



Town of Merrimack, New Hampshire

Community Development Department

603 424-3531

6 Baboosic Lake Road

Fax 603 424-1408

Town Hall - Lower level - East Wing

www.merrimacknh.gov

Planning - Zoning - Economic Development - Conservation

MERRIMACK ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MAY 30, 2018 MEETING MINUTES

A regular meeting of the Merrimack Zoning Board of Adjustment was conducted on Wednesday, May 30, 2018 at 7:00 p.m. in the Matthew Thornton Room.

Chairman Patrick Dwyer presided:

Members of the Board Present: Lynn Christensen (arrived at 7:13 p.m.)
Richard Conescu
Rod Buckley, Alternate
Kathleen Stroud, Alternate
Leonard Worster, Alternate

Members of the Board Absent: Fran L'Heureux, Vice Chair
Anthony Pellegrino

Also in Attendance: Kellie Shamel, Assistant Planner

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Dwyer led the Pledge of Allegiance and swore in members of the public who would be testifying. Richard Conescu read the Preamble.

2. ROLL CALL

Chairman Dwyer appointed Kathleen Stroud to serve as a voting member in the absence of Fran L'Heureux, and Leonard Worster in the absence of Lynn Christensen.

The next meeting of the Zoning Board of Adjustment will be conducted on June 27, 2018.

3. **Winning Swimming, LLC (petitioner) and Carolanne & Michael Caron (owners)** - Variance under Section 2.02.1.A.2.d of the Zoning Ordinance to permit a home occupation that occupies greater than 25% of the inhabitable floor area of the dwelling. The parcel is located at 12 Collins Avenue in the R-1 (Residential) and Aquifer Conservation District. Tax Map 6D, Lot 564. Case # 2018-10.

Carolanne Caron stated she was before the Board seeking a Variance for her home based business, which is more than 25% of the inhabitable space of the house; a restriction she was previously unaware of.

Ms. Caron read the statutory criteria into the record.

When asked if the addition (garage and 2nd floor bonus room) is complete, Ms. Caron stated it has had its electrical inspection, but a Certificate of Occupancy has not yet been obtained. Member Conescu commented once that is obtained, the business would be in compliance with the Ordinance. Ms. Caron remarked that would be the case assuming the Board counts a detached livable space as part of the calculation.

When asked if the detached garage would be considered part of the livable space, Kellie Shamel, Assistant Planner, stated the Planning & Zoning Administrator would make that determination. Ms. Caron stated the Planning & Zoning Administrator did not count it.

Chairman Dwyer opened the Public Hearing at 7:10 p.m.

Testimony in Favor - None

Testimony in Opposition

Chairman Dwyer read a letter from Antonia and Joan S. Cardillo, A&J Cardillo 2011 Trust, into the record.

When asked, Ms. Caron stated there is one individual in the pool at a time. There is a family of three that is there for 1½ hours because she has one at a time in the pool. On the busiest days there can be 7-8 individuals over an 8-10 hour period. The business operates 4 days/week and 1 Saturday a month (January through April).

Chairman Dwyer declared the Public Hearing closed at 7:13 p.m.

The Board voted 5-0-0 to grant the Variance, on a motion made by Richard Conescu and seconded by Kathleen Stroud.

Findings of Fact:

1. Granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest: The footprint of the house used for business purposes was calculated at 30% per the April 11, 2018 memorandum by Robert Price, Planning & Zoning Administrator. The business uses an indoor pool in a finished area of the house, which used to be a garage. The pool only has one swimmer at a time and noise is contained since it is indoors. We have also provided off-street parking in the old driveway and have reminded patrons to watch their speed and be respectful of neighbors.
2. The spirit of the Ordinance is observed:

We have installed the smallest indoor pool available to satisfy the needs of both our athletes and our learn-to-swim students. We have also provided access to the nearest bathroom with an available shower. All business is enclosed and the remainder of the house is not accessible during business hours. I am no different than a hairdresser other than my tools (a pool) is much larger than a chair.

3. Granting the variance will achieve substantial justice:

I am a single employee business providing a substantial community service in the most efficient and cost-effective way possible. Keeping the pool at my house keeps my costs down and lets me stay competitively priced with other swim schools. Since most of my clients have families of their own, they understand and respect being able to swim in a residential neighborhood.

