

**TOWN OF DERRY
ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MINUTES
May 15, 2014**

Members Present

Lynn Perkins, Chairman
Allan Virr, Vice Chairman
Donald Burgess, Secretary
Joseph Carnavale

Members Absent

Teresa Hampton

Alternates Present

Heather Evans
Stephen Coppolo

Alternates Absent

Michael Demeo

Mr. Perkins called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m. with the salute to the flag, and notice of fire and handicap exits and that this and all Zoning Board meetings are videotaped.

The Board introduced themselves for the record.

Mr. Perkins informed the Board that they had received a letter from Metro Sign & Awning seeking to continue their case to the June 5, 2014 meeting and he would entertain a motion to accept.

Mr. Virr motioned to continue case #14-108, Kevin Duggan, Metro Sign & Awning, Owner: Parkland Medical Center to the June 5, 2014 meeting.

Seconded by Mr. Carnavale.

Vote: Unanimous

Mr. Coppolo, Ms. Evans, Mr. Carnavale, Mr. Burgess, Mr. Virr, Mr. Perkins

It was noted for the record that Ms. Evans would sit for the following case.

14-109 22 Lenox Avenue, LLC

Applicant is requesting a variance to the terms of Article VI, Section 165-45B.2.d and Article XIII, Section 165-107A of the Town of Derry Zoning Ordinance to allow the construction of a second floor to the existing non-conforming garage for use as a residential condominium, 22 Lenox Road, Parcel ID 32040, Zoned MHDR

Timothy Winings, TJW Survey, said that he was representing the owner this evening. He read the application request for the Board. Mr. Winings explained the exhibits that were submitted to the Board at time of application. He said that the applicant was seeking a variance to allow an expansion on the existing garage that is currently too close to the lot line.

Board Questions

Mr. Burgess asked if they were looking at the whole proposed project. Mr. Winings said no that they were just here for the expansion on the existing garage.

Mr. Perkins asked if it was the understanding that the existing garage expansion is to create a studio apartment over the garage that is currently located 8' from the lot line. The Board is only reviewing the expansion over the existing garage. Mr. Winings said that was correct. The owner currently owns the property on Hampstead Road which he has also rehabbed and is seeking to rehab this property. He said that he has pictures of the Hampstead Road property if the Board would like to review.

Mr. Perkins said that the workmanship is not a concern for the Board as the applicant would be required to adhere to building codes so do not feel that the Board needed to see pictures of the Hampstead Road property.

Mr. Coppolo asked if there was a citation to the court case.

Mr. Perkins asked what pertinence would have for current request. Mr. Coppolo said that the applicant had referenced twice and there is a question of the non-conforming use.

Mr. Winings said that he had not brought the citation this evening as the applicant was only seeking to enclose the existing garage with a breezeway and add a second story for use as living space.

There was some discussion with regard to expanding on an existing non-conforming use.

Mr. Burgess said that the article states no expansion of a non-conforming use is permitted. Mr. Winings said the use is not a non-conformity as it is a residential use which is in conformance of the ordinance and that the only the setback is of non-conformance.

Mr. Coppolo asked if there was any input from neighbors. Mr. Winings said that both sides of the property have been acceptable to the proposed use.

Code Enforcement

Mr. Mackey said that the applicant is requesting approval to add a second story to a pre-existing, non-conforming garage located on the property. The garage would be converted to a living unit as part of a multi-family project that the applicant is proposing. The

garage (apartment) would be attached to the existing home and another 2 unit structure would be built in the rear of the property and also be attached to the converted garage. The intent is to create one building or structure all located under one roof line. A previous proposal to add a detached 2-family structure was denied by the Planning Board and is currently in litigation. If approved, site plan approval by the Planning Board will be required as the intent is to create a 4 unit multi-family structure. There are pictures of the property in the file for review by the Board.

Favor

No abutters were present in favor of the request.

Opposed

No abutters were present in opposition of the request.

Mr. Carnavale motioned go into deliberative session.

Seconded by Mr. Burgess.

Vote: Unanimous.

Ms. Evans, Mr. Carnavale, Mr. Burgess, Mr. Virr, Mr. Perkins

Deliberative Session

Mr. Virr said that the Board did not need to discuss the connections as that is not what is being requested. He read Article 165-107A for the Board. He said that the existing garage was not a 2-story structure and did not feel there was ever intent to turn the existing garage into a living facility. The request is to change the existing two car garage and expand to a second level for housing.

