

ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MINUTES
TUESDAY, JULY 9, 2002 - 7:00 P.M.
TOWN COUNCIL CHAMBERS - DURHAM TOWN HALL

MEMBERS PRESENT: Bill Annis, Chair; Jane Towle, Robin Rousseau;
John deCampi, Alternate; Linn Bogle, Alternate

MEMBERS ABSENT: Ted McNitt; Henry Smith; Robbi Woodburn,
Alternate

OTHERS PRESENT: Thomas Johnson, Code Enforcement Officer

Chair Annis called the meeting to order at 7:03PM

I. Approval of Agenda

Chair Annis stated that Administrator Selig was present and would briefly like to speak to the Board after the agenda is approved. He also stated that someone had called the Planning Dept. and requested that item V be moved up to item III.

There were no objections to this amendment to the agenda.

Jane Towle MOVED to approve the agenda as amended. Robin Rousseau SECONDED the motion and it PASSED unanimously.

Todd Selig, Town Administrator, spoke briefly about the Durham Cable Access Television station and the interest by the Town to broadcast the Zoning Board meetings. He stated that they would like to start video taping meetings for broadcast by next month, but hopes in the future that funds might be available to broadcast the meetings live as the Town Council and Planning Board meetings are.

John deCampi suggested waiting until funds are available to broadcast live as the meetings would be better presented and subsequently would be more interesting.

Robin Rousseau stated that she feels that it is more important to be broadcasting as soon as possible for the benefit of the public.

It was the consensus if the Board to continue as suggested by Administrator Selig, by taping the meetings for broadcast until live broadcast is possible.

II. CONTINUED DELIBERATION on a petition submitted by Fredrick & Elizabeth Bramante, Durham, New Hampshire for an **APPLICATION FOR VARIANCES** from Article IV, Section 175-27(B), Article X, Section 175-38(A) and from Article III, Section 175-16(A) of the Zoning Ordinance to build a gazebo on a nonconforming lot within the shoreland setback. The property involved is shown on Tax Map 20, Lot 3-1, is located at 587 Bay Road, and is in the RC, Residence Coastal Zoning District.

Chair Annis gave a brief introduction of this application.

John deCampi stated that he felt the proposed gazebo would not be environmentally harmful, but it was clearly prohibited in the Zoning Ordinance.

Linn Bogle stated that he was concerned because the applicant cited others who have gazebos in the setback, and by approving this application it may contribute to the precedent.

Robin Rousseau stated that she believed approving this application would not be an issue for her because she did not believe it would infringe on the intent of the Zoning Ordinance which speaks to low residential density, open space, and accessibility for recreation and conservation. She stated that she regarded the gazebo as a landscape accessory rather than a structure.

Jane Towle stated that she believed that the gazebo did not fulfill the criteria for a structure, and also felt it was not in conflict with the intent of the ordinance or causing harm to the shoreland area.

Robin Rousseau MOVED to grant the petition submitted by Fredrick & Elizabeth Bramante, Durham, New Hampshire for an APPLICATION FOR VARIANCES from Article IV, Section 175-27(B), Article X, Section 175-38(A) and from Article III, Section 175-16(A) of the Zoning Ordinance to build a gazebo on a nonconforming lot within the shoreland setback. The property involved is shown on Tax Map 20, Lot 3-1, is located at 587 Bay Road, and is in the RC, Residence Coastal Zoning District. John deCampi SECONDED the motion.

Tom Johnson requested that the Board designate a distance and size guideline for this application.

The Board discussed appropriate size and location guidelines for the gazebo. It was suggested that "with the condition that the size of the gazebo shall not exceed 10'x15' and shall be located 36 ft from the property line, 12 feet from the edge of the deck adjoining the dock, and approximately 25 ft from the high water mark." Be added to the motion.

Robin Rousseau and John deCampi accepted this as a friendly amendment.

The Board reviewed the following criteria, which must be met before the Board can grant a variance:

1. No decrease in the value of surrounding properties would be suffered. **AGREED 5-0**
2. Granting the variance must not be contrary to the public interest. **AGREED 5-0**
3. Denial of the variance would result in unnecessary hardship to the owner seeking it. **AGREED 5-0**
4. By granting the variance substantial justice would be done. **AGREED 5-0**
5. The use must not be contrary to the spirit and intent of the Ordinance. **AGREED 5-0**

The motion PASSED unanimously.

