



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 – July 28, 2022 - approved

The Hudson Zoning Board of Adjustment met on Thursday, July 28, 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. CALL TO ORDER**
- II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Chairman Gary Daddario called the meeting to order at 7:01 PM, invited everyone to stand for the Pledge of Allegiance and read the Preamble into the record describing the procedure for the meeting.

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. For the record, all the Regular Members voted

III. PUBLIC HEARING OF SCHEDULED APPLICATIONS BEFORE THE BOARD:

1. **Case 183-006 (07-28-22):** A **Rehearing** of the Variance granted on 04/28/2022 is being held by The Town of Hudson Zoning Board of Adjustment for **102 Central St., Hudson, NH**. Jesse M. Couillard, applicant/owner, submitted a revised Proposed Plot Plan dated March 28, 2022 with (revision 1 dated 6/1/22 and revision 2 dated 6/6/22) to replace and expand an existing non-conforming 12 ft. x 10 ft. deck as a breezeway and build an attached 2-stall, 24 ft. x 20 ft. 2-story garage addition and reconfigured driveway. The deck encroaches the front yard setback 12.5 feet leaving 17.5 feet and the garage encroaches the front yard setback 17.8 feet leaving 12.2 feet where 30 feet is required for both. [Map 183, Lot 006-000, Zoned Town Residence (TR); 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 Case into the record, noted that the Variance was granted on 4/28/2022, that a Rehearing was requested on 5/26/2022 and referred to the Supplemental Meeting Folder for the Revised Plan and information regarding cemetery

setbacks, the applicable RSA 289:3 and email from Town Counsel that it is a State Law that the ZBA cannot waive.

Jesse M. Couillard, Property Owner, sat at the Applicant's table with his wife, stated that he had met with the Town Engineer when he applied for the Building Permit who expressed concern with the short driveway and together they reconfigured the plan by rotating the proposed garage building ninety degrees, utilize the second driveway as the primary driveway to the lot and grass the existing approved driveway. Reference was made to the plan with a revised date of 6/23/2022.

Mr. Couillard next addressed the criteria for the grating of a Variance and the information shared included:

(1) *not contrary to public interest*

- The proposed addition is not contrary to public interest
- House was built in 1960 and has two front setbacks
- Proposed two-car garage with breezeway would bring positive value to all homes in the neighborhood and should not impact the character of the neighborhood nor impose any safety hazards or risks to the roadways, general public or any health or pose any safety hazards

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

- Zoning Ordinance Section 334-2 sets the general purpose which include promoting the most use of the land, conserving property values, maintaining aesthetics and residential use compatible with the neighborhood
- Variance for this corner lot with a garage addition would allow an efficient use of this portion of the lot as well as add square footage for additional tax revenue that will increase property value and property values of other homes in the neighborhood

(3) *substantial justice done*

- House is already a nonconforming structure on a corner lot with two (2) front setbacks in an existing neighborhood leaving minimal building area
- Substantial justice done because there would be no adverse impact on the general public
- Been a resident for 20 years at 102 Central Street and realize this is our 'forever' home
- As we continue to age, not having a garage will pose future hardship during our harsh New England winters

(4) *not diminish surrounding property values*

- The proposed addition of a garage to an existing nonconforming building on a corner lot with two (2) front setbacks in an existing neighborhood will not diminish values of surrounding properties
- The lot can accommodate the addition of a garage without adverse impact on the neighborhood
- Property values are generally enhanced with new construction

(5) *hardship*

- House was built in 1960, well before current setback requirements making the house now a nonconforming structure

- Corner lot with two (2) front 30' setbacks not met – house is 23' from Central Street and 17.5' from Vinton Street
- The lot also abuts Sunnyside Cemetery which imposes another restraint with its 25' no construction setback
- Setbacks minimize the buildable area for this lot and cause the hardship
- A garage is a normal component of a house

Public Testimony opened at 7:21 PM. No one addressed the Board.

Mr. Etienne stated that the Board has already extensively discussed and made the motion to grant the Variance based on the revised plan dated 6/23/2022. Mr. Nicolas seconded the motion for the same reasons. Mr. Dearborn voiced opposition to the motion noting that it would make the lot more non-conforming, that there are other discrepancies on the property noting the sheds in the setback and that one of the sheds, as well as the pool deck, impact the State imposed setback which the Board would not be able to even consider an Equitable Waiver of Dimensional Requirement. Mr. Buttrick noted that the upper shed is five feet (5') from the property line. Mr. Etienne pointed out that is a State issue and not a Town issue and called a point of order to call the vote.