Mr. Perkins said that the existing garage and residence and setbacks all apply to the non-conformity of the existing structure. The Board needs to find if applicant can expand the existing garage non-conformity as explained by the applicant the use is allowed and that the request is for the setback itself and that future use of the second story was not up for discussion by the Board.

Mr. Virr said that the existing garage was built prior to zoning.

Mr. Carnavale said that the increase is in volume as stated by Mr. Mackey and that an increase in volume was not allowed per the zoning ordinance.

Ms. Evans asked if the setbacks were what was needed to be determined and not the use.

Mr. Virr said that the applicant stated that item #4 that there would be no increase and that he felt there would be an increase in the non-conformity. He said also that item #5 the applicant stated that other property did not comply and that the neighborhood would not change. Mr. Virr said that he felt it would change the area.

Mr. Burgess asked Mr. Mackey when zoning became affective. Mr. Mackey said mid 1940's but the 15' setback ruling was not until 1960's.

Mr. Carnavale motioned to come out of deliberative session.

Seconded by Mr. Burgess.

Vote: Unanimous.

Ms. Evans, Mr. Carnavale, Mr. Burgess, Mr. Virr, Mr. Perkins

Mr. Carnavale motioned on case #14-109, 22 Lenox Avenue, LLC to Grant a variance to the terms of Article VI, Section 165-45B.2.d and Article XIII, Section 165-107A of the Town of Derry Zoning Ordinance to allow the construction of a second floor to the existing non-conforming garage for use as a residential condominium, 22 Lenox Road, Parcel ID 32040, Zoned MHDR as presented with the following conditions:

- 1. Subject to Planning Board approval.**
- 2. Subject to obtaining all Town permits & inspections.**

Seconded by Mr. Burgess.

Vote:

Mr. Burgess:	No. Believe it is an expansion of a non-conforming use.
Mr. Carnavale:	No. Zoning ordinance states expansion of non-conforming structures are not permitted.
Ms. Evans:	No. Believe it is an expansion of a non-conforming use.
Mr. Virr:	No. Side setbacks are not concern or the increase of non-conformity but the use of garage to residential living space
Perkins:	No. Fail to see the hardship and feel it would not be in the public interest.

The application was Denied by a vote of 0-5-0. Anyone aggrieved by a decision of the Board has 20 days to file a request for a rehearing. After that the recourse would be to appeal to Superior Court.

Mr. Carnavale asked if he could step down so an alternate could sit. Mr. Perkins said that was acceptable.

It was noted for the record that Ms. Evans and Mr. Coppolo would sit for the following case.

14-110 James and Sandra Hebert

Applicant is requesting a variance to the terms of Article VI, Section 165-47B.4 of the Town of Derry Zoning Ordinance to allow the replacement of an 8' x 10' shed with an 8' x 16' shed less than 15' from the side property line, 26 Hubbard Hill Road Parcel ID 06106-036, Zoned LMDR

James Hebert, owner, read his application request for the Board. He said that the size of the structure is slightly larger but would be positioned so as the larger portion of the shed would be towards his home. Mr. Hebert said that the reason for larger size is that his equipment is larger and needed to be housed.

Board Questions

Mr. Burgess asked if the picture submitted was of the shed seeking to be placed. Mr. Hebert said yes and that he had included pictures in his application submission along with an accurate picture of the property line and where the structure would be located. He explained his pictures for the Board.

Mr. Virr asked if the old shed was currently on the lot line. Mr. Hebert said yes but the new one he planned to move it approximately 2-3 feet away from the lot line. He said that he had forwarded an email to Mr. Mackey from his neighbor in acceptance of his proposed location of his shed.

Mr. Virr said that he commended the applicant for coming to the Board for permission to locate the shed as most people purchase sheds and just place them on their property and also place them to close to their lot lines.

Mr. Coppolo asked Mr. Mackey if there was ever a variance received for the previous shed. Mr. Mackey said that he did not believe a variance was ever granted for the previous shed.

Mr. Coppolo asked if the property with the existing shed location was an inherited one. Mr. Hebert said yes that he had purchased the property with the existing shed in its current location.

Code Enforcement

Mr. Mackey said that the applicant, is requesting approval to replace a dilapidated 8' x 10' shed located on the property with a new 8' x 16' shed to be located less than 15 feet

from the side lot line. The new shed is proposed to be further from the property line than the existing shed but will still be located within the 15' setback area. If approved, a building permit will be required. There are pictures of the property in the file for review by the Board.

