



TOWN OF HUDSON

Zoning Board of Adjustment



Gary M. Daddario, Chairman

Kara Roy, Selectmen Liaison

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

MEETING MINUTES – January 27, 2022 – approved

The Hudson Zoning Board of Adjustment met on Thursday, January 27, 2022 at 7:00 PM in the Community Development Paul Buxton Meeting Room in the lower level of Hudson Town Hall, 12 School St., Hudson, NH.

I. CONSULTATION WITH TOWN COUNSEL (non-public) per RSA 91-A:2 I (b) START 6:30 PM

Cancelled.

II. CALL TO ORDER

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairman Gary Daddario called the meeting to order at 7:03 PM, invited everyone to stand for the Pledge of Allegiance, welcomed Gary Dearborn back to the Board, read the Preamble into the record (Exhibit A in the Bylaws) and assigned Normand Martin to Clerk.

Clerk Normand Martin took attendance. Members present were Gary Daddario (Regular/Chair), Gary Dearborn (Regular), Brian Etienne (Regular), Normand Martin (Alternate/Clerk), Marcus Nicolas (Regular), Jim Pacocha (Regular/Vice Chair), Dean Sakati (Alternate) and Edward Thompson (Alternate). Also present were Bruce Buttrick, Zoning Administrator, Louise Knee, Recorder (remote) and Kara Roy, Selectman Liaison. Mr. Daddario noted that all five (5) Regular Members were in attendance and would be voting.

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS OF SCHEDULED APPLICATIONS BEFORE THE BOARD: 7:00 PM

CONTINUED/DEFERRED HEARING:

1. **Case 166-031 (01-27-22) (deferred from 10-28-21):** Daniel M. Flores, PE of SFC Engineering Partnership, Inc., 183 Rockingham Rd, Unit 3 East, Windham NH 03087 requests a Variance for **8 Lindsay St., Hudson, NH** for relief from HZO Article VII, Dimensional Requirements; § 334-27.1 D, General Requirements: to allow the creation of a new lot that has insufficient required frontage on a class V or better portion off Grigas St. [Map 166, Lot 031-000, Zoned Town Residence (TR).]

Mr. Buttrick read the Case into the record and stated that he received a request from the Applicant on 1/24/2022 to continue the Case to the February 24, 2022 meeting

Not Official until reviewed, approved and signed.

Approved 2/24/2022 as edited

on account of illness. Motion made by Mr. Dearborn and seconded by Mr. Pacocha to defer/continue the hearing to the 2/24/2022 meeting as requested by the Applicant. Roll call vote was 5:0. Mr. Daddario addressed the public and explained that if any one was present for the Case it would not be heard tonight but on 2/24/2022 and apologized for any inconvenience.

NEW HEARINGS:

2. **Case 147-024 (01-27-22):** James Silverthorn, **28 Mansfield Drive, Hudson, NH** requests an Equitable Waiver of Dimensional Requirement due to a foundation setback encroachment discovered upon review of a Certified Foundation Plan dated December 28, 2021 by John W. Yule, LLS which shows the foundation encroaching 1.1 feet into the required side yard setback of 15 feet leaving 13.9 feet. [Map 147, Lot 024-000; Split Zoned Residential-Two (R-2) and Residential-One (R-1); 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 1/14/2022 noting that the setback encroachment was discovered when the certified foundation plan was submitted for the garage.

James Silverthorn introduced himself and stated that he's trying to build a 30' x 50' garage, had an engineer come to the site and set the stakes, had a separate contractor to come out and dig the hole and a third contractor come out and pour the footings and they missed something and encroached the side yard setback by a foot. Mr. Silverthorn stated that he hired professionals and did not supervise them because he works everyday and when the encroachment was noticed, both of them claimed it was not their fault.

Mr. Silverthorn stated that he is pursuing Option 1 for an Equitable Waiver and addressed the criteria. The information shared included:

(a) discovered too late

- discovered when engineers came back to locate the garage and concrete was already backfilled

(b) innocent mistake

- hired a landscaper to dig the hole and a concrete company to pour the footings
- both are claiming the mishap is not their fault
- had an engineer stake out the location and somehow they didn't get it right

(c) no nuisance

- there is a heavy wooded area surrounding the entire structure
- it is just one corner of the concrete that breaches the sideyard setback by 11.1"

(d) high correction cost

Not Official until reviewed, approved and signed.