Roll call vote was 4:1 with Mr. Dearborn opposed. Mr. Etienne stated that each of the criteria have been satisfied and noted that there is no change in Use. Mr. Nicolas agreed with Mr. Etienne noting that it is not contrary and that a garage is a normal part of a home and will increase property values. Mr. Dearborn stated that the request is contrary to public interest and conflicts with the thirty foot (30') setback and does not observe the spirit of the Ordinance with the required setbacks and the hardship criteria is not satisfied as there is no hardship from the land and there is enough room on the property to place the garage out of the setback, even if it may not be "convenient" to the property owners and not require a Variance and noted that a two-story two-car garage is proposed. Mr. Pacocha stated that the request is not contrary to public interest, does not conflict with the spirit of the Ordinance and substantial justice is done with no harm to the public and that hardship is met with all the setback requirements imposed on the lot since the house was built. Mr. Daddario stated the amended/proposed plan is consistent with the neighborhood and addresses the concern with a short driveway, that there is no threat to the public and no harm to the public with the garage addition, noted that a garage adds value to a home without diminishing values of other properties in the neighborhood and that hardship is met with the two (2) front yard setbacks and the cemetery setback and to move the garage totally out of the setback would be awkward for house access and not, in his opinion, necessary.

Mr. Couillard thanked the Board and the Town Engineer. Mr. Daddario noted that 30-day Appeal Period.

2. **Case 198-029-002 (07-28-22):** Don Dumont, Manager of DMT Realty LLC, 195R Central Street, Hudson, NH requests 2 (two) Variances for **4 C Street, Hudson, NH** to reconfigure the existing lot with a proposed lot line adjustment [Map 198, Lot 029-002; Zoned Business (B)] as follows:

- a) A Use Variance for the construction of a single family home (after lot line adjustment) in the Business Zone where it is not a permitted use. [HZO Article V, Permitted Uses; §334-21, Table of Permitted Principal Uses.] and;
- b) A (size) Variance resulting in a reconfigured proposed 10,168 sqft lot area where 30,000 sqft is required and proposed 124.47 feet frontage where 150 feet is required in the Business District. [HZO Article VII, Dimensional Requirements; §334-27, Table of Minimum Dimensional Requirements.]

Mr. Buttrick read both Variances into the record, noted that the Board should make a motion for each Variance separately and referenced his Staff report initialed 7/19/2022 noting that the lot is an existing non-conforming lot of record in the B (Business) Zone for both lot size and frontage that the Applicant would like to reconfigure as if it was in the TR (Town Residence) Zone to construct a single family home.

Dillon Dumont introduced himself and Don Dumont, stated that the lot abuts the TR Zone, that a Lot Line Adjustment (LLA) is required from the Planning Board (PB) and addressed the criteria for the granting of a Variance. The information shared included:

- (1) *not contrary to public interest*
 - The proposed lot and proposed Use are not contrary to public interest
 - The proposed Use will maintain the character of the neighborhood
 - The proposed single family residence will not impose any safety hazards or risks to the roadways, general public or any health
- (2) *will observe the spirit of the Ordinance*
 - The entire neighborhood is made up of single family homes and some duplexes
 - The size of the lot is consistent with those in the neighborhood
 - Upholding the Zoning Ordinance would alter the character of the neighborhood
- (3) *substantial justice done*
 - The neighborhood abuts the TR Zone and is made up of small single family lots
 - Proposed lot size is compatible with the neighborhood
 - It would harm the abutters if a business Use was placed on this parcel
 - Substantial justice done because there would be no adverse impact on the general public to add another single family to the neighborhood
- (4) *not diminish surrounding property values*
 - New construction of a single family home and keeping the character of the neighborhood intact will increase property values
 - The lot conforms with the neighborhood
- (5) *hardship*
 - This is a pre-existing non-conforming lot in the B Zone.
 - Lot is surrounded by single family homes all with similar lot sizes

