

1 **HOOKSETT ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT**
2 **Tuesday, January 10, 2023**
3 **HOOKSETT MUNICIPAL BUILDING**
4 **35 Main Street**
5 **Meeting Minutes**
6 **6:30 pm**

7
8 **CALL TO ORDER**

9
10 Anne Stelmach (Chairman) called the regular meeting to order at 6:30 pm.

11 **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

12
13 **ATTENDANCE:** Anne Stelmach (Chairman), Richard Bairam (Vice-Chairman), Phil Denbow,
14 Timothy Stewart, Gerald Hyde, and Roger Duhaime (Town Council Representative).

15 **ALTERNATES:** Tony Lacasse (Alternate) arrived at 6:56 pm and Alex Glennon

16 **EXCUSED:**

17 **NOT PRESENT:**

18 **STAFF:** Dana Pendergast (Code Enforcement Officer)

19 A. Glennon will be a voting member for the approval of minutes only.

20 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** December 13, 2022

21 *A. Glennon motioned to approve the minutes of the December 13, 2022 meeting. Seconded by*
22 *R. Bairam. P. Denbow and G. Hyde abstained due to not being in attendance at the December*
23 *13, 2022 meeting. Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 5-0.*

24
25 **CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING:**

26
27 **Jack & Cindy Gagne #Z22-18**

28 **26 Hale Ave, Map 45 Lot 21**

29 **URD**

30 **APPLICATION FOR A VARIANCE:**

31 From **Article 5-A Section B.2** of the Zoning Ordinance to permit: Existing space looking to fin-
32 ish for an apartment. In 2021 addition of a 2nd garage with a bonus room above was approved.
33 No increase in footprint of existing structure should result.

34
35 C. Gagne: We are looking to put an apartment on the existing two car garage. It would have its
36 own parking and entrance. We are looking for a variance on the footprint.

37
38 R. Duhaime: You got approval in 2021 for second garage?

39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82

C. Gagne: We got approval and did not know our intentions for the second floor and now we would like to have an apartment.

R. Duhaime: Is there a leach field?

C. Gagne: Town water and sewer.

R. Duhaime: Are you changing the exterior?

C. Gagne: No

A. Stelmach: What would the size be?

C. Gagne: Approximately 800 sq. ft.

R. Duhaime: Would any existing structures have to change?

D. Pendergast: This is an existing garage. The area above was supposed to be storage. They got a variance for the setback to be close to the road and built the garage. It is attached to the other garage. They were going to use it for storage and now they have someone they would like to live there.

P. Denbow: Do you have a photo of what the garage looks like?

J. Gagne: We don't.

D. Pendergast: The house sits on Labonville. The side of the house is on Hale. It sits across from the Frasier Park tennis courts.

C. Gagne read the application and criteria into the record.

Open public hearing.

No public comments.

Close public hearing.

A. Stelmach: Is there only one house on that road?

J. Gagne: Yes.

It was a board consensus there is no regional impact.

Criteria 1 & 2 - The variance will not be contrary to Public Interest & the Spirit of Ordinance will be observed.

83 It was a board consensus this variance will not be contrary to Public Interest & the Spirit of Ordinance will be observed.

84

85
86 **Criteria 3 (Substantial Justice is done)**

87 It was a board consensus substantial justice is done.

88 **Criteria 4 (The value of surrounding properties will not be diminished)**

89 It was a board consensus that surrounding properties will not be diminished.

90

91 **Criteria 5 (Literal enforcement of the provisions of the ordinance would result in an Un-**
92 **necessary Hardship)**

93 Discussion ensued regarding hardship, missing information on the application, the variances and
94 special exception needed to meet the criteria, and legal standards. The applicants stated they are
95 looking the have their son, who is a disabled veteran, live in the apartment. A. Stelmach ex-
96 plained the way the ordinance is written and explained that for hardship the board needs more
97 information as to why the property is different than the other properties in the area. She stated
98 that if an applicant is adding density they need to comply with the ordinance.