III. PUBLIC HEARING on a petition submitted by M.J. Chase Revocable Trust, David J. Chase & Malcolm J. Chase, Trustees, Durham, New Hampshire for an **APPLICATION FOR VARIANCES** from Article IV, Section 175-27(B) and from Article III, Section 175-16(A) of

the Zoning Ordinance to build an attached two-car garage and connecting breezeway on a nonconforming lot and within the fifty-foot side-yard setback. The property involved is shown on Tax Map 20, Lot 16-1, is located at 271 Durham Point Road, and is in the RC, Residence Coastal Zoning District.

Chair Annis opened the Public Hearing

David Chase gave a brief overview of this application. He spoke about the history of the property. He spoke about the garage and breezeway he would like to build and stated that he was seeking relief from both a sideline setback and the lot size requirement. He stated that there was a tree buffer between his property and that of the abutter on the side where he wants to build within the sideline setback. He stated that this abutter has given their approval on the condition that none of the buffer is removed. He also spoke about the common land easement that he has rights to that he feels should be part of his lot size calculation.

Jane Towle asked about the letter from the abutter, and Jerry Chase distributed copies of this letter from the Williams family.

In response to a question from Jane Towle, David Chase stated that the roof ridgeline of the garage would not exceed the roof ridgeline of the house.

Chair Annis closed the Public Hearing.

Robin Rousseau stated that she would support approving the variance because she felt the proposed addition would not impact the environment or increase residential density.

Jane Towle stated that she felt granting the variance would not be in conflict with the ordinance.

John deCampi stated that he had no problem granting relief from the lot size requirement. He stated that he did have an issue with granting the sideline variance because the ordinance prescribes a very specific sideline setback. He also stated that he understands that there may not be an alternate location for the garage.

Linn Bogle stated that he believed that there was probably no alternative location appropriate for the garage. He stated he had no problem with allowing the variance in lieu of the abutters' agreement.

Jane Towle MOVED to grant the petition submitted by M.J. Chase Revocable Trust, David J. Chase & Malcolm J. Chase, Trustees, Durham, New Hampshire for an APPLICATION FOR VARIANCES from Article IV, Section 175-27(B) and from Article III, Section 175-16(A) of the Zoning Ordinance to build an attached two-car garage and connecting breezeway on a nonconforming lot and within the fifty-foot side-yard setback. The property involved is shown on Tax Map 20, Lot 16-1, is located at 271 Durham Point Road, and is in the RC, Residence Coastal Zoning District. With the condition that any vegetation to be removed would have the approval of Robert K. Williams, on behalf of John N. Williams and Robert P. Williams III or subsequent occupant of the property.

John deCampi suggested that the condition prohibiting removal of vegetation not be included in the motion.

Jane Towle rescinded the condition included in the motion restricting vegetation removal.

David Chase offered to submit to the public record a letter of intent to protect the vegetation buffer on the side of the property where the garage will encroach on the sideline setback.

Jane Towle stated that she felt a letter of intent from Mr. Chase would be sufficient.

John deCampi SECONDED the motion.

The Board reviewed the following criteria, which must be met before the Board can grant a variance:

1. No decrease in the value of surrounding properties would be suffered. **AGREED 5-0**
2. Granting the variance must not be contrary to the public interest. **AGREED 5-0**
3. Denial of the variance would result in unnecessary hardship to the owner seeking it. **AGREED 5-0**
4. By granting the variance substantial justice would be done. **AGREED 5-0**
5. The use must not be contrary to the spirit and intent of the Ordinance. **AGREED 5-0**

The motion PASSED unanimously.

IV. **PUBLIC HEARING** on a petition submitted by Thomas J. & Kim L. Schlessinger, Durham, New Hampshire for an **APPLICATION FOR VARIANCES** from Article IV, Section 175-28(B) and from Article III, Section 175-16(A) of the Zoning Ordinance to build a shed addition and an above-ground pool on a nonconforming lot. The property involved is shown on Tax Map 16, Lot 10-1, is located at 228 Longmarsh Road, and is in the R, Rural Zoning District.

Chair Annis opened the Public Hearing

Thomas Schlessinger gave a brief overview of the application. He stated that he was a new resident of Durham and was unaware that he needed a building permit to add a small shed and a pool and pool deck to his property. He stated that Thomas Johnson notified him of this as well as told him he would have to deny a building permit request based on the fact that his lot was nonconforming. He stated the shed will be built attached to the house where there previously was a shed.