- The neighborhood abuts the TR Zone and has always maintained that Use and lot size
- By conforming to ZO Sections 334-21 & 334-27, the lot would alter the character of the neighborhood and could severely diminish surrounding property values
- Literal enforcement of those ZO Sections would result in unnecessary hardship for the abutters

Mr. Dearborn asked if there would be any encroachments to any setbacks and Mr. Dumont responded that all would be within the setbacks and added that the LLA would create two (2) triangular lots with two (2) triangular building envelopes. Mr. Thompson noted that the neighborhood contains small lots and the two (2) new lots would be similar in size. Ms. Roy asked the size of the proposed lot and Mr. Dumont responded that it is approximately 1,900 SF (Square Feet). Mr. Thompson asked the size of the buildable envelope and Mr. Dumont stated that it is approximately half. Mr. Pacocha asked about a garage and Mr. Dumont responded that an attached garage is part of the plan to avoid any encroachments in the future. Mr. Dearborn asked Mr. Dumont if the two (2) houses being built on Highland Street were his and Mr. Dumont confirmed and added that the house proposed for this lot would be similar and noted that C street is a dead-end road.

Public Hearing opened at 7:56 PM. Mr. J. Bord (sp?) asked why the lot cannot become part of the residential zone seeing as how all the abutters are residences and if there was any guarantee that there would be no business operated from the house. Mr. Daddario stated that the ZBA does not have the power to rezone an area, that zones are determined by the Planning Board and voted in by the Town. Being no one else to address the Board, Public Testimony closed at 7:58 PM.

Mr. Dearborn made the motion to grant the waiver for a residence as it is a good use of the lot that matches the neighborhood and particularly there are no setback encroachments. Mr. Etienne asked to have Google Maps accessed and noted that even though there are several homes that became non-conforming when the Zone was changed, granting another residence is contrary to the central business concept proposed for this area of Town. Mr. Pacocha seconded the motion to grant the Variance noting that it is not contrary to public interest, that it conforms to the current neighborhood, that justice would be done to the Property Owner, that there is no harm to the public and that the re-zoning has caused the hardship. Mr. Dearborn concurred adding that it is not contrary and observes the spirit of the TR Zone, that justice is done, that it is a good use of a small lot and will not diminish surrounding property values. Mr. Etienne stated that he votes against the granting of this Variance as it is contrary to public interest and does not observe the spirit of the Zoning Ordinance to develop the business district in this area and noted that the transition has to begin and noted that there is no hardship based on the land and that it could be developed with a business use. Mr. Nicolas concurred with Mr. Etienne and voted against the motion. Mr. Daddario voted to grant the motion as it is consistent with the neighborhood and does not threaten the public, that it does not alter the character of the existing neighborhood, that justice would be done to the Property Owner, that new construction generally increases property values, that it is a pre-existing non-

conforming lot in a residential neighborhood, that all setbacks would be maintained, that it is a reasonable use of the lot and that a business would be out of place.

Roll call vote was 3:2. Mr. Etienne and Mr. Nicolas opposed. Use Variance granted by majority vote. The 30-day Appeal period was noted.

With regard to the size Variance, Mr. Dumont referred to his prior testimony. Public Testimony opened at 8:15 PM. No one addressed the Board.

Mr. Etienne made the motion to grant the Variance for size and frontage as it is not contrary to public interest and doesn't alter the neighborhood and observes the spirit of the Ordinance and substantial justice would be done to the Property Owner, that new construction increases property values and now that a Use Variance has been granted, it is a good Use of the small lot. Mr. Dearborn seconded the motion, concurred with Mr. Etienne and added that this lot is a small lot but no smaller than what is traditionally found in a TR Zone. Mr. Nicolas concurred and added that the size of the lot is its hardship. Both Mr. Pacocha and Mr. Daddario voted to grant for the same reasons previously stated. Roll call vote was 5:0. Variance for reduced size and frontage granted. The 30-day Appeal period was noted.

