

The Board of Adjustment met on Tuesday, March 30, 1976 to hear the petition of Eric F. Tenney for a variance concerning Article VI, Section D of the Zoning Ordinance. The roll call was as follows:

Emery S. Doane	- Present
Benjamin Pratt	- Present
Robert B. Flanders	- Present
Ralph Proctor	- Present
Carole Webber	- Present
Eugene Bried	- Absent
Harold P. Grant	- Present
Catherine C. T. Dik, Clerk	- Present

Also present were two abutters, Ms. Bernice Robb and her nephew Lee Marshall and Miss Pauline Whitney, and reporter Kay Hickey. The meeting was called to order at 7:40 P.M.

The Clerk read the petition and recounted the procedure of notification by certified mail, return receipt requested, to the petitioner and twenty abutters; by regular mail to all members of the Board, the Selectmen, (Town Clerk and Town Counsel are abutters), Chairman of the Planning Board; and Building Inspector; by publication in the Peterborough Transcript for March 25, 1976, page 6; and by posting on the Town Bulletin Board.

The Chairman then reviewed the procedure for conducting the hearing and called upon Mr. Tenney to present his case. Mr. Tenney said that this hearing is costing the Town a lot of money because of so many abutters, so he and his brother decided on what they might do in the near future and so present it all at this time. He is asking for seven variances, and presented a plot plan which is on file:

1. Permission for the already active greenhouse. He explained that on consultation with the Selectmen, Town Counsel and Building Inspector it was believed that the Tenney Farm came under the "grandfather clause"; no one looked at the Ordinance further to see that this was case for a variance because it was an additional non-conforming use in the Residential District. He obtained a building permit in October but

forgot to apply for a variance;

2. To build a second greenhouse with a
3. Side-line variance;
4. To build a farm shed (pole barn) with a
5. Set-back variance;
6. To extend an existing open sheep shed;
7. To conduct retail sales.

These buildings will be located around the old farm buildings, and the sketch gives the relevant set-backs, and shows why they do not conform. The plans would be carried out in a reasonable time, say a year or so, but if it went to three years Mr. Tenney would come back to the Board.

Mr. Doane asked what are your priorities, and the reply was the two greenhouses. He asked whether the present barn would be repaired or torn down. Would the new pole barn and extended sheep shed take its place? Mr. Tenney replied that it is not yet decided what to do with the existing barn.

It was asked why place the greenhouses at the farm and not on Rte. 202 where there is already a sales outlet. The reply was that there are only about three acres in Antrim that do not flood. The other land is in Bennington. The best farm land is in back of the present retail outlet on Rte. 202 so he does not wish to take it out of productive use. Mr. Doane asked about the side-line variance needed for the second greenhouse and Mr. Tenney explained that he needed ten feet between the houses so that he can plow the snow away so that it will not collapse them. He explained that the pole barn needs the set-back variance because he can only go to the power lines but not under them.

Miss Whitney asked if there would be any animals in the pole barn and was told it was to be used for storing farm machinery. She was fearful it would be so tall as to spoil her view over the brook and meadow but was

assured it would be about ten feet high, like a garage. Miss Whitney asked why he could not put the pole barn on the other side of the reel factory up near Rte. 202, but Mr. Tenney said it would take a great deal of fill in order to do that because of four springs and drain culverts from Rte. 202. Miss Whitney also asked about the possibility of the State relocating Rte. 202 in that area and moving the power lines, and it was remarked that the latest report from the State was that it would be a long time before Rte. 202 was relocated.

Mr. Tenney went on to say that if the two new sheds are built the chances are the old barn would be torn down, but that is only tentative. He said that the farm has always conducted a certain amount of retail sales from that barn--hay, meat, etc. They wish now to sell flowers and seedlings.

Ms. Robb had no questions, but Mr. Marshall asked why Mr. Tenney had to ask permission anyway because the farm has been there a long, long time. The answer was that the criterion for the Residential District was the water precinct in which the farm lies, but it probably was a mistake to include the farm because it is in the flood plain and is not suitable for dwellings.

The hearing was closed at 8:15 P.M.

The Board then met in executive session. The Chairman mentioned that in the month of April we should have a meeting to elect new officers and it was agreed to meet on Tuesday, April 13, 1976 at 7:30 P.M. in the Town Hall.

It was mentioned that Mr. Pratt, Mr. Flanders and Mr. Doane have viewed the farm site. Mr. Flanders feels it is a shame that the farm was ever put in the Residential District. If it were in the Rural District all this could be done without asking permission except set-back variances. He thinks we should grant whatever the petitioner wishes, and so

MOVED: That the petitioner be allowed to construct two greenhouses, farm shed (pole barn), extend existing sheep shed, and to ~~conduct~~ retail sales, and that the set-backs be allowed as indicated on the plan submitted.

SECONDED: By Mr. Pratt

VOTED: In favor: Emery S. Doane
Robert B. Flanders
Benjamin Pratt
Ralph Proctor
Carole Webber

Opposed: None

The meeting adjourned at 8:40 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Catherine C. T. Dik

Catherine C. T. Dik, Clerk