Donna Heald, 220 Longmarsh Rd (abutter), stated that she wanted to express concern about the pool causing traffic or noise, and spoke about a few incidents with the Schlessinger's guests parking on the road. She stated that she did not want to protest allowing the pool, rather she wanted assurance that it would not have an impact on the rural nature of the neighborhood.

Mr. Schlessinger stated that he did not realize that parking on the street had become an issue and assured her that this would not continue to be an issue.

Chair Annis closed the Public Hearing

Robin Rousseau stated that it seemed the abutters did not have a problem with allowing the additions and as a result she would have no issue supporting approval of the variance.

John deCampi stated that he had no issue with allowing the additions. He asked about the penalty for building without a permit.

Tom Johnson stated that if there was continued noncompliance by the applicant that a penalty would be appropriate, but this was not the case.

Jane Towle MOVED to grant the a petition submitted by Thomas J. & Kim L. Schlessinger, Durham, New Hampshire for an APPLICATION FOR VARIANCES from Article IV, Section 175-28(B) and from Article III, Section 175-16(A) of the Zoning Ordinance to build a shed addition and an above-ground pool on a nonconforming lot. The property involved is shown on Tax Map 16, Lot 10-1, is located at 228 Longmarsh Road, and is in the R, Rural Zoning District. John deCampi SECONDED the motion.

The Board reviewed the following criteria, which must be met before the Board can grant a variance:

1. No decrease in the value of surrounding properties would be suffered. **AGREED 5-0**
2. Granting the variance must not be contrary to the public interest. **AGREED 5-0**
3. Denial of the variance would result in unnecessary hardship to the owner seeking it. **AGREED 5-0**
4. By granting the variance substantial justice would be done. **AGREED 5-0**
5. The use must not be contrary to the spirit and intent of the Ordinance. **AGREED 5-0**

The motion PASSED unanimously

- V. **PUBLIC HEARING** on a petition submitted by Larry & Janet Nicoludis, Durham, New Hampshire for an **APPLICATION FOR VARIANCES** from Article IV, Section 175-25(B) and from Article III, Section 175-16(A) of the Zoning Ordinance to expand on a screened porch on a nonconforming lot. The property involved is shown on Tax Map 21, Lot 13-0, is located at 26 Sumac Lane and is in the RA, Residence A Zoning District.

Chair Annis opened the Public Hearing.

There was no one present to speak about the application.

The members of the Board discussed how to proceed in lieu of the applicant's absence.

John deCampi stated that he felt it was not necessary to have the applicant present to proceed with this application.

Chair Annis stated that he had no problem with proceeding on this item without the applicant present.

Chair Annis closed the Public Hearing.

Robin Rousseau stated that she was not comfortable voting on this matter without the applicant having a chance to give a presentation. She suggested continuing this item until the next meeting.

Jane Towle stated that she felt it was unnecessary to delay deliberation on this application until the next meeting. She stated that there may be an issue if the Board does not deliberate on this application for reason of the applicant's absence, when it is not required that the applicant be present for the meeting.

John deCampi MOVED to grant the petition submitted by Larry & Janet Nicoludis, Durham, New Hampshire for an APPLICATION FOR VARIANCES from Article IV, Section 175-25(B) and from Article III, Section 175-16(A) of the Zoning Ordinance to expand on a screened porch on a nonconforming lot. The property involved is shown on Tax Map 21, Lot 13-0, is located at 26 Sumac Lane and is in the RA, Residence A Zoning District. Jane Towle SECONDED the motion.

Linn Bogle suggested that if the Board wants to require an applicant to be present at the meeting that such language should be incorporated into the application.

Robin Rousseau stated that she would be abstaining from the vote because she would like see the applicant and know their intent as a matter of procedure before voting on this application.

The Board reviewed the following criteria, which must be met before the Board can grant a variance:

1. No decrease in the value of surrounding properties would be suffered. **AGREED 4-0-1 (Robin Rousseau abstained)**
2. Granting the variance must not be contrary to the public interest. **AGREED 4-0-1 (Robin Rousseau abstained)**
3. Denial of the variance would result in unnecessary hardship to the owner seeking it. **AGREED 4-0-1 (Robin Rousseau abstained)**
4. By granting the variance substantial justice would be done. **AGREED 4-0-1 (Robin Rousseau abstained)**
5. The use must not be contrary to the spirit and intent of the Ordinance. **AGREED 4-0-1 (Robin Rousseau abstained)**

The motion PASSED on a vote of 4-0-1 (Robin Rousseau abstained because the applicant was not in attendance at the meeting).

