoning issues with broken down cars in yard, overgrown trees and shrubs and an illegal and dangerous kitchen like area in the basement – neighbors pleased with the clean up and improvements made and upkeep of property
- (5) *hardship* – the partition wall to isolate the ADU and contain its square footage was required to obtain a CO which was under a time crunch because a family member had an immediate temporary need to occupy – the wall prevents Property Owner access to HVAC room and storage area from inside the house which is a hardship to the Property Owner and poses a safety concern especially when access to the HVAC room is needed – house is in a Zone that allows a two-family house – do not want a two-family – ADU rules restrict occupancy to two (2) people it is Mr. Chopelas' intention that his disabled sister come live in the ADU, rent free – approving this Variance will not change the ADU or the footprint or exterior of the house - enforcing the Ordinance continues the unnecessary hardship to the Property Owner

Public testimony opened at 8:41 PM. No one present addressed the Board. Board went into recess at 8:42 PM for public to call-in or connect on the go-to-meeting website. Meeting reconvened at 8:47 PM. Mr. Buttrick stated that there was one call on one on the website

- (1) Brenda, former neighbor who recently just moved and now residing at 140 Hampstead Road, Derry, NH, stated that she was one of his neighbors that

- clapped and appreciated all the cleanup he as done to the property, the painting of the house and supports this Variance
- (2) Jenna Chopelas, 11 St Laurent Drive, called in supporting the granting of the Variance

Mr. Buttrick referenced his Staff Report signed 3/16/2021 and noted that a – 2019 Building Permit to create a 594 SF ADU was issued in 2019. ADU's have to communicate with the main house and that was accomplished with the stairs going down from the main house. Mr. Buttrick stated that the other end of the lower level was once a garage that was finished into rooms with a door to the exterior, providing an exit from the ADU, and that violated the ADU provisions as it exceeded the allowed 750 SF and was corrected with the construction of a walled partition. Mr. Buttrick stated that the Applicant would like to remove the partition walls and that would allow the ADU access to the entire lower level and allow the Property Owner inside access to the HVAC room and storage rooms. The Property Owner stated that he wants to keep a single-family house with a connection to the entire house and does not want to create a two-family with two separated living units.

Mr. Chopelas stated that he included the 2017 appraisal of his house that showed that the basement was finished and added that he hired local professionals to do the work and honored all the required Permits and even installed communicating fire alarm system to both floors.

Mr. Daddario asked and received confirmation that the relief being sought is all internal, just to remove two partition wall that connect to hallways and nothing would be changed to the outside of the house. Mr. Chopelas noted that the living space of the ADU would not be increased with the removal of the walls.

Public testimony closed at 8:55 PM.

Mr. Fauvel stated that the house is in the R-2 Zone and asked if an addition could be added to the house in the future to convert it to a two-family home. Mr. Buttrick stated that an addition is always possible however an ADU can only be part of a single-family home, that a two-family house cannot have an ADU, and added that there are certain requirements for a two-family that include separate electrical and firewalls and no communication between each dwelling unit.

Mr. Pacocha referenced the diagram and questioned the stairway and noted that the partition wall blocks an egress (a third egress) from the ADU. The ADU floor plan was posted and Mr. Chopelas pointed out where the partition walls were added. Mr. Buttrick stated that the Final Inspection had to be denied because the ADU was not built per plan submitted with Building Permit and as constructed was greater than the allowed square footage. Mr. Buttrick referenced the floor plan that accompanied the ADU Building Permit (Exhibit C4 of his Staff Report) that showed a 595 SF studio style ADU and now the Applicant desires a separate bedroom for the ADU in addition to removing the partition walls. Mr. Buttrick noted that ADUs are allowed two bedrooms.

Discussion arose on the square footage calculation and accumulation of the square footage attributed to the ADU, the existing and proposed floorplan for the ADU, and the access points to the ADU and the internal access denial from the main level to the remainder of the lower level. Mr. Pacocha stated that it makes little sense as constructed because the ADU Occupant would have to walk around the house to access the sliding door into the kitchen or enter the house and go down the stairs when there is a French door right by where the car is parked that is not accessible.

Mr. Pacocha made the motion to approve the Variance. Mr. Fauvel seconded the motion. Mr. Pacocha stated that the criteria have been satisfied, that it makes no sense to require the entire basement to be considered part of the ADU and block off access to the HVAC room from inside the house. Mr. Buttrick clarified that the ADU is not in the basement but on the lower level because it is at grade level that has a door. Mr. Fauvel stated that the Use does not alter the character of the neighborhood, not is contrary to the Zoning Ordinance, will not diminish property values and the Use is permitted. Mr. Daddario added that the only changes apply to the interior of the building and there is a hardship creating an annex and denying the Applicant access to his storage and HVAC from inside his home and from a safety perspective it is beneficial to have a third egress for the ADU. Roll call vote was 4:0. Variance granted. Mr. Buttrick noted the 30-day appeal period. Mr. Chopelas inquired if he needed another CO. Mr. Buttrick stated that the current CO is good but an accurate floor plan needs to be submitted identifying the ADU and its square footage with the required new Building Permit to remove the partition walls.

III. REQUEST FOR REHEARING: No requests were received for Board consideration.

IV. REVIEW OF MINUTES: 02/25/21 edited Minutes:

Motion made by Mr. Etienne and seconded by Mr. Pacocha to accept the 2/25/2021 Minutes as edited. Vote was 4:0.

V. OTHER:

1. Home Occupation Special Exception Application- Mr. Buttrick recapped the history with the Retail Sales omission and presented a clarified draft. Mr. Pacocha referenced hair salons and their ability to sell hair products and asked if that would no longer be allowed with this proposed revision. Mr. Buttrick responded that it could continue because hair products are considered accessory and incidental to the service provided by the Home Occupation. Mr. Buttrick stated that revision does not require a Public Hearing and was asked to present the new HO/SE edition for Board adoption.
2. OSI – Office of Strategic Initiatives – Spring Conference – Mr. Buttrick stated that there is a free half-day web conference scheduled for Saturday 5/15/2021 and that OSI is now offering free online monthly lunch time webinars every third Thursday

Motion made by Mr. Pacocha, seconded by Mr. Etienne and unanimously voted to adjourn the meeting. The 3/25/2021 ZBA meeting adjourned at 9:34 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Gary M. Daddario, ZBA Chairman

Not Official until reviewed, approved and signed.
Approved 4/22/2021 as edited.