Favor

Mr. Burgess read a letter from Paul Nowick, 28 Hubbard Hill Road, in favor of the applicant's proposed shed location.

Opposed

No one spoke in opposition of the application.

Mr. Virr motioned go into deliberative session.

Seconded by Mr. Coppolo.

Vote: Unanimous.

Mr. Coppolo, Ms. Evans, Mr. Burgess, Mr. Virr, Mr. Perkins

Deliberative Session

Mr. Virr said that he felt that this case was a routine request and commend the applicant for doing the right process and asking for a variance.

Mr. Burgess said that the motion should include being subject to obtaining all Town permits and inspections.

Ms. Evans motioned to come out of deliberative session.

Seconded by Mr. Burgess.

Vote: Unanimous.

Mr. Coppolo, Ms. Evans, Mr. Burgess, Mr. Virr, Mr. Perkins

Mr. Burgess motioned on case #14-110, James and Sandra Hebert to Grant a variance to the terms of Article VI, Section 165-47B.4 of the Town of Derry Zoning Ordinance to allow the replacement of an 8' x 10' shed with an 8' x 16' shed less than 15' from the side property line, 26 Hubbard Hill Road Parcel ID 06106-036, Zoned LMDR as presented with the following conditions:

- 1. Subject to obtaining all Town permits and inspections.**

Seconded by Mr. Coppolo.

Vote:

Mr. Coppolo: Yes.
Mr. Burgess: Yes.
Mr. Virr: Yes.
Ms. Evans: Yes.
Mr. Perkins: Yes.

The application was Granted by a vote of 5-0-0. Anyone aggrieved by a decision of the Board has 20 days to file a request for a rehearing. After that the recourse would be to appeal to Superior Court.

It was noted for the record that Mr. Coppolo would sit for the following case.

14-111 Mark Young

Applicant is requesting a variance to the terms of Article VI, Section 165-48.B.1 of the Town of Derry Zoning Ordinance to allow the subdivision of an existing, non-conforming commercial area to create a lot containing 1.513 acres in an area zoned as Low Density Residential (3 acres required), 109-113 Gulf Road, PID 04038-005, Zoned LDR.

Attorney William Mason, representing owner, read the application for the record. Attorney Mason described the prior use of the property for the Board. He said that the applicant has discussed this proposal with Mr. Mackey and the Planning Board prior to making application.

Board Questions

Mr. Coppolo said that if only seeking was requesting variance for what was on the existing ground if the purpose was for a future subdivision of the remaining property. Attorney Mason said that there was currently no future purpose but the request was twofold as the property is currently located in the LDR district and that seeking to delineate the non-conforming portion so as to identify the lot that has always been utilized as commercial. He said seeking relief to create a 1.5 acre lot which the Town has defined as the commercial portion of the property.

There was some discussion of the previous history of the property.

Mr. Perkins asked if there had been any engineering performed to support the current use of the property and the 1.5 acre parcel. Attorney Mason said that there has been engineering studies performed and that the proposed property and that it meets all criteria for what is existing on the site.

Mr. Coppolo asked why the variance was needed if there were no plans other for the property why the property could not be subdivided with the 3 acre requirement. Attorney Mason said that the rear portion of the land was separated by a stream and that providing another 1.5 acres would be pointless as it could never be used. He also said that by allowing the variance it would give relief to the Town as it would then identify what the Town has always determined as the pre-existing, non-conforming use of the property. Attorney Mason said that the lot was self-sustaining in terms of soils, sewer and water and allowing variance would be beneficial to both parties.

Mr. Coppolo asked how wide the stream was. Attorney Mason said that it was approximately 10-15' and that the flow varies on season but always flows.

Mr. Virr said that this variance was to allocate the portion of the property that has always been of commercial use. Attorney Mason said that was correct.

Mr. Perkins said that he also wished more detail was given as stated by Mr. Coppolo would like to know what the intention was for the remaining property. Attorney Mason said that the intent was to delineate the existing pre-existing non-conforming portion of the property of the 25 acres. He said that the Weber family had several uses on the property in the past years and that when Mr. Young purchased the property he has since cleaned it up and rehabilitated the property. He said that they were seeking to identify the lot that was being used as commercial.