Chair Annis declared a 5 minute recess at 8:25PM

- VI. **PUBLIC HEARING** on a petition submitted by Michael J. Sievert, PE, of MJS Engineering, Newmarket, New Hampshire on behalf of Edward Ricker, Durham, New Hampshire for an **APPLICATION FOR VARIANCES** from Article IV, Section 175-28(B) and from Article III, Section 175-16(A) of the Zoning Ordinance to build a larger single family home in the same location as the current single family home on a nonconforming lot. The property involved is shown on Tax Map 19, Lot 2-0, is located at 110 Dame Road, and is in the R, Rural Zoning District.

Chair Annis opened the Public Hearing

Mike Sievert gave an overview of the application. He spoke about the proposed plan to upgrade the house on Mr. Ricker's property as well as the septic system. He stated that the issue was only that the lot's nonconformity was due to its size, and that there would be no increased violation with the proposed upgrade.

John deCampi expressed concern about the proximity of the house to Dame Road, should the road be enlarged in the future. He suggested that the house might be moved back a bit.

In response to a question from Linn Bogle, Mr. Sievert stated that the leach field would be beyond the ledge and raised and the septic system would be an innovative system, which is cleaner and smaller than a conventional system. He also stated that the septic area location would not be subject to flooding even in a 50 year storm, which he knew because he had studied this area during work on the Gonet Subdivision project.

Chair Annis closed the Public Hearing.

Jane Towle stated that she would have no problem granting the variance because there was no increased violation, and because the septic system proposed is better than the existing system.

Robin Rousseau stated that she has no problem with granting the variance because it would be an improvement of the current situation on the property.

Jane Towle MOVED to grant the petition submitted by Michael J. Severest, PE, of MJS Engineering, Newmarket, New Hampshire on behalf of Edward Ricker, Durham, New Hampshire for an APPLICATION FOR VARIANCES from Article IV, Section 175-28(B) and from Article III, Section 175-16(A) of the Zoning Ordinance to build a larger single family home in the same location as the current single family home on a nonconforming lot. The property involved is shown on Tax Map 19, Lot 2-0, is located at 110 Dame Road, and is in the R, Rural Zoning District. Linn Bogle SECONDED the motion.

Tom Johnson requested that the Board qualify the footprint size.

Jane Towle added "with the condition that the footprint of the home be no larger than 30'x 50'" to the motion.

The Board reviewed the following criteria, which must be met before the Board can grant a variance:

1. No decrease in the value of surrounding properties would be suffered. **AGREED 5-0**
2. Granting the variance must not be contrary to the public interest. **AGREED 5-0**
3. Denial of the variance would result in unnecessary hardship to the owner seeking it. **AGREED 5-0**
4. By granting the variance substantial justice would be done. **AGREED 5-0**
5. The use must not be contrary to the spirit and intent of the Ordinance. **AGREED 5-0**

The motion PASSED unanimously

VI. **PUBLIC HEARING** on a petition submitted by Joe Caldarola of Smithfield Construction, Portsmouth, New Hampshire, for an **APPLICATION FOR VARIANCE** from Article IV, Section 175-25(B) of the Zoning Ordinance to place a mail shed within the ten-foot front-yard setback. The property involved is shown on Tax Map 1, Lot 16-7, is located on Fitts Farm Drive, and is in the RA, Residence A Zoning District.

Chair Annis opened the Public Hearing

The applicant was not in attendance to make a presentation.

Tom Johnson spoke briefly about the application. He stated that mailboxes were part of the approved Fitts Farm site plan. He stated the issue was with an open front shed that was built to shelter the mailboxes that was not on the approved site plan.

In response to a question from Robin Rousseau, Jane Towle stated that Mr. Caldarola was the owner on record with the Town of the Fitts Farm property, and was also the developer and builder of the development.

Chair Annis closed the Public Hearing

Jane Towle MOVED to grant the petition submitted by Joe Caldarola of Smithfield Construction, Portsmouth, New Hampshire, for an APPLICATION FOR VARIANCE from Article IV, Section 175-25(B) of the Zoning Ordinance to place a mail shed within the ten-foot front-yard setback. The property involved is shown on Tax Map 1, Lot 16-7, is located on Fitts Farm Drive, and is in the RA, Residence A Zoning District. John deCampi SECONDED the motion.