Approved 2/24/2022 as edited

- neither party wants to take responsibility
- looking at a \$10,000 - \$15,000 cost to move

Mr. Dearborn stated that this type of innocent mistake has come before the Board. Mr. Thompson stated that given the size of this lot it seems like an innocent mistake and asked the number of bays intended for the garage. Mr. Silverthorn stated that he was trying to utilize the existing driveway otherwise he could have placed the garage on the other side and that the plans call for a 4-bay garage lined up to the driveway.

Public testimony opened at 7:17 PM. No one addressed the Board.

Mr. Sakati asked how close are the neighboring properties and Mr. Silverthorn responded that there is a great distance, that most of the houses in the neighborhood are much closer to the cul de sac and his house and garage much further back on his odd shaped lot and surrounded by trees and not visible from the road or his neighbors. An aerial view was posted and it was evident how sheltered the house and garage are by the trees. Mr. Martin stated that he has experience with this particular engineer, both from his past experience on the Board and personally and agrees that it is an innocent mistake by the Property Owner. Mr. Silverthorn stated that he utilized this engineer to save money because he did the development and would not need to survey his entire lot.

Public testimony opened again at 7:19 PM. No one addressed the Board.

Mr. Etienne stated that he agreed with and also recalls the Case Mr. Dearborn mentioned, that this encroachment poses no impact to the neighbors or the road and is in a very rural setting nature.

Motion made by Mr. Etienne and seconded by Mr. Dearborn to approve/grant the Equitable Waiver. Mr. Etienne stated that an innocent mistake occurred. Mr. Dearborn agreed and noted that there were no abutters present and no opposition received. Roll call vote was 5:0. Equitable Waiver granted. Mr. Daddario noted the 30-day appeal period. Mr. Dearborn questioned whether the appeal period applied to Equitable Waivers. Because it is a decision of the Board, the decision is appealable. Mr. Buttrick noted that this decision is linked to a Building Permit and the Applicant could proceed with construction during the Appeal period but it would be at his own risk.

3. **Case 215-009 (01-27-22):** Earl Blatchford, P.E., Haynor/Swanson, Inc., 3 Congress St., Nashua, NH requests a Variance at **2 Wentworth Dr., Hudson, NH** to permit construction and use of a 12' diameter, 48' high storage silo constructed on a 13.5' x 13.5' concrete pad which encroaches 3 feet into the side yard setback leaving 12 feet where 15 feet is required. [Map 215, Lot 009-000; Zoned Industrial (I); 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 1/14/2022. Atty. Thomas J. Leonard from Welts, White & Fontaine, PC in Nashua, NH introduced himself as representing the Integra Biosciences Corporation, the Property Owner, and Earl Blatchford, PE, of Hayner/Swanson, Inc. in Nashua, NH, who was technically the Applicant acting as the Agent for Integra.

Atty. Leonard identified the location of the site in the Industrial Zone presently used for manufacturing and warehouse and noted that Integra makes medical equipment. The manufacturing facility is a single story building of approximately 42,305 SF (square feet) and the existing building was constructed in two (2) Phases. The southerly section was the original building and the northerly section was constructed as an addition. At the time of the addition, a jog was designed to accommodate the existing silo and ensure compliance with the side yard setback. The plant is running at full capacity and is facing supply restrictions that interfere with the manufacturing process. A second silo has become needed and is essential to the operation of the plant and must be placed adjacent to the first silo. The second silo is 48' high, same height as existing silo, and 12' in diameter and placed on a 13.5' x 13.5' concrete pad. Atty. Leonard stated that the silo cannot be constructed anywhere else on the site in an efficient manner.

Atty. Leonard stated the encroachment into the side yard setback is less than 3' for the silo and noted that the abutting property at 6 Wentworth Drive has a 20' sewer easement along their shared property line, then their parking area then their building. So there is a great distance between the two (2) buildings, as is shown on the aerial submitted with the application.