4. The values of the surrounding properties would not be diminished:

5. The business exists within the original footprint of the house. We recently added a detached garage with a shop and a bonus room upstairs, but the new building will not have anything to do with the business, and we would have built it even if we didn't have the business. The 2nd floor bonus room will have livable space, which would bring the business percentage down to 21% of the livable space. This business has existed for 6 years and has not affected any property values in the area. A. Owing to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area,

denial of the variance would result in unnecessary hardship because:

1. No fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purpose of the Ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property because:

We installed this pool because my daughter and I were training for triathlons and we wanted a pool to train in. This room was large enough to hold the pool, bike trainers, and the treadmill. Once I received my coaching certifications, I started helping others in my pool for convenience. More requests for help started the business. There is no other room to put the pool in the house and moving it to a commercial area would be costly and not feasible for my business model of one client at a time.

2. The proposed use is a reasonable one because:

Many residential houses have pools, either indoor or outdoor. I just happen to teach in mine. Also, I generate no more traffic than any other single appointment home business.

Lynn Christensen arrived at 7:13 p.m. and Leonard Worster returned to Alternate status.

- 4. FMR NH Realty/FMR Merrimack Realty (petitioners/owners) - Special Exception under Section 2.02.4 (E) of the Zoning Ordinance to permit an automotive service and repair use within the I-2 (Industrial) District. The parcels are located at 1 Spartan Way and 2 Contra Way in the I-2 (Industrial) and Aquifer Conservation Districts and Wellhead Protection Area. Tax Map 3C, Lot 191 (1 Spartan) and Map 2C, Lot 113 (2 Contra). Case # 2018-14.**

Richard Conescu recused himself.

Chairman Dwyer appointed Leonard Worster to serve as a voting member in place of Richard Conescu.

John Sokul, Esq. Hinckley Allen, stated Fidelity, as part of an employee amenity, wishes to bring in (6-8 times/month) a customized automobile service trailer called Zippity Cars. It would be located in an

existing parking area and would be exclusively for Fidelity employees. Fidelity is trying to stay in line with ongoing trends for employee attraction and retention.

Robin Gotshall, Fidelity Investments, noted the trailer itself is self-contained. The services would primarily be oil changes and detailing.

Attorney Sokul read the ordinance criteria into the record.

Chairman Dwyer opened the Public Hearing at 7:19 p.m.

Testimony in Favor - None

Testimony in Opposition - None

Chairman Dwyer declared the Public Hearing closed at 7:20 p.m.

The Board voted 5-0-0 to grant the Special Exception with the following condition:

1. The applicant shall obtain site plan approval from the Planning Board for the proposed automobile service and repair use.

on a motion made by Kathleen Stroud and seconded by Lynn Christensen.

Findings of Fact:

- a) The specific site is an appropriate location for such a use or uses in terms of overall community development because:
 - The trailer will be located on an existing Fidelity paved parking lot.
 - Zippity is a popular workplace amenity and will be made available on the Fidelity campus exclusively for the benefit of Fidelity employees.
 - The trailers are entirely self-contained, customized, fully enclosed, EPA approved, and believed to be good in terms of overall community development as it is a benefit for Fidelity employees.
 - This employee benefit will assist with Fidelity's recruitment and employee retention efforts for its Merrimack, NH campus.
 - Fidelity is a large employer in the Town of Merrimack.
- b) The use as developed will not adversely affect the neighborhood and shall produce no diminution of real estate values in the neighboring area because:
 - Zippity's service is fully mobile, requires no infrastructure, and leaves the site untouched.
 - Zippity's service will be operated exclusively on Fidelity's private property and will not be visible or audible to neighbors.
 - All of Zippity's systems have been designed to be fully self-contained, quiet, and clean.
 - Zippity uses low decibel equipment and battery powered tools to ensure there is no obnoxious noise.

- Zippity carries in and carries out all supplies, trash, and materials so they have no on-site footprint or impact.
- The EPA has signed off on Zippity operating procedures and confirms “no-exposure” to the sites on which it operates.
- There will be absolutely no impact to surrounding properties or the neighborhood because Zippity will operate in a designated parking area on the Fidelity campus in a completely self-contained trailer.

c) There will be no nuisance or serious hazard to vehicles or pedestrians, because:

The Zippity mobile service trailer will be operated in a safe, Fidelity-designated parking area within the Fidelity campus when it is on-site. When operating, it will not move from this spot or disrupt movement of vehicles or pedestrians in the Fidelity parking lot.

d) Adequate and appropriate facilities will be provided for the proper operation of the proposed use or uses because:

- On the days in which Zippity is on-site, Zippity will operate only in a Fidelity-designated area in an existing Fidelity parking lot.
- This arrangement is a reallocation of existing parking and does not require any new parking spots or additional on-site improvements.
- As shown on the accompanying plan, there is ample, adequate and safe parking for the proposed use.