Robin Rousseau stated that she would be abstaining from the vote because the applicant was not in attendance to make a presentation of the application.

The Board reviewed the following criteria, which must be met before the Board can grant a variance:

1. No decrease in the value of surrounding properties would be suffered. **AGREED 4-0-1 (Robin Rousseau abstained)**
2. Granting the variance must not be contrary to the public interest. **AGREED 4-0-1 (Robin Rousseau abstained)**
3. Denial of the variance would result in unnecessary hardship to the owner seeking it. **AGREED 4-0-1 (Robin Rousseau abstained)**
4. By granting the variance substantial justice would be done. **AGREED 4-0-1 (Robin Rousseau abstained)**
5. The use must not be contrary to the spirit and intent of the Ordinance. **AGREED 4-0-1 (Robin Rousseau abstained)**

The motion PASSED on a vote of 4-0-1 (Robin Rousseau abstained)

VII. **REQUEST FOR REHEARING** on a May 14, 2002, decision whereas the Durham Zoning Board denied a petition submitted by Marcel E. Lavoie, Beverly Lyndes, Helen Morse, and Maria Russell, Durham, New Hampshire for an **APPEAL OF ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION** to permit the building of a duplex on a lot. The petition for a request for rehearing is submitted by David Meyer, Durham, New Hampshire and Jan Nisbet, Durham, New Hampshire. The property involved is shown on Tax Map 2, Lot 8-6, is located at 5 Madbury Court, and is in the RA, Residence A Zoning District.

Jane Towle recused herself from this discussion

Chair Annis asked the Board if they believed there was enough new information to justify a rehearing.

John deCampi stated that he felt there should be a rehearing on this item because the ordinance permits one. He stated that he was having an issue with the fact that the Zoning Ordinance permits a duplex, as well as any other use permitted in the RA district, on this size lot with proper setback compliance. He stated that the benefit of having the rehearing is that new issues may be revealed.

Linn Bogle stated that he had concerns relating to the small size of Madbury Court and how an increase in traffic, residents, and parking as a result of the duplex might have a serious impact on safety.

Robin Rousseau stated that she felt the material submitted protesting the duplex was pertinent to a variance, rather than rebutting the administrative decision. She stated that she had read something in the petition about an ownership issue, and she felt that would be an appropriate issue to address in a rehearing.

Chair Annis recognized Roger Burlingame, representing Mr. Macklin, the owner of the property.

Mr. Burlingame stated that he did not believe the Board had a valid request for rehearing because the parties seeking a rehearing are not qualified to do so according to RSA 677 (2) and (3). He stated that although the abutters submitted the original petition for appeal, they were not party to the petition requesting rehearing.

David Meyer stated that he is a party to the petition for rehearing and is an abutter.

Mr. Burlingame stated that he did not feel Mr. Meyer had outlined a rebuttal to the Board's previous decision in his petition, rather he submitted information pertinent to the proceedings on the appeal.

Robin Rousseau stated that the definition of abutter as referenced in RSA 677 (2) and (3) had been expanded in recent legislation, and defined an abutter also as "anyone who is able to demonstrate that his land will be directly affected by the proposal under consideration."

Annmarie Harris, 56 Oyster River Road, stated that she felt it was inappropriate that the public was speaking during this deliberation.

Chair Annis stated that Ms. Harris was correct, and he requested a motion be made.

Robin Rousseau attempted to make a motion to accept the request for rehearing. She stated that the premise for her motion to rehear would be that additional information was submitted pertaining to the owner of the property on record with the town. She attempted to determine who had submitted this information.

John deCampi stated that he believed that Mr. Meyer's letter of July 2 had divulged this information.

Robin Rousseau MOVED to grant the REQUEST FOR REHEARING on a May 14, 2002, decision whereas the Durham Zoning Board denied a petition submitted by Marcel E. Lavoie, Beverly Lyndes, Helen Morse, and Maria Russell, Durham, New Hampshire for an APPEAL OF ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION to permit the building of a duplex on a lot, because of new evidence submitted by David Meyer regarding ownership of record for the property in question. The petition for a request for rehearing is submitted by David Meyer, Durham, New Hampshire and Jan Nisbet, Durham, New Hampshire. The property involved is shown on Tax Map 2, Lot 8-6, is located at 5 Madbury Court, and is in the RA, Residence A Zoning District.

Chair Annis stated that he believed the premise for granting the request for rehearing as moved was invalid because David Meyer was not party to the original petition. He suggested a valid premise would include one of the parties to the original petition.