Atty. Leonard went through the criteria necessary for the granting of a Variance and the information shared included:

(1) *not contrary to public interest*

- The variance is for a small side yard encroachment on this fully developed lot
- The variance will not be contrary to the public interest
- Site is a manufacturing facility actively and successfully used in a successful medical supply business
- Under the current economic climate, supplies in the manufacturing process have been interrupted with the uncertain timing of deliveries is causing a serious problem to the plan and presenting a need for a second silo
- Client's product is in extreme high demand due to the pandemic
- The pad and silo are a small part of the facility but are essential
- There will be no violation of the essential character of the neighborhood considering it is in a fully developed Industrial Zone

(2) *will observe the spirit of the Ordinance*

- The proposed use is consistent with the Spirit of the Ordinance
- Side yard setbacks are to enable access around the building for safety and emergency access, provide access to sunlight and ventilation and avoid an overcrowded appearance

Not Official until reviewed, approved and signed.

Approved 2/24/2022 as edited

- The building on the abutting property is a significant distance away with the sewer easement and parking lot
 - Mere conflict in the terms of the Ordinance is insufficient
 - The area is a developed area of similar uses and the request is minor
 - The variance is essential for an efficient manufacturing facility already existing
 - Granting the Variance will promote the Spirit of the Ordinance – to promote the health, safety and welfare of the community
- (3) *substantial justice done*
- The existing manufacturing facility was constructed over time and when the addition was constructed, the Applicant provided an indent for the silo which was sufficient and there were no concerns about supply uncertainties
 - Times have changed – supplies are uncertain and restricted and continue to interfere with the production process
 - The small variance is essential to the efficiency and viability of the existing 42,305 SF manufacturing facility
 - There will be no adverse affect or effect on the health, safety or welfare of the community and will not impact private rights of any other property owners
 - Denying the variance will have a substantial adverse impact on the Property Owner as supplies are uncertain and it will interfere with efficient use of the existing manufacturing facility – and no benefit to the Town
- (4) *not diminish surrounding property values*
- An efficient up-to-date manufacturing facility that is able to compete effectively and to operate efficiently in times where supplies are uncertain is a benefit and will not diminish surrounding property values
 - An active vibrant industrial building is an important component of the neighborhood and will help maintain values of surrounding properties
- (5) *hardship*
- The 42,305 SF manufacturing building is located on the eastern side of the lot, as is the silo and when the addition was constructed, a jog was created for the silo
 - There is no opportunity to create another jog and it is a business requirement that the silos be placed close to one another for the manufacturing process
 - The special conditions are the existing building, the need for an additional silo and the requirement that the new silo be constructed adjacent to the existing silo
 - There is a good distance between this building and the abutting building at 6 Wentworth Drive with its parking lot and sewer easement that the encroachment of 3' would not be noticed
 - Checked with the Fire Department and they expressed no concerns

Mr. Daddario asked for clarification regarding the 12' diameter silo on the 13.5' square concrete pad and specifically whether 1.5' of the 3' encroachment is just the pad and the silo only goes into the setback for 1.5'. Earl Blatchford, PE, stated that the

concrete pad is flush to the ground and its encroachment into the side yard setback does not require a variance and the variance being sought is the silo's encroachment. Mr. Blatchford stated that the content of the silo are polypropylene pellets, the main feed stock used in their extrusion process.

Mr. Dearborn asked and received confirmation from Atty. Leonard that both silos will be 48' high and contain solid product, not liquid. Mr. Dearborn asked if there is any spillage or dust when the silo is loaded and asked how the material is delivered to the silo and how many deliveries does it take to fill a silo and would that traffic be doubled with the second silo. Mr. Blatchford stated that he believes it is by truck as there are tire marks along the side of the building but he has not ever seen the process and does not work at Integra Biosciences. Atty. Leonard stated that the traffic associated with the silo is diminish to the other traffic to the site.

Mr. Dearborn asked how many days of production are contained in a silo and whether the two (2) silos would be connected in any fashion. Atty. Leonard stated that he did not know if the silos would be connected or just be using the same delivery system within the building and did not know the consumption rate of the material. Mr. Thompson stated that in his experience he would expect the selection of silo intake to be controlled inside the building and added that he noticed a ladder on the outside of the existing silo and assumes that the same would be on the proposed second silo and asked if the Fire Department reviewed the proposal. Mr. Blatchford responded that the Fire Department did review their specs and MSDA Sheets and expressed no concerns.

Ms. Roy asked if the surfaced is paved along side the building that a truck would use to reach the silo. Atty. Leonard stated that it is not paved and that the current silo has been in place approximately a year and a half. Ms. Roy asked if the trucks traverse in the sewer easement and Atty. Leonard stated that the trucks travel parallel to the building and not over/on the sewer easement as the easement is on the abutting property at 6 Wentworth Drive.