3. **Case 198-029-001 (07-28-22):** Don Dumont, Manager of Posey Investments LLC, 195R Central Street, Hudson, NH requests 2 (two) Variances for **6 A Street, Hudson, NH** to reconfigure the existing lot with a proposed lot line adjustment [Map 198, Lot 029-001; Zoned Business (B)] as follows:
 - a) A Use Variance for the construction of a single family home (after lot line adjustment) in the Business Zone where it is not a permitted use. [HZO Article V, Permitted Uses; §334-21, Table of Permitted Principal Uses.] and;
 - b) A Variance resulting in a reconfigured proposed 10,525 sqft lot area where 30,000 sqft is required and proposed 130 feet frontage where 150 feet is required in the Business District. [HZO Article VII, Dimensional Requirements; §334-27, Table of Minimum Dimensional Requirements]

Mr. Buttrick read both Variances into the record, referenced his Staff Report initialed 7/19/22, noted that the lot is an existing non-conforming lot of record in the B (Business) Zone for both lot size and frontage and abuts the TR Zone. The Applicant seeks two (2) Variances to construct a single-family house as if it was in the TR (Town Residence) Zone.

Dillon Dumont addressed the Board, stated that this is the other lot from the LLA, that it abuts the TR Zone, that a single family residence is desired that would conform to the Zoning Ordinance, that the two (2) Variances needed are because it is in the B Zone and noted that the purpose of the Zoning Ordinance is to maintain the character of the neighborhood, which is all residential. Mr. Dumont stated that his presentation is identical to the other lot and asked the Board if he should repeat it. The consensus was that there is no need as it is fresh in everyone's mind.

Public testimony opened at 8:29 PM. No one addressed the Board.

Mr. Pacocha made the motion to grant the Use Variance. Mr. Etienne seconded the motion. On a roll call vote each Member referenced their reasoning as being the same as the previous Variance. Vote was 5:0 to grant the Use Variance. The 30-day Appeal period was noted.

Mr. Sakati stated that the Zoning Board (ZBA) should recommend to the Planning Board (PB) to tidy up these discrepancies. Mr. Etienne stated that the PB is now reviewing, agreed that the current neighborhood does not match the Zone and added that the PB also considers the long term desire to expand the B Zone. Ms. Roy added that was prescribed in the Town's Master Plan. Mr. Buttrick stated that these lots are existing non-conforming lots because the Zone was changed to Business which requires a greater lot size and frontage requirements and that he has a list of existing residential neighborhoods caught in the arbitrary distance set from Lowell Road.

Mr. Dumont stated that his presentation is the same as that of the previous size variation.

Public testimony opened at 8:39 PM. No one addressed the Board.

Mr. Nicolas made the motion to grant the Variance for reduced lot size and frontage. Mr. Etienne seconded the motion. On a roll call vote each Member referenced their reasoning as being the same as the previous Variance. Vote was 5:0 to grant the Use Variance. The 30-day Appeal period was noted.

4. **Case 175-143-000 (07-28-22):** Esther J. Maturo, **57 Adelaide St., Hudson, NH** requests 2 (two) Variances for a proposed installation of a 21 ft. diameter above ground residential pool on an existing non-conforming lot with an existing nonconforming use (single family) [Map 175, Lot 143-000; Zoned Business (B)] as follows:
 - a) A Use Variance to install the pool in the Business district where it is not a permitted use. [HZO Article V, Permitted Uses; §334-21, Table of Permitted Principal Uses and HZO Article VIII, Nonconforming Uses, Structures and Lots; §334-29 Extension or enlargement of nonconforming uses] and;
 - b) A Variance to locate the pool 7 feet in the side yard setback leaving 8 feet where 15 feet is required. [HZO Article VII, Dimensional Requirements; §334-27, Table of Minimum Dimensional Requirements]

Mr. Buttrick read both requests into the record and referenced his Staff Report initialed 7/20/2022. Mr. Martin stated that he knows the Applicants and, seeing as he is not voting, has decided not to recuse himself and to continue to Clerk.

Esther Maturo introduced herself, identified the location of her property as directly behind the Dairy Queen, that she bought the property in 2018 that has had an in-ground pool for over thirty (30) years but the pool was structurally damaged and there

was an issue with asbestos and in October 2021 it had a leak and the walls caved in. They want to replace the pool with an above-ground pool and locate it where their diving board used to be because they cannot place the above ground pool over the filled-in in-ground pool because the land requires a few more years to 'settle' to be able to support an above-ground pool and the back of her property slopes down to Dairy Queen. It was also noted that the property fronts on two (2) streets.

