1		ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
2		268B MAMMOTH ROAD
3		LONDONDERRY, NH 03053
4		
5	DATE:	DECEMBER 17, 2014
6		
7	CASE NO.:	8/20/2014-2 (CONTINUED)
8		
9	APPLICANT:	ROBERT CASEY
10		26 PINE STREET
11		LONDONDERRY, NH 03053
12		
13	LOCATION:	26 PINE STREET; 3-70, AR-I

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: JIM SMITH, CHAIRMAN

NEIL DUNN, VOTING MEMBER JACKIE BENARD, VOTING MEMBER ANNETTE STOLLER, VOTING ALTERNATE BILL BERNADINO, NON-VOTING ALTERNATE

DAVID PAQUETTE, CLERK

REQUEST:

RELIEF OF ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE

PROVISIONS OF RSA 676:5.

PRESENTATION: Case No. 8/20/2014-2 was read into the record with one previous case listed.

 NEIL DUNN: If I may before we go further. I know that you're probably about to recuse yourself but what we're here for on this case is a relief of administrative decision, and I guess maybe if we heard from Richard. My understanding if we look at the powers of the Zoning Board Adjustment for relief of administrative decision. We're really looking to see if Richard misinterpreted something. We're not here to decide, we're not here to enforce an ordinance or a portion of the ordinance. So I'm a little bit confused Richard maybe before we get going. It seems to me what is really needed here is a variance. Your decision, and again I'm' not quite sure how it all transpired. It was in regards to something, so can you explain how this all started? How did you made a decision with the decisions referenced.

RICHARD CANUEL: Okay, without going in to too much detail because it should be the applicant that has the opportunity to bring this case to the Board, but under the process of an appeal for an administrative decision. It's much different than how the Board would precede for a variance or a special exception. Basically, the Board acts as the official for whom the appeal is taken, and the Board must make a literal interpretation of the ordinance just as I would base on the facts that are presented to the Board. Like I said without going into too much detail on how I got to this process, we should probably allow the applicant to plea his case first.

NEIL DUNN: I guess to me, I'm afraid what do us have one, two, three, four, five...

[Overlapping comments]

NEIL DUNN: No we won't. Because, alright, I guess we'll let them go forward. It just seems crazy to me that we are really here to decide if your decision is right, and it sounds to me what we really need is a variance, so it seems like it's two (2) different topics, and maybe it's dragging out longer than it has to as far as this individual case.

RICHARD CANUEL: That's correct, and like I say, the Board acting as the official Zoning officer, Code Enforcement officer, if you will. You're viewing the facts of the case and making a decision on whether to agree with the officials' decision, disagree with that decision, or make a decision that the Board feels ought to have been made. If the Board feels that a variance will be appropriate to allow the use then the Board can so direct the applicant to go through that process.

JIM SMITH: Okay, I have a particular problem with this particular case given my experiences working as building inspector and zoning officer in the past, so I don't' feel that I'm in a position that I can hear this case with a completely open mind, so what I am is recusing myself from this particular case. The problem with that it drops us down to four (4) members because...

BILL BERNADINO: I have to recuse myself also.

JIM SMITH: Because he's the neighbor.

BILL BERNADINO: I'm an abutter.

JIM SMITH: So rather than get up and walk away...Neil is going to be Acting Chairman at this point, and why don't you let them do whatever it is they have got to do.

NEIL DUNN: Alright, would the applicant care however to speak the applicant?

BRUCE MARSHALL: So we would like to continue 'til we have a full panel.

 NEIL DUNN: I would like to if we may get some more background information because I really, it seems to me that this is a zoning, without knowing what's transpired, and we don't have a lot of information except for basically we need to decide if his decision was right or wrong, and that's totally different from what appears to me to be a true zoning issue, so I mean, we could do this forever if you want. To me, I'd like to get it resolved and get you in the right spot, but I guess it is your choice; we only have four (4) people.