Mr. Etienne expressed concern with access to the silo considering the size of a delivery truck and the probability that it would traverse on the side yard setback and even possibly over the sewer easement for who knows how many trips a week. Mr. Etienne stated that he has heard that there is a need that the silos be close to one another and asked why the second silo could not be located elsewhere on the site or even placed rooftop that would not require a variance and be connected inside the building with the addition of pipes to bring the product to where it needs to be inside the building. Atty. Leonard stated that it would be a substantial expense to place the second silo in any other location and would involve a substantial change in the process. With regard to the sewer easement, Atty. Leonard stated that it is on the abutting property and has been mentioned because it affords an added open area, an additional setback and delivery trucks would not travel over it because that would be trespassing.

Discussion continued. An aerial view was posted. There is 13.5' from the building to the 15' setback line. That distance could provide enough space for a truck to

Not Official until reviewed, approved and signed.

Approved 2/24/2022 as edited

approach the second silo but, without knowing the delivery method, if the delivery truck has to move to the original silo it might need to scrape the second silo or encroach to reach the current silo because the second silo encroaches the setback 3' and there is not enough space to turn delivery truck around so it would have to back up. Delivery method and number/frequency questioned as well as alternatives to a 12' silo and lack of alternate locations and lack of structural analysis for the silo and reduced access around the building.

Public testimony opened at 8:02 PM. No one was present to address the Board.

Mr. Daddario asked Atty. Leonard if he would request a referral in order to provide answers to the Board's questions regarding delivery – type, method and frequency – access and encroachment. Atty. Leonard stated that there is no need to delay, silo traffic is minimal to the overall site traffic, there will be no change in current delivery method and is on record confirming that there will be no encroachment on the sewer easement or trespass onto adjacent property.

Ms. Roy expressed concern with wear and tear on the unpaved delivery path to the silo. Mr. Martin asked if this change would also require Planning Board review and if so then it can be addressed there. Mr. Buttrick stated that he believes it will need a Modification to Site Plan Review and noted that the property line is also the sewer easement line. Mr. Dearborn stated that it is unfortunate that a representative from the company was not present to answer the questions and Atty. Leonard agreed and apologized for not having anticipated the Board's questions and noted that someone from Integra Biosciences would be present when they appear before the Planning Board.

Mr. Dearborn made the motion to approve the Variance with the stipulation that there shall be no encroachment onto the sewer easement. Mr. Pacocha seconded the motion. Mr. Dearborn stated that despite the fact that there is no company representative present to answer the Board's questions, the variance criteria have been satisfied. Mr. Pacocha concurred. Roll call vote was 4:1, Mr. Etienne opposed.

Mr. Daddario stated that it is an existing facility, that there is an existing use and that the variance criteria are satisfied given consideration that the abutting property building is separated by the sewage easement and their parking and Atty. Leonard's assurances that there would be no trespassing. Mr. Dearborn added that considering the doubling of delivery alongside the building, he hoped the Planning Board would look at that delivery access way and request something more permanent than grass.

Mr. Etienne stated that he is disappointed with the presentation received, that there was no company representative present to answer Board questions of the delivery system/method, that there was no analysis presented regarding other potential silo locations, no price or cost associated with any option, just a "substantial cost" with no evidence presented, that there appears to be a management problem with their delivery systems that is more than the 'pandemic' and questions how any assurance

can be taken seriously when delivery is by third party drivers who have no idea where the property line is let alone a sewage easement.

Mr. Daddario stated that the Variance has been granted with one stipulation by a vote of 4:1, that the next step for the Applicant would be to go before the Planning Board and noted the 30-day appeal period.

V. REQUEST FOR REHEARING:

Case 168-020 (12-09-21): Paul & Sandra O’Sullivan, **8 Washington Drive, Hudson, NH** requested a Variance to build a 9 ft. x 20 ft. covered porch on the front of an existing non-conforming structure (house), which encroaches the front yard setback an additional 9.3 feet, leaving 14.8 feet where 30 feet is required. [Map 168, Lot 020-000; Zoned Residential-Two (R-2); HZO Article VII, Dimensional Requirements; §334-27, Table of Minimum Dimensional Requirements and HZO Article VIII, Nonconforming Uses, Structures and Lots; §334-31.A, Alteration and expansion of nonconforming structures.]