Richard Conescu returned to his seat on the Board. Leonard Worster returned to Alternate status.

5. Steven Grenier (petitioner/owner) - Variance under Section 2.02.1 of the Zoning Ordinance to permit an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) with 1,131 sq. ft., whereas a maximum of 1,000 sq. ft. is permitted. The parcel is located at 75 Baboosic Lake Road in the R-4 (Residential) and Aquifer Conservation District. Tax Map 5C, Lot472-01. Case # 2018-12.

Steven Grenier stated he purchased the property in 2006. There was an existing ADU on the 2nd floor for which there was a building permit issued in 1996. He approached the Town wanting to have everything effectively in compliance. He listed the home for sale the previous day. Without an approval there would be an undertone that there is something improper going on. He stated the desire to have the property recognized for what it is.

When asked what is on file, Ms. Shamel stated the ADU existed prior to Mr. Grenier purchasing the home. An old service request (2006) is on file for the property, and that request flagged the ADU as not having obtained the proper approvals. However, it is not clear in the records if the previous owner was ever notified to correct the issue before selling the property.

Mr. Grenier read the statutory criteria into the record.

Chairman Dwyer opened the Public Hearing at 7:30 p.m.

Testimony in Favor - None

Testimony in Opposition - None

Chairman Dwyer questioned how the ADU is accessed and was informed there is a rear entrance with a deck and 6' slider. The only other access is through the primary dwelling unit (through the living room). There is no direct second entrance or exit for the ADU.

Chairman Dwyer questioned if someone could purchase the property with the intent of utilizing it as two apartments. Mr. Grenier responded there would be two additional variances that would be required in order to be in compliance with a legal two-family; structural change adding a direct entrance in the front of the building and set back requirements and size of lot.

Ms. Shamel stated the only portion of the ADU that is currently out of compliance is amount of square footage. The ADU is 1,131 sq. ft.; the ordinance allows a maximum of 1,000 sq. ft.

Member Buckley questioned what would occur if the request was denied, e.g., would it be a matter of having something on paper for a potential sale.

Mr. Grenier responded that is a big part of it. He has a desire to be up front with everything and everyone. Currently, having the home for sale, it would otherwise be an undertone, e.g., if a buyer's representative came to the Town questioning if the ADU is approved, and was told it is not, he believes it would lend to negativity and perhaps would cost the sale. He does not want to advertise the home for something that it isn't.

Ms. Shamel noted because staff has been made aware that is the ADU is not in compliance, they would have to either pursue enforcement action or if the property sells then the future owner would need to come before the Board requesting a variance.

When asked for clarity, Ms. Shamel stated a building permit for the ADU is on file with the Building Department however, Community Development Department records do not indicate that a Special Exception was ever obtained for the ADU, as was required at the time it was constructed. A service request from 2006 flagged the ADU as not having obtained the proper approvals; however it is unclear if the previous owner was ever notified to correct the problem before selling the property to the Mr. Grenier.

Chairman Dwyer declared the Public Hearing closed at 7:34 p.m.

The Board voted 5-0-0 to grant the Variance, on a motion made by Lynn Christensen and seconded by Rod Buckley.

Findings of Fact:

1. Granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest:

Since this request for a variance does not involve any change to the existing structure, the public interest would not be impacted in any way. The use of the dwelling remains exactly the same.

2. The spirit of the Ordinance is observed:

The ADU was constructed in 1996/1997. The prior owner applied to the Town and was issued a building permit. I believe that he acted in good faith, at that time, in getting the Town's approval for the ADU addition. As the current owner, I too am acting in good faith and trust by initiating this action to be in compliance with the Town's guidelines.

3. Granting the variance will achieve substantial justice:

Granting this variance would simply bring full property disclosure to all of the various municipal departments involved in community oversight and development. The property is assessed and taxed based on the addition of the ADU.

