1		ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT	
2		268B MAMMOTH ROAD	
3		LONDONDERRY, NH 03053	
4			
5	DATE:	APRIL 18, 2012	
6			
7	CASE NO.:	4/18/2012-1	
8			
9	APPLICANT:	FREDERICK AND JILL GREEN	
10		1 SADDLEBACK ROAD	
11		LONDONDERRY, NH 03053	
12			
13	LOCATION:	1 SADDLEBACK ROAD; 6-13-5; AR-I	
14			
15	BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:	MATT NEUMAN, CHAIR	
16		JAMES SMITH, VICE CHAIR	
17		LARRY O'SULLIVAN, VOTING MEMBER	
18		JAY HOOLEY, VOTING MEMBER	
19		JAMES TOTTEN, NON-VOTING ALTERNATE	
20		NEIL DUNN, CLERK	
21			
22	ALSO PRESENT:	RICHARD CANUEL, SENIOR BUILDING INSPECTOR/ZONING OFFICER	
23		JIM BUTLER, TOWN COUNCIL LIAISON	
24			
25	REQUEST:	VARIANCE TO ALLOW A POOL STRUCTURE WITHIN THE 150' PLANNED	
26		RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SETBACK.	
27			
28	PRESENTATION: Case No. 4/18/201	2-1 was read into the record with one previous case listed. The Clerk also	
29	read Exhibits "A" and "B" into the re	ecord (letters from abutters in favor of the request).	
30			
31	MATT NEUMAN: Richard, do you ha	ave some information?	
32	•		
33	RICHARD CANUEL: Yes. Yeah, if I co	ould comment before the Board hears this case, I'm gonna recommend to	
34	the Board that they table this case	, the reason being that this application is asking for relief of the setback	
35	provisions from what was once our	Planned Residential Development ordinance. Those provisions have since	
36	been amended from our ordinance	e. However, this subdivision exists as approved by the Planning Board,	
37	based on those PRD provisions.	However, because those provisions are no longer a part of our zoning	
38		er the Zoning Board has authority to grant the variance being that there's	
39	no specific provisions in the ordinance to point to. I've been doing some research on approval of the		
40	subdivision. I've done research on our past ordinances and consulted with our Town Attorney on this issue		
41		time, it's best for the Board to table the hearing, allow him to make a more	
42		haps come back to the Board with a recommendation.	
43	•		
44	LARRY O'SULLIVAN: Now wasn't this	s submitted more than a month ago?	

45

RICHARD CANUEL: Yes, it was. Yeah. It certainly was. As a matter of fact, the ordinance was repealed back in 2005 when there was a complete rewrite of the zoning ordinance, so... LARRY O'SULLIVAN: Mm-hmm. RICHARD CANUEL: Again... LARRY O'SULLIVAN: So is this just something that fell through the cracks in the...? RICHARD CANUEL: I guess you could say that. I mean, this Board has granted variances in that subdivision previously and those variances were before those provisions were repealed, so... LARRY O'SULLIVAN: I remember the porch. Yeah. RICHARD CANUEL: ...you know, again, like I say, it's definitely a fine line on whether the Board has authority to grant those variances at this point in time simply because you can't look at the ordinance and say "We deny based on this section." There is no section for a PRD any longer. However, all of those setbacks that were approved as part of that subdivision are still applicable. So, it may be under the purview of the Planning Board at this point in time for someone to come back and modify those approvals, so, again, to give our Town Attorney some time to take a look at it, we're going to meet and talk about this tomorrow and maybe come back to the Board with a much better idea on how to approach this. LARRY O'SULLIVAN: Mr. Green? Are you Mr. Green? FRED GREEN: Yes. LARRY O'SULLIVAN: Were you aware of this, Mr. Green, that...? FRED GREEN: No. LARRY O'SULLIVAN: No? FRED GREEN: No, I'm not. RICHARD CANUEL: Neither was I. NEIL DUNN: And when you say table it as opposed to continue it? LARRY O'SULLIVAN: 'Cause we haven't even opened it yet. MATT NEUMAN: Right. RICHARD CANUEL: Yeah. Yup. NEIL DUNN: 'Cause we haven't...

RICHARD CANUEL: Well, you can table it or continue it. Yeah, either way.

NEIL DUNN: No, and I was just looking for clarification.

RICHARD CANUEL: Yeah.

NEIL DUNN: If we table it, it sounds a little bit more...you know? I don't know. I'm making sure we're using the right...

RICHARD CANUEL: No, continue it is fine. Basically, you're tabling it. You're just setting it aside until you receive additional information.

[Overlapping comments]

106 MA

MATT NEUMAN: Right. Right. Mr. Green, obviously, you know, it's...

LARRY O'SULLIVAN: Surprise, surprise for us too, sir.

MATT NEUMAN: Right and apologize to you for having to sit here for over two hours, hoping that your case was gonna be heard. Unfortunately, without having the guidance from the Town Attorney, I think it would be inappropriate for the Board to hear your case if it's possible that it's not within our jurisdiction. Certainly it's something...we don't want to affect you down the road one way or another.

FRED GREEN: Okay. So there's uncertainty as to when, you know, I will...you know, would it be the next meeting or...?

RICHARD CANUEL: It would be the next monthly meeting if...

MATT NEUMAN: Right, but it is possible that it won't...you won't be presenting to this Board. It could be to the Planning Board...

RICHARD CANUEL: That's right.

MATT NEUMAN: ...is the issue.

RICHARD CANUEL: That's correct. Yup.

FRED GREEN: Is there a chance that it might be just the typical application then for a pool? Or do you think it's still a variance?