Ms. Maturo addressed the criteria for the granting of a variance and the information shared included:

(1) *not contrary to public interest*

- Request is not contrary to public interest
- Have had a pool for over thirty (30) years on property
- Proposal does not change current residential use of property nor does it change or affect any in neighborhood
- The only change is the type of pool – above ground instead of in-ground – due to inability to fix in-ground existing pool
- The impact into the setback leaves the same impact as others in this residential neighborhood
- The encroachment into the setback doesn't encroach on any usable yard space for neighbors and also keeps it out of view and does not affect curb appeal
- The proposed will not impose any safety hazards or risks to the roadways, general public or any health

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

- The spirit is to provide proper boundaries between businesses and their customers
- Most of the neighborhood is residential in a Business Zone
- The proposed setback still provides sufficient space between properties to not negatively impact use by either owner.

(3) *substantial justice done*

- The setbacks in the Residential Zone of neighbors is five feet (5'), but this property is in the Business Zone due to the arbitrary distance from Ferry Street when re-zoned
- Neighborhood abuts the TR Zone and is made up of small single family lots
- Proposed lot size is compatible with the neighborhood
- Variance will allow continued use of their land and pool that has been part of the property for thirty plus (30+) years and since they moved in
- Substantial justice done with no adverse impact on the general public and hidden from view to the neighborhood

(4) *not diminish surrounding property values*

- pool behind fence and not seen by neighbors or from the street and adds value to their property which will have a positive impact on surrounding properties
- The lot conforms with the neighborhood

(5) *hardship*

- This is a pre-existing non-conforming lot in the B Zone.
- Lot is surrounded by single family homes all with similar lot sizes
- The in-ground pool was in the center of the backyard for over 30 years

- The in-ground pool was a wood walled asbestos paneled pool that does not meet current code laws and no pool contractor would repair it and it began to collapse
- On October 2021 a contractor was hired to perform the asbestos mitigation and fill in the pool to prevent additional damage to the property
- The filled-in in-ground pool is still settling and not stable enough to hold the weight of an above-ground pool
- The back portion of property slopes down to Dairy Queen and nothing can be built or placed there
- There is no other location on the property for an above-ground pool and even though the proposed location encroaches the business setback requirement it is still far enough away so as not to interfere with the neighbor next door to enjoy their residential use of their property, and it will not be visible to anyone passing by on the road

Mr. Dearborn asked when the fill in for the in-ground pool would be ready to support and Ms. Maturo responded that it still needs a couple more years to stabilize the land. Mr. Thompson stated that it does take years to settle and asked about the fence between the trailer and the property. Mr. Maturo stated that Dairy Queen built the fence and added that the wife of Dairy Queen used to live in their house. Mr. Daddario and Mr. Nicolas both commented that Dairy Queen is very busy with plenty of traffic twelve (12) hours a day. Mr. Pacocha questioned substantial justice as it refers to the five (5) foot setback for the lots across the street.

Public testimony opened at 9:04 PM. No one was present to address the Board.

Mr. Pacocha made the motion to grant the Use Variance. Mr. Nicolas seconded the motion. Mr. Pacocha stated that it is another case of being Zoned wrong, the house was already built and land in residential use when the Zone changed, it is not contrary to public interest as there is no change to affect public interest, it is a reasonable use for a residence and will not decrease property values and that hardship is met by the shape and configuration of the lot as it limits where a pool could be located considering the slope in the back and being unable to place over in-ground pool until the land finished settling. Mr. Nicolas stated that the proposed use does not conflict with the character of the neighborhood, does not threaten public health and safety, that the spirit of the Ordinance will be observed and does not alter the character of the neighborhood, that the benefit to the owner outweighs any harm to the general public, that values of surrounding properties will not be diminished and that hardship exists by the setbacks of the Business Zone which are larger than the TR Zone that limit house and any attachments, that the land surface of the in-ground pool is not yet settled enough to hold the above ground pool and the land slopes in the back down to Dairy Queen. Roll call vote was taken.

Mr. Dearborn voted to grant as it is not contrary to public interest, the pool would not be visible to abutters as it would be fenced in, would not alter the character of the neighborhood, that justice would be done by the granting of the Variance, that the land of the filled-in in-ground pool cannot yet be used for years which is a hardship and the land slopes down in the rear of the site.