4. The values of the surrounding properties would not be diminished:

There are no physical changes to the property and therefore the approval would have no adverse impact to any surrounding properties.

5. A. Owing to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area, denial of the variance would result in unnecessary hardship because:

1. No fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purpose of the Ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property because:
Since the property will physically remain unchanged, there would be no impact by way of advantage or hardship to other properties in the area. The use of the property will continue as a residential dwelling and any decision by the board would likely go unnoticed by the general public.

2. The proposed use is a reasonable one because:

In 1996, the Town's governing representatives at the building department thought that the addition of the ADU was reasonable, with the permit issuance. I am asking the current board membership to recognize that prior decision, approval and intent.

6. Sarah & Steve Pieroni (petitioner/owner) - Variance under Section 3.02 of the Zoning Ordinance to permit the installation of an in-ground pool 3 feet from the rear property line whereas 12 feet is required. The parcel is located at 29 Level Street in the R-4 (Residential) District. Tax Map 7D, Lot 012-25. Case # 2018-11.

Ms. Sarah Pieroni stated the request to be relief from the rear property setback requirement that abuts Windover Landing common land. When purchasing their home, they had not realized the land in the rear of their property was common land. That came to light when they were pulling permits to start constructing the pool. They shifted the location of the pool to ensure it is on their property. However, they are requesting a setback variance.

Chairman Dwyer questioned if Windover Landing Homeowner's Association was approached, and what their feedback was. Mr. Steven Pieroni stated they have not expressed any objections.

Ms. Pieroni read the statutory criteria into the record.

Chairman Dwyer opened the Public Hearing at 7:40 p.m.

Testimony in Favor - None

Testimony in Opposition – None

Chairman Dwyer declared the Public Hearing closed at 7:41 p.m.

The Board voted 5-0-0 to grant the Variance, on a motion made by Rod Buckley and seconded by Kathleen Stroud.

Findings of Fact:

1. Granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest:

The installation of an in-ground pool on our property would not be contrary to the public interest, for reasons outlined below:

I. The pool would not alter the essential; character of the locality:

- a. Our property line abuts ground owned by the association. This association owned land is not used by any of the residents in our association and is largely enclosed by a row of trees to the left, wetland to the right, and woods owned by the Town along the back.

II. The pool would not threaten the public health, safety or welfare:

- a. Our pool would adhere to all safety standards, including, but not limited to, a gate no less than 4 ft. tall, that would go around the perimeter of the pool.

2. The spirit of the Ordinance is observed:

I. The pool would be located in an area of our property that has ample distance between the structure and our neighbors, so will not result in overcrowding.

II. The land our property abuts is owned by the association and therefore, unable to be purchased and built upon in the future, ultimately limiting the chance of overcrowding in the future.

3. Granting the variance will achieve substantial justice:

I. The section of our property we would like to place our pool on is currently used by our family, including two young girls, to enjoy recreational activities. The installation of a pool would therefore be consistent with the area's present use of recreational enjoyment.

II. The absence of a pool in our yard does not result in a gain to the general public, as the area in which we are proposing to place our pool is not encroaching on any of our neighbors' land. The loss to our family with not being able to install a pool in that location is not outweighed by a gain to the general public, and therefore granting the variance would do substantial justice.

4. The values of the surrounding properties would not be diminished:
 - I. The proposed structure is unobtrusive.
 - II. The pool will have a privacy fence and/or shrubbery blocking the end of our driveway, where the pool would begin.
 - III. The proposed location is ample distance away from any of our neighbors' property lines.
5. A. Owing to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area, denial of the variance would result in unnecessary hardship because:
 1. No fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purpose of the Ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property because:

The proposed location of the pool borders land owned by the association, which is not designed to be used by others within the association, due to there being no direct access to the land from the street. Therefore, the existence of a pool in that location of our property would not result in overcrowding, a decrease in property value, or a decrease in public safety or general welfare
 2. The proposed use is a reasonable one because:
 - i. It would not interfere with the value or have negative impact on neighboring properties.
 - ii. It would not alter the essential character of the neighborhood.
 - iii. It would be placed in a discreet location, with appropriate privacy measures implemented.

Member Worster left the room.

- 7. APMK Ventures, LLC. (petitioner/owner)** - Special Exception under Section 2.02.3(C)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance to permit the construction of a single family residence in the General Commercial District. The parcel is located at 702 Daniel Webster Highway in the C-2 (General Commercial). Tax Map 7E, Lot 023-01. Case # 2018-13.