99

100 *P. Denbow motioned to continue the application for a variance from Article 5-A Section B.2 of*
101 *the Zoning Ordinance to permit existing space to finish for an apartment (in 2021 addition of*
102 *a 2nd garage with a bonus room above was approved; no increase in footprint of existing struc-*
103 *ture should result) for Jack & Cindy Gagne #Z22-18, 26 Hale Ave, Map 45 Lot 21, URD until*
104 *the February 14 meeting. Seconded by G. Hyde. Motion carried unanimously with a vote of*
105 *5-0.*

106

107 **Jack & Cindy Gagne #Z22-19**

108 **26 Hale Ave, Map 45 Lot 21**

109 **URD**

110 **APPLICATION FOR A VARIANCE:**

111 From **Article 5-A Section B.2** of the Zoning Ordinance to permit: An apartment over existing
112 garage. The lot will not be impacted any further as the building is already built. The lot size re-
113 quired for a Two-Family consists of at least 18,000sqft., where our lot size is 12,624.4sqft.

114

115 *P. Denbow motioned to continue an application for a variance from Article 5-A Section B.2 of*
116 *the Zoning Ordinance to permit an apartment over existing garage (the lot will not be im-*
117 *acted any further as the building is already built; the lot size required for a two-family con-*
118 *sists of at least 18,000 sq. ft., where our lot size is 12,624.4 sq. ft.) for Jack & Cindy Gagne*
119 *#Z22-19, 26 Hale Ave, Map 45 Lot 21, URD until the February 14 meeting. Seconded by G.*
120 *Hyde. Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 5-0.*

121

122 **Jack & Cindy Gagne #Z22-20**

123 **26 Hale Ave, Map 45 Lot 21**

124 **URD**

125 **APPLICATION FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION:**

126 From **Article 5A Section B.2** of the Zoning Ordinance to permit: To an existing 2 car garage we
127 are looking to add a one-bedroom apartment with approx. 800sqft.

128
129 ***P. Denbow motioned to continue an application for a special exception from Article 5A Sec-***
130 ***tion B.2 of the Zoning Ordinance to permit adding a one-bedroom apartment with approx. 800***
131 ***sq. ft. to an existing 2 car garage for Jack & Cindy Gagne #Z22-20, 26 Hale Ave, Map 45 Lot***
132 ***21, URD until the February 14 meeting. Seconded by G. Hyde. Motion carried unanimously***
133 ***with a vote of 5-0.***

134
135 **Balance Investment & Development LLC will be heard at this time.**

136
137 **R. Duhaime recused himself from Springwood Homes & Dev. Corp. #Z22-21 due to a con-**
138 **flict of interest.**

139
140 **Springwood Homes & Dev. Corp. #Z22-21**
141 **3 Dartmouth St, Map 18 Lot 29 thru 29-5**

142 **PZ**
143 **APPLICATION FOR A VARIANCE:**

144 From **Article 7 Section B.3.a** of the Zoning Ordinance to permit: 12 Elderly Housing units to be
145 constructed on Map 18 Lot 29, which is a density of 4 dwelling units per acre, where density of 3
146 units per acre are permitted

147
148 JR Ouellette (Owner and President of Springwood Homes & Dev. Corp.): We have a rough con-
149 ceptual plan. This was a vacant run-down house situated in PZ. The house has been removed and
150 the area needs a face lift. The property is three acres in size, there are no wetlands, is relatively
151 flat, and adjacent to what used to be a mobile home park. It is in an area with commercial, resi-
152 dential, and an older person development. The property has received prior approval for six single
153 family homes. A company purchased the property at the end of October and applied for a 55+
154 community with the planning board. That was approved with a density of an older person home
155 development that limits it to nine units. If we want to increase density we need a variance. I be-
156 lieve they did not grant the variance out of respect for this board. This property is suited for an
157 older person community. The proposed concept has a common driveway. Our request is for three
158 more units for a total of twelve framed units. Natural wooded buffers will remain. There is a
159 need for older person homes. This will provide taxes without impacting services. There would be
160 a road from Dartmouth St. to Hunt St. that would be maintained by the community. The addi-
161 tional three units are needed to make this viable. Water and sewer is available. We will hire for
162 trash pickup and lawn maintenance which will be a cost savings for the town. There would be
163 twelve overflow parking spaces. This is an efficient and appropriate use of the property keeping
164 up with the existing neighborhood. This would be a creative and functional use of this property.

165
166 D. Pendergast: The planning board gave the use. It has to fall back on Article 7 - Elderly Hous-
167 ing which is 4 acres.

168
169 JR Ouellette read the application and criteria into the record.

170
171 Open public hearing.