Mr. Virr said that the property is existing and has been more than 50 years when there was not low density zoning and that he understands why the applicant is seeking to carve out the lot in question. He said that what currently abuts the property is Planning Board issues and did not see any change to what as the property is currently already being utilized as commercial and that granting a variance would assist the Town in controlling an existing situation that has been defined out by court decision.

Code Enforcement

Mr. Mackey said The applicant, is requesting a variance to allow the subdivision of a lot containing 1.513 acres in the Low Density Zoning District which requires a minimum of 3 acres. The applicant wishes to separate a portion of the parcel which contains a pre-existing, non-conforming construction related business use that pre-dates the residential zoning. Historically, based in part from litigation with the Town involving a previous owner, the portion of the property that has been designated as containing the non-conforming use is the area located east of the brook which flows to the rear of the existing commercial garage and gravel parking area. The remainder of the property is limited to residential and accessory uses and should be stipulated by the Board as a condition of your motion. If approved, Planning Board subdivision approval will be required. There are pictures of the property in the file for review by the Board.

Mr. Coppolo asked if the order had been record. Mr. Mackey said yes.

Attorney Mason said that the none of the previous court cases involved Mr. Young. He said that in addition to the dynamite on the Mr. Weber stored on the property the barn also stored beaver tails etc. and are still currently hanging on the walls of the barn.

Mr. Virr asked if the 21.9 acres goes to Island Pond. Mr. Young said no that the property goes west of Island Pond that the property abuts neighbors on Goodhue Road.

Mr. Virr said that he understood the reason for carving out and that the remainder of the property unable to be used for much.

Mr. Coppolo asked if the court order had any legal bearing on the request. Attorney Mason said no as it involved other tenants when the Weber's owned the property that exceeded the use status. Mr. Young was not involved in prior issues and has since made numerous improvements to the property as he has cleaned up and replaced the old garage and obtained all proper permits.

Mr. Coppolo asked no current plans stating what the remaining use of the property would be utilized for. Attorney Mason said that possible to build a home on the remaining 20 acres and plant peach trees.

Favor

Richard Frank, said that he had no objection to the proposed variance.

Anne Barbarick, 107 Gulf Road, said that she lives next door to the property and owns 7 acres. She said that she knows there was a class action suit on the property and would not want to allow more commercial property to be added and that if there was a limit to allow the amount of commercial area it would be helpful as she has horses and the less commercial noise the better.

Heather Evans, recused herself from the Board so she could speak in favor of the applicant, 78 Gulf Road, said she was a neighbor of the property and that the applicant always has a clean area and has kept in very good condition and that she was in favor of the proposed request.

Cheryl Lynch, 140 Goodhue Road, said that she has lived thru the landfill and the Weber barn blowing up and questioned if the 1.5 acre would become part of a problem for the area.

Mr. Virr said that essentially it would shrink down any possible expansion and limiting the commercial area to only the 1.5 acre parcel that is already currently being utilized.

Mrs. Lynch asked if it would become one entity of non-conformity. Mr. Perkins aid yes that it would be limited to the 1.5 acres.

Opposed

No abutters were present in favor of the request.

Rebuttal

Attorney Mason said that the 1.5 acre encompasses an existing situation and not creating any additional land and that seeking only to establishing area of what is currently non-conforming and essentially shrinking the area.

Mr. Virr asked if the remaining 20 acres would be residential. Attorney Mason said that it was already residential.

Mr. Burgess asked if intent was to allow the 1.5 acre parcel as commercial and the rest would remain residential and unable to expand. Attorney Mason said that was correct and there is no intention of expansion.

Mr. Virr said that the Board was not trying to sound unreasonable but typically have plans that they can read. Attorney Mason said that they were trying to show whole area and apologize for not having submitted a full size drawing.

Mr. Virr motioned go into deliberative session.

Seconded by Mr. Carnavale.

Vote: Unanimous.

Mr. Coppolo, Mr. Carnavale, Mr. Burgess, Mr. Virr, Mr. Perkins

Deliberative Session

Mr. Virr said that he felt that this was a wining situation.

Mr. Perkins said that he agreed that felt it was a responsible property owner correcting an existing situation for the better.

Mr. Coppolo said that he was by the property and it was very well maintained.

Mr. Virr said that the motion should include subject to Planning Board approval.

Mr. Burgess asked Mr. Mackey if there would be any required inspections or other criteria needed. Mr. Mackey said no that the Planning Board would make certification of meets and bounds so other stipulations would not be necessary.