Mr. Buttrick read the request into the record, noted that it was filed within thirty (30) days and clarified that this is a request to grant a rehearing, not the rehearing.

Mr. Martin asked if there would be a change in the Voting Members. Mr. Daddario stated that would not be necessary in the decision process whether to grant a Rehearing and added that he would allow the Applicant to speak and noted to the Applicant that there are two requirements that need to be satisfied in order to grant a Rehearing – whether there is new evidence presented or an error was made. Mr. Dearborn recused himself as he was not present for the Variance hearing and stated, that in his opinion, the Voting Members for the Rehearing should have the same Members as with the Variance. Minutes were checked. Mr. Martin appointed to vote.

Mr. O’Sullivan introduced himself and stated that his request for a front porch was denied for the following wrong reasons: due to concerns about safety, a “slippery slope”, possible future addition of sidewalks and/or widening of Washington Drive and that the hardship requirement was not satisfied and that additional information is now available that was not at the hearing.

Mr. O’Sullivan stated that the proposed porch is a single story structure and is intended to provide safer access to the front of his home and front door. Constructing a porch elsewhere would not accommodate that need. The porch would be “open air” and although it would encroach an additional nine feet (9’) into the setback, it would not be imposing from the street and referred to Exhibit 1 that shows the front of his house and the concept drawing of the intended porch. Mr. O’Sullivan stated that the porch would improve safety to everyone accessing his home by providing a covered walkway to his front door. With regard to the concerns regarding traffic and threat posed by the encroachment, Mr. O’Sullivan noted the retaining wall by the driveway and the existing tree in the front yard would protect the porch and added that there is no through traffic in the neighborhood. Mr. O’Sullivan stated that his house is the only one in the neighborhood that encroaches the front setback and

Not Official until reviewed, approved and signed.

Approved 2/24/2022 as edited

that encroachment was approved by Variance to allow a 25' setback instead of 30' and that makes it unique with regard to the hardship criteria and invalidates the "slippery slope" the Board based its denial upon.

Mr. O'Sullivan stated that he contacted both the Town Engineer and Director of Public Works and both told him there are no plans to widen or place sidewalks on Washington Drive yet both were reasons given for the denial. Exhibit 3 lists several Cases recently approved by the Board for front setback encroachments.

Mr. Martin referenced RSA 677:2 noting that if there is a good reason for the granting of a rehearing, that reason should be part of the motion granting a Rehearing and if you check the Minutes of the meeting, the potential future widening of the street was not given as a reason for the denial but as a comment from one Member that it could happen, and per the RSA, only new evidence is to be considered or recognition that an error was made. Mr. Etienne agreed and referenced point #4 on the Applicant's request and asked if that could/would qualify as new evidence. Mr. Martin noted that each Case before the Board is individually evaluated/reviewed and added that safety is a legitimate concern, for the Applicant and for people driving on the road. Mr. Daddario concurred regarding the individuality of each Case and noted that the O'Sullivan house encroachment itself is greater than one Case on the Applicant's Exhibit #3 which granted a front porch. Ms. Roy asked what is considered "new evidence" because it is important to be consistent. Mr. Daddario agreed and stated that in his opinion there was no error made in the law, but maybe there is new evidence.

Public testimony opened at 8:26 PM. No one was present.

Mr. Buttrick read the segment from the 12/09/2021 Minutes of the Board's deliberation and motion regarding Case #168-020 into the record, pages 6-7

Mr. Daddario referenced the Worksheet and asked Mr. Buttrick whether the correlation between the two (2) factors is an "and" or an "or" - whether both factors had to be met or just one factor met. Mr. Buttrick read RSA 677:2 and 677:3 into the record. The lack of specificity was noted. ZBA Bylaws were referenced - 143.11 Reconsideration by the Board and 143.12 Motions for Rehearing - and both pertained to the timeline.

Mr. Etienne stated that regardless of the ambiguity in the worksheet, he would be willing to vote for a Rehearing with the understanding that the Board could reach the same conclusion - to deny the Variance. Mr. Martin noted that there is no property hardship with this request. Mr. Daddario agreed that a Rehearing is a fair approach and re-emphasized that a Rehearing could yield the same result. Mr. Buttrick agreed to confer with Town Counsel for clarity on the criteria. Both Mr. Pacocha and Ms. Roy agreed that the clarification should be incorporated into the Bylaws.