172

173 Jerome: (7 Dartmouth Street - Granite State Dog Recovery): The property is not surrounded by
174 residential. It is surrounded by commercial. This is becoming a loop of the planning board and
175 ZBA. This was set on a precedent that will only accept five units. The March 21, 2022 minutes
176 talk about the waiver they requested. This property has changed hands and each time they have
177 sought remedy through the boards. With the density and going up and down two roads it impos-
178 sible to get in and out safely. Another commercial property that rents large trucks is being put in.
179 Dartmouth and the new road will not be passable. One of the approvals asks for concession on
180 the buffers. We were entitled to a 50' buffer. The board gave them a 20' buffer because they
181 thought this was a commercial property. I don't know how you will put elderly in with the traffic
182 and next to a dog shelter.

183

184 D. Pendergast: This was one home. The property was approved for a six-lot single family sub-
185 division with three on Hunt Street and three on Dartmouth Street. The property has since sold
186 and that is why he is here today.

187

188 Jerome: I assumed this was a mixed-use property.

189

190 D. Pendergast: It was approved and there was no appeal.

191

192 Jerome: Can I appeal?

193

194 D. Pendergast: The deadline has passed.

195

196 Jerome: I am upset that people are traversing the system because they know how to traverse the
197 system. I missed a 30-day deadline because I don't know what I am doing. There is already an
198 elder person community in the area.

199

200 A. Stelmach: This was approved as a six-lot single family sub-division. Now they are approved
201 for nine elderly units.

202

203 Jerome: The density does not fit the good use of the property.

204

205 D. Pendergast: They got the elderly units under the PZ and now he is asking for more.

206

207 Jerome: In the dialogue they did not want to approve residential use because it would limit com-
208 mercial use for the front of the property. Another applicant applied for this same thing and was
209 denied for that specific reason. Now we are back to the same process.

210

211 G. Hyde: Dana, on the first application on that front property we granted 50 percent residential
212 and 50 percent commercial. Is that still there because they have not developed it?

213

214 D. Pendergast: They never made substantial strides at doing anything.

215

216 P. Denbow: What we have in front of us is nine units approved for a 55+ community. JR is now
217 looking for twelve.

218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263

Jerome: That road is a danger. When the trucks from the truck rental across the street pull out they block the road. When the restaurant opens it is even worse.

T. Lacasse: With the current zoning it sounds like nine units are allowed with the elderly housing. He is asking for three more units. If we are talking about adding six more cars it is a small cluster development. Who is to say what is going to happen in the front parcel? That potentially could add more risk. I agree that area is tough with traffic.

Jerome: It is the existence of the extra units that will eat into the 50' buffer if they give us the 50' buffer. They agreed to the 20' buffer based on not realizing the zoning was PZ.

Amy Mailhot (152 Amherst Rd., Merrimack - Treasurer of Granite State Dog Recovery): The traffic is an issue. I appreciate JR's statement that he would preserve the buffer.

Holly Mokrzecki (40 Grand Avenue, Manchester - President of Granite State Dog Recovery): Adding more units will add more traffic seven days a week. I have to take a right to take a left. We can't even walk down to the end of the street because it is a private road. We are fully licensed by the Dept. of Agriculture. We can't walk left now and if this goes in we are not going to be able to walk right. We will be stuck. Where are we supposed to walk if everything is private around us? It is very frustrating when you have to make \$100,000 worth of changes to a commercial property, and this is happening with another property. This is very frustrating.

Roger Duhaime (19 Sawhill Road): JR is a builder and has a good reputation. We have not had any issues. It is not a hardship. No one is going to build small single-family homes on a parcel and have them bought. I don't know why he wants to build something so small. I think this would be good for the town. I don't think it is out of context. PZ is a mix of commercial and residential. I am in favor of this. I would like to see what he is going to build.

JR Ouellette: I asked Roger to present for me at the planning board with a different application. When I went to the planning board my intention was to build this same concept. I have been wanting to do an adult community in this town for some time. I have built a lot of homes in Hooksett, and it costs the town money. I felt like I could create back some additional income for the town. This will not generate the type of income as much as doing an adult community. When I got shot down at the planning board, I did some multi-families and single families. They did not want to allow any residential on the three-acre piece. They wanted it commercial. I told them it was never going to happen. This area is mostly residential. I didn't purchase the piece. Someone else did and went to planning board. They were looking for residential and got shot down. They finally got approved for six units. I felt like that opened the door, so I purchased it. Single family impacts services. I asked for elderly, and they agreed to nine units. The zoning indicates three units per acre. I need the twelve units in order to build the road. If I get shot down here I go back to the six residential units which impacts the town. The elderly housing will not have as much traffic flow as the single family. I am not aware of the 50' buffer that the previous owner did.