Mr. Coppolo asked if DES and soils was not of purview of the Zoning Board. He said that he was hearing nothing is changing so why seeking now. Understand of what

applicant is seeking to do makes sense carving off the 1.5 acres but raising flag of what happens to rest of the area.

Mr. Burgess said testimony stated that owner was planning on planting fruit trees.

Mr. Burgess motioned to come out of deliberative session.

Seconded by Mr. Carnavale.

Vote: Unanimous.

Mr. Coppolo, Mr. Carnavale, Mr. Burgess, Mr. Virr, Mr. Perkins

Mr. Carnavale motioned on case #14-111, Mark Young to Grant a variance to the terms of Article VI, Section 165-48.B.1 of the Town of Derry Zoning Ordinance to allow the subdivision of an existing, non-conforming commercial area to create a lot containing 1.513 acres in an area zoned as Low Density Residential (3 acres required), 109-113 Gulf Road, PID 04038-005, Zoned LDR as presented with the following conditions:

- 1. Subject to obtaining Planning Board approval.**
- 2. Remaining acreage to be utilized as residential uses only per the LDR zoning district.**

Seconded by Mr. Burgess.

Vote:

Mr. Virr:	Yes.
Mr. Coppolo:	Yes.
Mr. Carnavale:	Yes.
Mr. Burgess:	Yes.
Mr. Perkins:	Yes.

The application was Granted by a vote of 5-0-0. Anyone aggrieved by a decision of the Board has 20 days to file a request for a rehearing. After that the recourse would be to appeal to Superior Court.

It was noted for the record that Ms. Evans would sit for the following case.

14-112 Richard and Tina Silva

Applicant is requesting a variance to the terms of Article III, Section 165-25.e of the Town of Derry Zoning Ordinance to allow an accessory apartment greater than 600 square feet in area, 6 Silver Street Parcel ID 02079-008, Zoned MDR

Tina Silva, 6 Silver Street, owner, read application for the record. Mrs. Silva said that they had purchased the property 12 years ago and that the property was previously utilized as Mountain View Daycare that occupied the lower level. She said that the area already has a kitchenette and bath and very large rooms. She said that her parents were already utilizing the lower level as their living space and would continue to do so but they were seeking to relocate.

Board Questions

Mr. Perkins asked if the property was a split level home and that the downstairs portion is where seeking to have apartment. Mrs. Silva said yes.

Mr. Virr said according to the tax card the area is currently listed as recreation room. Mrs. Silva reviewed the floor plan for the Board. She said that they have done no construction except installation of a new septic system and flooring.

Mr. Perkins asked the size of the septic system. Mrs. Silva said that it was upgraded to a 5 bedroom system.

Mr. Virr said that the size is not accessory if grant a variance and property sold it stays as such.

Mr. Mackey said unable to be sold off separately if keeping as accessory use will protect from going forward and being sold as a 2-family.

Mr. Perkins asked if property could be marketed as accessory. Mr. Mackey said yes.

Mr. Virr said 2 family homes were not allowed.

Mr. Burgess said an accessory use is still an apartment.

Mr. Virr said that what Mr. Mackey is saying is that if the Board restricts as an accessory use it also restricts the property being sold as a 2 family.

Mrs. Silva said originally purchased the property and had no children and have since adopted 3 children who are getting larger and that the home is currently too small so they are seeking to relocate but wish to retain the property so their parents can still reside there and the upper level could be rented out.

Mr. Virr said that he understood as it can be stressful. Mrs. Silva said their parents were 67 & 77 and have lived there 12 years and have a comfort level as all their doctors are here and close to Parkland Hospital and shopping convenience for them. She said that they were in process of purchasing a horse farm and know that this property used to have horses on it but do not think that the neighbors would be too keen on having there now.

Mr. Perkins said that he understands the reasoning for the request.

There was some discussion of layout of home and use allowance.

Mr. Perkins said that the applicant was not opposed to restriction of removal of accessory if property sold.

Mr. Mackey said intention of in-law but not stipulated in ordinance. He said it would not hurt to stipulate the removal of kitchen if property were to be sold.

Mr. Virr asked how would it be enforced as a variance runs with the land. He said he did not see how Code Enforcement would be able to monitor.

Mr. Coppolo said anytime that he has read court cases a variance runs with the property. The problem is essentially granting a variance that really isn't a variance.

Mr. Perkins said that a prospective buyer would need to come to the Board to seek request. What impact would it be to neighborhood if not stipulated.