Peter McClintick, Manager, APMK Ventures, stated the desire to construct a single-family home within the C-2 zone, which is allowed by special exception. The lot complies to all residential zoning.

Mr. McClintick read the ordinance criteria into the record.

Chairman Dwyer opened the Public Hearing at 7:45 p.m.

Testimony in Favor - None

Testimony in Opposition

Chairman Dwyer read a letter from Nancy Church Vanier into the record:

When asked when construction would begin, Mr. McClintick stated he is uncertain. When asked if he has spoken with the Church family, he stated he has, but not recently. There was a tree concern expressed during a storm, and he visited to discuss it. When asked if they have expressed any of the concerns mentioned in the letter, he stated he has not heard from the family.

Member Buckley noted the letter did not indicate when a good time to begin construction would be. Member Conescu commented unfortunately it is a rather subjective item. Mr. McClintick remarked when he purchased the property he indicated he was uncertain what his plans were; nothing in the immediate future. He does not know even at this time.

Chairman Dwyer declared the Public Hearing closed at 7:50 p.m.

The Board voted 5-0-0 to grant the Special Exception, on a motion made by Lynn Christensen and seconded by Rod Buckley.

Findings of Fact:

- a) The specific site is an appropriate location for such a use or uses in terms of overall community development because:

It would be in character for the immediate area. There are 2 single-family homes abutting the site and 1 other just a lot away. They are also in the C-2 zone.

- b) The use as developed will not adversely affect the neighborhood and shall produce no diminution of real estate values in the neighboring area because:

There are other single-family homes in the area and minimal site work would be needed to develop the site. The topography of the lot should not substantially change. The home will be connected to Town water and sewer.

- c) There will be no nuisance or serious hazard to vehicles or pedestrians, because:

The proposed use will add minimal traffic to the area and road. The occupant of the proposed use would probably have 2-3 vehicles. The extra 2-3 cars coming and going should have little impact.

- d) Adequate and appropriate facilities will be provided for the proper operation of the proposed use or uses because:

It will be serviced by Town water and sewer and have onsite parking.

Member Worster returned.

- 8. College Bound Movers (petitioner) and 14 Continental SPE, LLC. (owner) - Variance under Section 17.10.3.B of the Zoning Ordinance to permit a sign with a setback of 12 feet from the right-of-way whereas 20 feet is required. The parcel is located at 14 Continental Boulevard in the I-1 (Industrial) and Aquifer Conservation Districts and Wellhead Protection Area. Tax Map 3C, Lot 089. Case # 2018-15.**

Nathan Chamberlin, P.E., Fieldstone Land Consultants, stated the request to be for a variance to permit a sign with a setback of 12 feet from the right-of-way where 20 feet is required. College Bound movers purchased the building, rehabbed it, and constructed an addition in 2016. A sign was placed. Typically Fieldstone does the site plan and the owner hires a sign contractor who acquires the necessary permits. That is what occurred. The contractor put the sign in, and when they did the final walk through someone noticed it was less than the required distance of 20'. The contractor measured from edge of pavement and not from the right-of-way.

Mr. Chamberlin read the statutory criteria into the record.

Chairman Dwyer opened the Public Hearing at 8:01 p.m.

Testimony in Favor - None

Testimony in Opposition - None

Chairman Dwyer declared the Public Hearing closed at 8:02 p.m.

The Board voted 5-0-0 to grant the Variance, on a motion made by Kathleen Stroud and seconded by Rod Buckley.

Findings of Fact:

1. Granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest:

Granting this variance would allow the existing sign to remain in its current location. Upon reviewing the location of signage along this stretch of Continental Boulevard, I found that the subject signage is very consistent with what currently exists on neighboring properties.

The signage for neighboring properties is as follows:

- 8 Continental's sign is approximately 12 feet off the edge of the road
- 10 Continental's sign is approximately 25 feet off the edge of the road
- 12 Continental's sign is approximately 16 feet off the edge of the road
- 15 Continental's sign is approximately 18 feet off the edge of the road
- 19 Continental's sign is approximately 16 feet off the edge of the road

The sign for this property currently sits 20 feet from the edge of the roadway and does not present safety hazards, which is obviously consistent with the surrounding properties. Zoning Ordinances are generally written to manage the development in towns and to allow for responsible and reasonable development and expansion. Considering that this sign is consistent with its surroundings and will not create any issues for the general public, we believe that this proposal is reasonable. For these reasons and the fact that this proposal will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood or threaten the health, safety or general welfare of the public, we believe that this proposal would not be contrary to the public interest.