Motion made by Mr. Etienne and seconded by Mr. Pacocha to grant a Rehearing based on new evidence. Roll call vote was 4:1, Mr. Martin opposed. Rehearing

granted. Mr. Buttrick advised Mr. O'Sullivan that fees and an Abutters' List would be needed by the second Tuesday of February, 2/7/2022.

Board took a five-minute break at 9:01 PM. Mr. Daddario called the meeting back to order at 9:06 PM and noted all Members returned to the table.

VI. REVIEW OF MINUTES:

12/09/21 edited Minutes: Motion made by Mr. Etienne and seconded by Mr. Nicolas to approve the 12/9/2021 Minutes as edited. Vote was 4:0:1, Mr. Dearborn abstained.

VII. OTHER:

1. 2022 Election of ZBA Officers

Chairman: Motion made Mr. Etienne and seconded by Mr. Pacocha to nominate Gary Daddario to continue as Chairman. Mr. Etienne made the motion to close nominations, seconded by Mr. Dearborn and unanimously voted to close nominations. Vote was unanimous. **Gary Daddario** to continue as Chairman for 2022.

Vice Chair: Motion made Mr. Etienne and seconded by Mr. Dearborn to nominate Jim Pacocha to continue as Vice Chair. Mr. Etienne made the motion to close nominations, seconded by Mr. Dearborn and unanimously voted to close nominations. Vote was unanimous. **Jim Pacocha** to continue as Vice Chairman for 2022.

Clerk: Mr. Etienne stated it is challenging and cumbersome for a Regular Voting Member to also Clerk during a meeting and, even though a change in the Bylaws is underway to specify that the Clerk be an Alternate, he would like not to be re-nominated and added that he is running for Board of Selectmen and if elected would have to resign from ZBA. Mr. Daddario stated that changes to the Clerk position are being drafted for the Board's Bylaws and Mr. Buttrick confirmed and noted that until adopted, the current Bylaws require the Clerk position to be elected every year.

Motion made Mr. Dearborn and seconded by Mr. Nicolas to nominate Alternate Normand Martin as Clerk. Mr. Dearborn made the motion to close nominations, seconded by Mr. Nicolas and unanimously voted to close nominations. Vote was unanimous. **Normand Martin** to be ZBA Clerk for 2022.

2. Discussion of proposed ZBA Bylaws amendments: alternate status, recusals and Clerk position/duties

Mr. Buttrick stated that the list of revised sections include: 143.3 added gender clarification; 143.4(3) Clerk appointment and added Appendix "B" Clerk Duties; 143.7(3)b on Alternate status for continued/deferred Cases; 143.7(4) by adding Recusals; 143.7(4)g striking "then" and adding "currently"; and 143.7(4) added subsection "h" Direct/Indirect Abutter as disqualification;

Board reviewed the draft changes made in track-change and engaged in discussions. Recap of proposed changes and discussion points included:

- 143.3 – consensus reached not to include the change but to make consistent the choice of wording to “Member” and “General Public or Individual”
- 143.5(2) – Vice Chairman should have capital “V”
- 143.5(3) – discussion arose on whether the Clerk reads the Cases into the record. Mr. Buttrick expressed his preference to do the reading as it leads into his Staff Report findings of facts. Board agreed.
- 143.5B(3) Clerk position – in-depth discussion, Appendix B reviewed
- 143.6(2) – typo – should be “5”, not (%)
- 143.7(4) – discussion arose on Direct Abutter versus Indirect Abutter
- 143.9 – Decision Process – must keep 30 days for appeal per RSA
- 143.11 & 143.12 – Reconsideration & Rehearing – discussed in depth – RSAs consulted, consensus to eliminate 143.11 Reconsideration and add subsection to 143.12 striving for clarity and possibly including criteria
- Exhibit/*Attachment A* versus *Appendix B* versus *Appendix C* – should be same name and Appendix C not attached to draft document for review

Additional review items included the two-year expiration of Cases if not begun and deferment.

Motion made by Mr. Pacocha, seconded by Mr. Etienne and unanimously voted to adjourn the meeting. The 1/27/2022 ZBA meeting adjourned at 10:22 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Gary M. Daddario, ZBA Chairman