P. Denbow: What is the square footage of the units?

264
265 JR Ouellette: 1,400 sq. ft.
266
267 P. Denbow: What is the price range?
268
269 JR Ouellette: \$450,000 to \$500,000.
270
271 D. Pendergast: JR still has to go back to the planning board with the site plan and buffers.
272
273 JR Ouellette: We are commercial and the property in front of them is commercial. two abutters
274 are commercial. In the planning board notes they talk about the number of units.
275
276 D. Pendergast: This is PZ so no matter what the houses currently are they could be rezoned.
277
278 JR Ouellette read from the planning board minutes regarding the number of units.
279
280 Close public hearing.
281
282 **Criteria 1 & 2 - The variance will not be contrary to Public Interest & the Spirit of Ordinance will be observed.**
283
284 Board discussion ensued regarding density, use, and traffic.
285
286 It was a board consensus that the variance will not be contrary to public interest & the spirit of
287 the ordinance will be observed.
288
289 **Criteria 3 (Substantial Justice is done)**
290 Board discussion ensued regarding buffers and fencing. The hope is JR would be a good neigh-
291 bor and work with his abutters.
292
293 It was a board consensus that substantial justice has been met.
294
295 **Criteria 4 (The value of surrounding properties will not be diminished)**
296 It was a board consensus that this variance will not diminish the value of surrounding properties.
297
298 **Criteria 5 (Literal enforcement of the provisions of the ordinance would result in an Un-**
299 **necessary Hardship)**
300 Discussion ensued regarding amenities and public utilities that are nearby for the elderly, the def-
301 inition of hardship, and the acreage.
302
303 A board consensus was not established on criteria 5.
304
305 *P. Denbow motioned to grant the application for a variance from Article 7 Section B.3.a of the*
306 *Zoning Ordinance to permit 12 Elderly Housing units to be constructed on Map 18 Lot 29,*

307 *which is a density of 4 dwelling units per acre, where density of 3 units per acre are permitted*
308 *for Springwood Homes & Dev. Corp. #Z22-21, 3 Dartmouth St, Map 18 Lot 29 thru 29-5, PZ*
309 *Seconded by G. Hyde.*

310

311 **Roll Call**

312 **P. Denbow: Yes**

313 **G. Hyde: Yes**

314 **R. Bairam: No because Criteria No. 5 is not met.**

315 **T. Stewart: No because Criteria No. 5 is not met.**

316 **A. Stelmach: No because Criteria No. 5 is not met.**

317

318 **Motion fails with a vote of 3-2.**

319

320 **T. Lacasse recused himself from Balance Investment & Development LLC. #Z22-22 due to**
321 **a conflict of interest.**

322

323 **Balance Investment & Development LLC. #Z22-22**

324 **449 West River Rd, Map 8 Lot 44**

325 **URD**

326 **APPLICATION FOR A VARIANCE:**

327 From **Article 5-A Section B.2** of the Zoning Ordinance to permit: a Three (3) Family dwelling
328 where a Two (2) family dwelling is permitted. *This three-family is an existing condition not*
329 *known for how long and if town has any documentation*

330

331 Muharem Mahmutovic: When we purchased the property it had 3 dwellings. It is only zoned as
332 a two family. We are applying for a variance to legalize the existing three family where only two
333 are allowed. No addition will be built. The structure will stay the same as it is now. We will work
334 will building department to make sure renovations make sense.

335

336 A. Stelmach: You have the 18,000 sq. ft., the two onsite parking spaces and you are not increas-
337 ing the footprint? You are just increasing units?

338

339 M. Mahmutovic: Correct. There will be six parking spaces. Tenants park in the bottom parking
340 lot and take the stairs up to the home.

341

342 A. Stelmach: Do you know when they put the third unit in?

343

344 M. Mahmutovic: We do not. There are no files to say when or why this was added. This struc-
345 ture is very old. It is set up for three two-bedroom apartments.