2. The spirit of the Ordinance is observed:

The location of the existing signage is consistent with other signs along Continental Boulevard. We believe that the intent of this ordinance is to provide adequate separation from the sign to the adjacent street and to provide a nice visual appearance. The photos attached to this application show that the sign is balanced well within the landscaped area in front of the building. Also worth noting is that Continental Boulevard has a larger right-of-way consisting of 60 feet rather than the normal 50 feet with most other roads. If Continental Boulevard had a 50 foot right-of-way the existing sign would be setback 17 feet which is why the sign, in our opinion, looks good in its current location. For these reasons and the fact that this proposal will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood or threaten the health, safety or general welfare of the public, we believe that this proposal would observe the spirit of the ordinance.

3. Granting the variance will achieve substantial justice:

Granting this variance would allow the existing sign that The Sign Gallery installed to remain. The sign is currently balanced nicely in the landscaped area between the building and Continental Boulevard. The sign in its current location will result in no negative impacts to the neighborhood and no safety hazards. Given this, it is our belief that this proposal will have no negative impacts to the general public. For this and all of the reasons noted, we believe granting this variance would do substantial justice for the land owner. A denial of this variance would be an injustice to my client as there would be no apparent gain to the general public.

4. The values of the surrounding properties would not be diminished:

The existing sign on the subject property has been located 20 feet off the edge of pavement rather than 20 feet off the right-of-way. This separation is very consistent with neighboring signage along Continental Boulevard. The sign on the subject property has been designed to complement the building and has been located with surrounding landscaping. There are no factors with this sign that should negatively impact the values of surrounding properties. It has also been our experience that new construction and development will often times actually increase the value of surrounding properties. For all of these reasons we would expect this project to have positive impacts on surrounding property values as it will rejuvenate the site and the surroundings.

5. A. Owing to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area, denial of the variance would result in unnecessary hardship because:

1. No fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purpose of the Ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property because:

Section 17.10.3.B of the Merrimack Zoning Ordinance requires a 20 foot setback from the right-of-way to the location of a sign. We believe that the intent of this ordinance is to provide adequate separation from roadways to enhance the visual appearance from the adjacent street. Since the right-of-way of Continental Boulevard is 60 feet wide the existing location of the sign is close to where it would be located if the roadway had a standard right-of-way width of 50 feet. The location of the existing signage is also very consistent with the signage on neighboring properties and for the most part is actually more conforming. Since the current sign location is balanced well within the landscaped area at the front of the site and enhances the visual appearance from the street, we believe there should be some consideration given to the setback requirement. If the sign was located 8 feet further into the site we believe the visual

appearance would be negatively impacted as the sign would be too close to the building. This may very well be why The Sign Gallery positioned the sign in its current location. We do not believe that the existing signage will have a negative impact on the general public. Based on the above, we do not believe that a fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purpose of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property.

2. The proposed use is a reasonable one because:

For the reasons previously stated we believe that the sign in its current location meets the spirit and intent of the ordinance. The sign in its current location will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood or threaten the health, safety or general welfare of the public. Since the sign in its current location will be consistent with the neighborhood, will enhance the property visually and will result in no negative impacts to the public, we believe that the proposed use is reasonable.

9. DISCUSSION/POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING OTHER ITEMS OF CONCERN

Member Conescu noted two members of Boy Scout Troop 15 in the audience. Given the opportunity to address the Board, the scouts indicated they were completing the requirement for their Communications Merit Badge, which requires they attend a Town meeting and take notes on the differing points of view. They will have to put the information into a format that they can then present to their Council.

10. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – APRIL 25, 2018

The minutes of April 25, 2018, were approved as submitted, by a vote of 4-0-1, on a motion made by Lynn Christensen and seconded by Kathleen Stroud. Richard Conescu abstained.

11. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:08 p.m., by a vote of 5-0-0, on a motion made by Richard Conescu and seconded by Lynn Christensen.

Submitted by: Dawn M. MacMillan