RICHARD CANUEL: It can't be a variance from what I get speaking with our Town Attorney. That...simply because those provisions are not in our ordinance, as I said, there's no specific section for the Board to point to to either grant or deny. So it's not likely that a variance is appropriate. So, in all fairness to you, as the

applicant, rather than the Board just simply denying the variance because those provisions aren't there, you know, allowing some time to get a decision from our Town Council and... FRED GREEN: Okay. LARRY O'SULLIVAN: Counsel with an "s," right? Counsel, the Counselor, the Attorney for the Town? RICHARD CANUEL: Yeah, Town Attorney. Yeah, not the Town Council. LARRY O'SULLIVAN: No, what Mr. Green would need to do then would either come before us again next month or the Planning Board? RICHARD CANUEL: Yup. LARRY O'SULLIVAN: Okay, so that... RICHARD CANUEL: He may not need to come to this Board. That's the point I'm trying to make... MATT NEUMAN: Right. LARRY O'SULLIVAN: Okay, well that's my point is... MATT NEUMAN: Yeah. LARRY O'SULLIVAN: ...that's why I said "or"... RICHARD CANUEL: Yeah, so, you know... LARRY O'SULLIVAN: Or either the [indistinct], so... RICHARD CANUEL: ...therefore, you know, the application would be rescinded and so on, so... LARRY O'SULLIVAN: Okay, so if it is the Planning Board issue, what would it be called? A special...it couldn't be a special exception here but is there some kind of a review that's done? RICHARD CANUEL: It would be a request to modify the provisions of the site plan approval. LARRY O'SULLIVAN: Okay. Now, is that a major thing for Mr. Green, then, in the way of time and expense? RICHARD CANUEL: Well, if it comes to the point where it's decided that a variance is not appropriate, then of course that application would be rescinded and, you know, his fee would be refunded, which, you know, could be used for a Planning application, so... MATT NEUMAN: Are you talking about the presentation to the Planning Board? Is that...?

LARRY O'SULLIVAN: No, I'm talking about if he needs to have some type of a, you know, survey done on his lot or anything along those lines. RICHARD CANUEL: No, not unless he's looking to change any of those boundary lines and that's not the case here. The case is just to be allowed to encroach on those boundary lines, so... NEIL DUNN: And also, could it be then that nothing's required other than Mr. Green pulling a permit? RICHARD CANUEL: That could be. That's right. That's right. LARRY O'SULLIVAN: Okay, good. FRED GREEN: That would be nice. LARRY O'SULLIVAN: At least we have some... [Laughter] LARRY O'SULLIVAN: I was hoping you'd get a better of idea of what would be next, so... FRED GREEN: Thank you. Yeah, I appreciate that. I mean, is there any precedence here? Has this happened to anyone else? I mean... RICHARD CANUEL: Well... FRED GREEN: There's nothing I can do to prepare. I mean, it's not the five criteria anymore. RICHARD CANUEL: No, there isn't any longer... NEIL DUNN: Don't throw those away, though. RICHARD CANUEL: That would not apply... [Laughter] RICHARD CANUEL: But you know... NEIL DUNN: [Indistinct] it could be, but... RICHARD CANUEL: But yeah, I would say definitely hold your breath on that one because, you know, even our Town Attorney was scratching his head and saying, you know, how would be, you know, the best way to approach this, so... FRED GREEN: Well, this is good. I was thinking of going to law school after doing this. Inspire me.

225 226	[Laughter]		
227 228	FRED GREEN: So, okay.		
229 230	RICHARD CANUEL: So, you know, I would say		
231 232	LARRY O'SULLIVAN: There are openings on this Board.		
233 234	MATT NEUMAN: Absolutely.		
235 236	FRED GREEN: Not after what you did to this guy. No.		
237 238	[Laughter]		
239 240	MATT NEUMAN: Alright, so		
241 242	RICHARD CANUEL: Yeah, I would say just hold onto your application		
243 244	FRED GREEN: Okay.		
245 246 247	RICHARD CANUEL:and all of your information and I'll get in touch with you after speaking with our Attorney.		
248 249	FRED GREEN: So there's nothing I can do to review or prep right now? It's just I wait		
250 251	RICHARD CANUEL: Nothing more than you've already done, I would say.		
252 253	FRED GREEN: Okay.		
254 255	LARRY O'SULLIVAN: This is the worst that it gets. What you already did.		
256 257	RICHARD CANUEL: Yeah.		
258 259	LARRY O'SULLIVAN: So with that out of the way		
260 261	FRED GREEN: Okay.		
262 263	LARRY O'SULLIVAN: Move along, right?		
264 265	FRED GREEN: Alright. Thank you, Chairman, thank you Board.		
266 267	MATT NEUMAN: Well, I guess we'll probably need a motion to continue.		
268 269	LARRY O'SULLIVAN: Motion to continue 'til next month.		

270 271	NEIL DUNN: Second.		
271272273	MATT NEUMAN: Second? Alright. All those in favor?		
274 275	NEIL DUNN: Aye.		
276 277	LARRY O'SULLIVAN: Aye.		
278 279	JIM SMITH: Aye.		
280 281	JAY HOOLEY: Aye.		
282 283	MATT NEUMAN: Aye. Opposed? Abstention?		
284 285	[No response to either]		
286 287 288 289	RESULT:	THE MOTION TO CONTINUE CASE NO. 4/18/2012-1 TO THE MAY 16, 2012 MEETING WAS APPROVED, 5-0-0.	
290 291 292 293	RESPECTFULL	Y SUBMITTED,	

294 295

296

297 298

299

TYPED AND TRANSCRIBED BY JAYE A TROTTIER, SECRETARY

<u>APPROVED MAY 16, 2011</u> WITH A MOTION MADE BY LARRY O'SULLIVAN, SECONDED BY JAY HOOLEY AND APPROVED 4-0-0.