346

347 A. Stelmach: Do you have any idea of time?

348

349 M. Mahmutovic: Easily 10 to 15 years old.

350

351 D. Pendergast: This is listed in everything we have as a two family.

352

- 353 P. Denbow: The house next door was a single family but sold as a two family.
354
- 355 M. Mahmutovie read the application and criteria into the record.
356
- 357 A. Glennon: How long as the applicant owned the property for?
358
- 359 M. Mahmutovie: Under six months.
360
- 361 A. Glennon: During the purchase was the applicant under the impression this was a three fam-
362 ily?
363
- 364 M. Mahmutovie: The building was abandoned. You could not even walk through. You could see
365 three kitchens and three meters. During the application process we did not want to proceed with-
366 out being correct with the town and putting it the way it is.
367
- 368 R. Duhaime: This place has been empty for a long time. The person who sold it does not like
369 older homes. I can't remember the last time this home has been lived in.
370
- 371 M. Mahmutovie: There is plenty of space to put in a parking lot and there is a lot of access to get
372 to the building. If we go the harder way and make it larger two family units there will still be the
373 same amount of parking. The impact to the neighbors will be the same. It is more reasonable to
374 keep it the way it is.
375
- 376 R. Duhaime: It that the standard parking spaces?
377
- 378 D. Pendergast: Yes.
379
- 380 M. Mahmutovie: If this gets approved we will work with the building department to provide site
381 plans. We have enough room for the parking.
382
- 383 A. Stelmach: Is there any reason you left hardship blank?
384
- 385 M. Mahmutovie: The application is long. We are just seeking a variance.
386
- 387 R. Duhaime: Can it be brought up to code to be a three family?
388
- 389 M. Mahmutovie: That is the next step.
390
- 391 D. Pendergast: The residential parking calls for a 10 x 20 parking space size.
392
- 393 T. Stewart: Is there going to be a back entrance?
394
- 395 M. Mahmutovie: The only exit or entrance will be out of the basement. It will be a walk out
396 basement.
397
- 398 Open public hearing.

399

400 An email to Dana Pendergast received from Craig St. Pierre, on behalf of Robby Bouchard,
401 dated January 10, 2023, was read into the record by A. Stelmach.

402

403 Christopher St. Pierre and Craig St. Pierre (26 Riverside)

404

405 Craig St. Pierre: When we initially came for the first hearing this was under a different trust that
406 was under me primary. We have since retitled the property. It is now under a separate trust that
407 lists Chris primary, but I am still trustee and power of attorney. The lot size is 13,068 sq. ft. The
408 applicant is required 18,000 by the code for a two unit. They are already over lot density by their
409 current size. There are two variance requests. The applicant has owned this property for 105 days
410 and they did not buy it at a foreclosure sale. It came from an investor purchase. They would be
411 bound to the normal due diligence of any other investor purchasing a property.

412

413 A. Stelmach: There is only one variance. I am confused why you are saying there are two.

414

415 Craig St. Pierre: The lot size is 13,068 sq. ft. and for a two family 18,000 is required. Wouldn't
416 adding a third unit require an additional variance?

417

418 D. Pendergast: This is a pre-existing non-conforming for the two family. There is not an ap-
419 proved use for three family and therefore he is requesting a variance.

420

421 Craig St. Pierre read a letter of opposition dated December 13, 2022 from himself to the Town of
422 Hooksett, NH Zoning Board of Adjustment into the record.

423

424 Craig St. Pierre brought the applicant's parking plan.

425

426 A. Stelmach: The parking and water lines are the jurisdiction of the planning board.

427

428 Craig St. Pierre: I think the plan creates all the hardships to us as listed in the letter. There is no
429 precedent for it. The tax card lists it as a two family. This is a cash card by an absentee investor.

430

431 Shawn Hickey (447 West River Road): I am against this to be a three family. I have a concern
432 about parking and safety. The pool has never been removed; it has been filled in. It is a mud pit
433 trapping all the water. If it rains it turns that whole lot into a mud pit. Cars rip down that road ex-
434 tremely fast.

435

436 M. Mahmutovic: I don't think anything they mentioned is valid. Whether this is a two or three
437 family it will have the same affect to everyone on the street.

438

439 Close public hearing.

440

441 P. Denbow: If you are the applicant, you should fill out all the sections accordingly.

442

443 R. Duhaime: Has been demo'd inside. Can we see if it has three units?

444

445 M. Mahmutovic: He can come by and see. This is the first step. We are willing to address any-
446 thing the building department addressed.

447
448 A. Stelmach: I am hearing this has been a three family and it should stay that way. I am not okay
449 with that as far as hardship. It is as reasonable to have two apartments as well as three.

450
451 G. Hyde: Demoiing a third unit is a hardship. There is precedent out there. I owned a building
452 that was two units but listed as a one. That was a hardship. I have an issue with there being so
453 little filled out on the application. Hardship is not filled out. We can't say that there are three ex-
454 isting units other than taking the applicants word for it. If we can't prove there are three units are
455 we granting a third unit without knowing?