Mr. Daddario voted to grant the Variance as it is consistent with the character of the neighborhood and does not harm the public, allows full use of current residential property, should have no impact to surrounding property values, and that hardship is met by it being a corner lot in a residential neighborhood with an unstable asbestos remediation for center of backyard and slope at rear of property.

Mr. Etienne stated that public interest is not in conflict, that the residence was a permitted use as late as 2008 as it was in the TR Zone, that the spirit and character of the Ordinance met, that the house is already residential and the pool was previously there, that surrounding property values are not likely to be affected and that this is a very small lot with restrictions.

Roll call vote was 5:0. Variance to grant the pool in the Business Zone passed. The 30-day appeal period was noted.

With regard to the Variance to the side-yard setback, Mr. Maturo referred to her previous testimony. Public testimony opened at 9:17 PM. No one addressed the Board.

Mr. Etienne made the motion to grant the Variance locating the pool seven feet (7') into the side-yard setback with the condition that once the land that filled in the in-ground pool has settled, that the above-ground pool be moved out of the setback. Discussion arose on the condition, why it was needed, who would enforce, timeline etc. and Mr. Etienne withdrew the condition from his motion. Mr. Nicolas seconded the motion to grant the Variance with no conditions.

Mr. Etienne spoke to his motion noting that public interest is maintained as the character is maintained, that the spirit of the Ordinance is maintained and does not threaten public health, that substantial justice is done as the property owners have reasonable enjoyment without harming others, that this would not impact surrounding property values, and that the lot is too small and the characteristics in the abutting TR Zone holds a five foot (5') side yard setback.

Mr. Marcus spoke to his second stating that public interest is not harmed or threatened, that the neighborhood will not be altered nor will it threaten safety and welfare of the neighborhood, that it would not diminish surrounding property values, and that the hardship is the property due to its size, shape and setbacks.

Roll call vote was 5:0.

Mr. Dearborn stated that the request does not alter the neighborhood or threaten public health & safety, that substantial justice is done, that the pool would not be visible to the public and should not impact surrounding property values add due to the small size of the lot, the inability to place the above-ground pool over the filled-in in-ground pool and the sloping land to the rear, there is very limited space to place the above-ground pool. Mr. Pacocha concurred and added that a pool is a customary accessory use to a residence. Mr. Daddario stated that it is consistent with the character of the neighborhood, that there is no public harm, that justice for the property owner outweighs any harm to the surrounding properties which would not have their property values diminished by this request and the hardship is satisfied

with it being a corner lot with unstable asbestos remediation in the center of the backyard and the slope of the land in the rest of the backyard.

The 30-day Appeal period was noted.

IV. REQUEST FOR REHEARING: None

No requests were presented for Board consideration.

V. PUBLIC HEARING: 2nd Reading of proposed ZBA Bylaws amendments

It was noted that there were no people in the audience.

Mr. Buttrick stated that and oversight was noted in §143-8.C(1) Public Hearing, specifically to change “Clerk” to “Zoning Administrator” to align with the change made in §143-5.C and align with Appendix B. It was also noted that there were three (3) question marks (???) left in §143-8.C(12) that should be removed.

Mr. Nicolas made the motion to adopt/approve the ByLaws as presented and edited. Mr. Etienne seconded the motion. Roll call vote was 5:0. ByLaws amended.

VI. REVIEW OF MINUTES: 06/23/22 edited Draft Minutes

Board reviewed the Edited Minutes. Motion made by Mr. Dearborn, seconded by Mr. Nicolas and unanimously voted (5:0) to accept the Minutes as edited.

VII. OTHER: ZBA training/workshop

Mr. Buttrick stated that the Municipal Association offers free training, referenced Town Counsel’s confidential email noting that the Decision Sheets should refer to the motion when completed and asked the Board to advise what training they would be interested in receiving and noted that there is a one-hour webinar scheduled 8/10/2022.

Mr. Buttrick stated that HB 1661 has been signed into Law and noted that it impacts the Planning Board more than the ZBA.

Mr. Nicolas made the motion to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Etienne and unanimously voted to adjourn the meeting. The 7/28/2022 ZBA meeting adjourned at 9:35 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Gary M. Daddario, Chair