BRUCE MARSHALL: We'd like to get it resolved also, my client doesn't appreciate having to pay for me to come down her, but we'd like our full panel that we feel we have the right to because you are talking about my clients livelihood and a lot of expense to him and we agree with Chairman Smith that he should recuse himself because he has stated opinion publicly in this prior positions with the Town, so we think that's proper, but we don't think it's out of the ordinary for us to want a full panel on something that's so important like money.

 NEIL DUNN: No, no and I don't mean to imply that that's what I'm saying is my thought looking at it and what we are really looking at is an appeal of an administrative decision. I don't think that necessarily clears from what might be required down the road, so you're fine, if that's your choice. I was trying to help you get past one step to maybe what might turn out to be the next step. I don't know.

BRUCE MARSHALL: Well and maybe it'll help you understand a little better, we feel...

JIM SMTIH: Do you want to get on a mic?

BRUCE MARSHALL: Oh, I'm sorry. I thought you could hear me, I apologize.

NEIL DUNN: I'm sorry, you should state your name.

BRUCE MARSHALL: Attorney Bruce Marshall from the law firm in Concord at the D'amante Couser Pellerin & Associations, P.A. I understand how you are looking at it, I've served on Planning Boards for a long time in my home town, and have represented them, so I've done quite a bit of this, but we have an administrative decision that we feel is wrong number one, but number two, you're conversation about maybe we just need to go to a variance, or this or that to address the issue, we don't feel based on the record that we have to. We feel the Town has already made prior decisions, and really the Town to stop from doing anything, but we want full panel to decide that to present out case is what we are asking for.

NEIL DUNN: Okay, again, I'm bringing it up because all we have is a relief of administrative decision, and based on statutes and ordinances all we can say is whether he's right or wrong or if he misinterpreted something, so to me, I guess I was trying to get some clarity, and I appreciate that as anybody based on the fact that we only have four (4) people, we continue to case to January 21, 2015.

NEIL DUNN: Everyone here agree on the Board? Do we need a motion to continue the case to January 21, 2015, or do we just...?

RICHARD CANUEL: Just a consensus from you would be adequate.

NEIL DUNN: Any other thoughts up here?

ANNETTE STOLLER: Well it's okay by me, but are we going to keep running into the same thing here?

NEIL DUNN: Not if James's here. The other Jim.

JACKIE BERNARD: I wish I had more information so that we could get passed this because I feel that it's everyone's time is so precious, you know we all volunteer up here that they're a lot of people come each and every time away from their families, it's the holiday's that you know, if you would take the suggestion maybe you know it would help. I just was hoping that more information would be here because we have so little.

BRUCE MARSHALL: I understand where you're coming from in my client brings in this whole side of I think here is from the client, and the worst case he's paying for me to be here, and it's no cheap, and like I said I

volunteer up in Bow, and all the Boards. I understand, but its important issue for my client we are talking about his livelihood, his home and that he's had there since 1986. Especially, on the very first meeting, I read those draft minutes where Mr. Smith didn't recuse himself, conducted a conversation, and allowed the neighbor that is now a member of the Zoning Board to really bad mouth me and say I lied to the Board about having a conflict and that I was going to have another one be in Florida, and that's in the minutes, so we have some issues, and we want to make sure, we have a full Board that's going to hear us because that's what's transpired so far. So we'd ask that we get put on the schedule and get a full panel. We'd appreciate that. Thank you.

NEIL DUNN: Case 8/20/2014-2 continued to January 21, 2014.

RESULT: Case 8/20/2014-2 continued to January 21, 2014.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

DAVID PAQUETTE, CLERK

TYPED AND TRANSCRIBED BY NICOLE DOOLAN, PLANNING & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT SECRETARY.

<u>APPROVED JANUARY 21, 2015</u> WITH A MOTION MADE BY NEIL DUNN, SECONDED BY ANNETTE STOLLER AND APPROVED, 5-0-0.