456
457 P. Denbow: When is the last time this was operated as a three family? If it was recently used as
458 a three family it could possibly be grandfathered in. I look at public interest and safety, people do
459 rip down that road. Between hardship and public interest I am concerned.

460
461 A. Glennon: Three electrical meters doesn't speak to three units. Are there three oil tanks?

462
463 M. Mahmutovic: One had propane tanks and they may have had oil tanks.

464
465 G. Hyde: Theoretically you can have three meters for two units.

466
467 R. Duhaime: I would love to see this fixed up. To do that I want to know if it was a three family.
468 I would like to know what the planning board thinks about parking on this street and have Dana
469 verify if this was a three family.

470
471 A. Stelmach: I will respectfully disagree about asking the planning board about parking, but we
472 could take a site walk.

473
474 R. Duhaime: We could invite the planning board to the site walk.

475
476 A. Stelmach: We could do that.

477
478 D. Pendergast: If it is a three family, it has been abandoned so they would have lost that use.
479 That is why he is here.

480
481 M. Mahmutovic: I would like to move forward tonight. Either way you decide we will move
482 forward.

483
484 **Criteria 1 & 2 - The variance will not be contrary to Public Interest & the Spirit of Ordi-**
485 **nance will be observed.**

486
487 G. Hyde and A. Stelmach believe this will not be contrary to public interest and the spirit of the
488 ordinance. P. Denbow, R. Bairam and T. Stewart believe this is contrary to public interest and
489 the spirit of the ordinance due to the safety and character of the neighborhood.

490 A board consensus was not established on criteria's 1 & 2.

491

492 **Criteria 3 (Substantial Justice is done)**

493 It is a board consensus that substantial justice is done.

494

495 **Criteria 4 (The value of surrounding properties will not be diminished)**

496 It is a board consensus that the value of surrounding properties will not be diminished.

497

498 **Criteria 5 (Literal enforcement of the provisions of the ordinance would result in an Un-**
499 **necessary Hardship)**

500 Board discussion ensued regarding the abandoned use, reasonable use, financial investment not
501 being a hardship, going from three smaller units to two bigger units, and the property having to
502 be gutted and renovated.

503 A board consensus was not established on criteria 5.

504

505 *P. Denbow motioned to grant an application for a variance from Article 5-A Section B.2 of the*
506 *Zoning Ordinance to permit a three (3) family dwelling where a two (2) family dwelling is per-*
507 *mitted for Balance Investment & Development LLC. #Z22-22, 449 West River Rd, Map 8 Lot*
508 *44, URD. Seconded by R. Bairam.*

509

510 **Roll Call**

511 **P. Denbow: No because Criteria Nos. 1, 2 and 5 are not met.**

512 **G. Hyde: Yes**

513 **R. Bairam: No because Criteria Nos. 1 and 2 are not met.**

514 **T. Stewart: No because Criteria Nos. 1, 2 and 5 are not met.**

515 **A. Stelmach: No because Criteria 5 is not met.**

516

517 **Motion fails with a vote of 4-1.**

518

519 **Recess at 8:27. Reconvened at 8:34 PM. Springwood Homes & Dev. Corp. #Z22-21 will**
520 **now be heard followed by Springwood Homes & Dev. Corp. #Z22-23.**

521

522 **R. Duhaime recused himself from Springwood Homes & Dev. Corp. #Z22-23 due to a con-**
523 **flict of interest.**

524

525 **Springwood Homes & Dev. Corp. #Z22-23**

526 **3 Dartmouth St, Map 18 Lot 29 thru 29-5**

527 **PZ**

528 **APPLICATION FOR A VARIANCE:**

529 From **Article 7 Section B.2.a** of the Zoning Ordinance to permit: An age restricted housing
530 community on a 3-acre lot where 4 acres is the minimum lot required

531

532 JR Ouellette withdrew this application.

533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552

**REVIEW NEW APPLICATIONS FOR IMPACT TO REGIONAL PLANNING per RSA
36:56 Review Required**

NEW PUBLIC HEARING: NONE

ADJOURNMENT

*G. Hyde motioned to adjourn at 10:02 pm. Seconded by R. Bairam. Motion carried unani-
mously with a vote of 5-0.*

The next meeting of the Zoning Board of Administration will be held February 14, 2023 at 6:30
pm.

Respectfully submitted by:

/s/ AnnMarie Scott

AnnMarie Scott
Recording Clerk