Mr. Coppolo asked if there was any intention of selling. Mrs. Silva said not at this time only seeking to make legal.

There was some discussion with regard to usage.

Code Enforcement

Mr. Mackey said that the applicant is requesting approval to allow an accessory apartment of approximately 930 sq. ft. where the maximum square footage allowed is 600 sq. ft. The area of the home being utilized as the apartment is pre-existing living space that was utilized as a day-care by the previous owner. The septic system was replaced in 2009 with a 5 bedroom system. There are pictures of the property in the file for review by the Board.

Favor

No abutters were present in favor of the request.

Opposed

No abutters were present in opposition of the request.

Mr. Burgess motioned go into deliberative session.

Seconded by Mr. Carnavale.

Vote: Unanimous.

Ms. Evans, Mr. Carnavale, Mr. Burgess, Mr. Virr, Mr. Perkins

Deliberative Session

Mr. Burgess said that the only conditions that he could see so far were subject to obtaining all permits and inspections. He said that he had a problem that if allowed would be forever.

Mr. Carnavale said that he had heard testimony from the applicant that they were willing to remove if property was to be sold.

Mr. Burgess said that if a variance is granted it is an allowed use and unable to make a stipulation to remove.

Mr. Virr said that the owners will still have an interest in the property as the parents will still be residing there.

Mr. Burgess asked Mr. Mackey if another variance would be required if the home was rented and if there were any possible fire codes that need to be adhered to if it becomes a rental property. Mr. Mackey said that an additional variance would not be needed and he was unaware of any fire codes for rental.

Mr. Burgess asked if accessory apartment allowed and rent top floor was it possible to do without a variance. Mr. Mackey said yes as there were no regulations to prevent that it was a tough call.

Mr. Perkins said that the square footage used to be 400 square feet now 600 square feet and this footprint is much larger.

Mr. Virr said that the ordinance defines an accessory use sort of like a large studio apartment. He said that he was unable to see where granting a variance with a stipulation to remove is legal.

Mr. Perkins said that he felt it requires some sort of stipulation.

Ms. Evans said that a 600 square foot accessory was legal that she did not see a problem with allowing 300 additional square feet where it is already being utilized as the applicant is only seeking to make it a legal use.

Mr. Perkins said that the only stipulation that he felt should be added is subject to obtaining permits and inspections.

Mr. Carnavale asked if that possible removal if property were to be sold.

Mr. Virr said a variance is a variance subject to conditions and did not feel that it would be legal to ask for removal if granting use.

Mr. Carnavale motioned to come out of deliberative session.

Seconded by Mr. Burgess.

Vote: Unanimous.

Ms. Evans, Mr. Carnavale, Mr. Burgess, Mr. Virr, Mr. Perkins

Mr. Burgess motioned on case #14-112, Richard and Tina Silva to Grant a variance to the terms of Article III, Section 165-25.e of the Town of Derry Zoning Ordinance to allow an accessory apartment greater than 600 square feet in area, 6 Silver Street Parcel ID 02079-008, Zoned MDR as presented with the following conditions:

1. Subject to obtaining permits and inspections.

Seconded by Mr. Carnavale.

Vote:

Ms. Evans: Yes.

Mr. Carnavale: Yes.

Mr. Virr: Yes.

Mr. Burgess: No. Feel there will be possible problems in the future sale of the property. No hardship shown.

Mr. Perkins: Yes.

The application was Granted by a vote of 4-1-0. Anyone aggrieved by a decision of the Board has 20 days to file a request for a rehearing. After that the recourse would be to appeal to Superior Court.

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Virr said that he only had one correction to be made in reference to the case for East Derry Road property with regard to Mr. Zolla not being a direct abutter.

Mr. Virr motioned to approve the minutes of May 1, 2014 as amended.

Seconded by Mr. Burgess.

Vote: Unanimous

Mr. Coppola, Ms. Evans, Mr. Carnavale, Mr. Burgess, Mr. Perkins, Mr. Virr

Other Business

Mr. Virr said that the Board needed to give some thought to the summer schedule and what

Adjourn

Mr. Burgess motioned to adjourn.

Seconded by Mr. Carnvale.

Vote: Unanimous.

Mr. Coppolo, Ms. Evans, Mr. Carnvale, Mr. Burgess, Mr. Perkins, Mr. Virr

Adjourn at 9:37 pm

Minutes transcribed by:
Ginny Rioux
Recording Clerk