John deCampi stated that it seemed to him that an abutter has standing to request a rehearing, not just someone who was party to the original petition.

The Board discussed the validity of using the evidence provided by the abutter not party to the original petition as premise for granting the request for rehearing. They also discussed whether consulting with legal counsel about this matter would be appropriate.

Robin Rousseau suggested continuing this deliberation to the next meeting so that it may be determined the appropriate premise for a motion to accept the request for rehearing and such can be specified.

Robin Rousseau MOVED to continue deliberation on the REQUEST FOR REHEARING on a decision whereas the Durham Zoning Board denied a petition for an APPEAL OF ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION.

Chair Annis asked if the time limit for rehearing the petition would expire should deliberation on this item be continued.

Tom Johnson stated that the time limit applied to the parties filing the petition for rehearing, not to the rehearing itself.

The motion PASSED unanimously.

The Board discussed scheduling of the deliberation on the rehearing. They concluded that the deliberation would continue at the next meeting as the first item on the agenda.

VIII. Approval of Minutes –

The Board discussed the minutes from June 11, 2002

Robin Rousseau stated that on page 7, 3rd paragraph from the bottom of the page, she felt that the criteria for “structure” should be specified.

Chair Annis suggested adding, “attached to the ground” to the end of the sentence in question. Robin Rousseau agreed with this suggestion.

Linn Bogle stated that on page 5, in the review of criteria #2 for granting a variance, the vote contained a typo stating it was “4-0-2”, and should read “4-0-1”.

Jane Towle MOVED to approve the minutes from June 11, 2002 as amended. Robin Rousseau SECONDED the motion and it PASSED unanimously.

The Board discussed the minutes from April 9, 2002

Robin Rousseau stated that in her statement on page 3, the 4th paragraph from the bottom, should be included “She stated that she researched the additional encroachment of a larger system by calling Epping Septic. She stated that they told her that a larger system would require more space and increase the violation further in the Shoreland Protection Zone.

Jane Towle MOVED to approve the minutes from April 9, 2002 as amended. John deCampi SECONDED the motion and it PASSED unanimously.

IX. Other Business

Tom Johnson stated that Jim Campbell, Town Planner, would like the Chair to come and meet with him to review some information from the last meeting. He also reported that no one attended the workshop last week.

John deCampi stated that he found the recent sitewalk he attended to be very helpful, and asked if there would be a way to have regular group visits to certain sites scheduled on the agenda prior to the meetings.

The Board discussed John deCampi’s suggestion to tour sites regularly before the meeting. They discussed the propriety of meeting as a group outside of the meeting time. They

resolved that doing this may be difficult because of issues relating to legality and time constraints on the members.

Robin Rousseau asked about the Planning Office's advisement of the applicants that the Board has been reviewing.

Tom Johnson stated that the Planning Staff answers any questions applicants may have about the Zoning Ordinance or application procedure.

Roger Burlingame, representing Paul Macklin owner of property at 5 Madbury Ct, requested that the Board schedule the rehearing for the Appeal of Administrative Decision as an item on the agenda after the deliberation on if the rehearing will occur.

John deCampi stated that he had an issue with this suggestion.

Robin Rousseau stated that she felt it would not be inappropriate to schedule the rehearing anticipating a decision to rehear because it was at the request of the party who was opposed to the rehearing.

Mr. Burlingame stated that he would be willing to risk any momentum resulting from scheduling the rehearing rather than to unnecessarily prolong resolution of the matter.

Jane Towle stated that they have, in the past, scheduled a rehearing that would occur immediately following deliberation on the acceptance of a request for rehearing.

Linn Bogle suggested that the scheduling on the agenda be worded clearly so there will be no public confusion.

Annmarie Harris, 56 Oyster River Road, spoke to request that the Zoning Board allow their meetings be aired on the DCAT channel.

Chair Annis informed Ms. Harris that they had discussed this matter with the Town Administrator earlier. The Board told her that they were informed that meetings would be airing soon. Chair Annis mentioned that the Board is interested in having the meetings aired live and he encouraged Ms. Harris as a member of the Town Council, to support funding for such an effort.

John deCampi stated that he was having an issue attending the Zoning Rewrite Committee meetings. He requested that someone else be appointed to take his place as a Rep from the Zoning Board.

X. Adjournment

Chair Annis adjourned the meeting at 9:50 PM.