NOTTINGHAM ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT July 16, 2019

- 1 Approved: September 17, 2019
- 2 **Members Present:** Bonnie Winona-MacKinnon, Chair; Teresa Bascom, vice-Chair; Terry
- 3 Bonser; Peter White; Kevin Bassett, Alternate
- 4 **Members Absent:** Realene Shippee-Rice
- 5 Others Present: JoAnna Arendarczyk, Land Use Clerk; Wendy Greenleaf, Abutter; Dale Sylvia,
- 6 Building Inspector
- 7 **Call to order:** 7:01pm

8

- 9 Applicant was not present at the opening of the meeting. The Chair adjusted the agenda to vote
- on the minutes.
- 11 Minutes
- 12 May 21, 2019
- 13 **Motion Made By:** Mrs. Bascom to approve the minutes as amended.
- 14 **Seconded by:** Mr. Mr. Bonser
- 15 Vote: 4-0-1 Motion Passed

16

17 June 18, 2019- noted in error on the agenda

18

20

- 19 Building Inspector, Dale Sylvia, introduced himself to the Board.
- 21 Land Use Clerk called the applicant, Dawn Fernald who stated she wasn't aware her presence
- was required for the hearing. She requested the Board hear the case and base their decision on the information in the letter she submitted with her application.
- 24 **Public Hearing**
- 25 **Public Hearing Opened:** 7:17pm
- 26 Case 19-005-AA
- 27 Application from Joe and Dawn Fernald, requesting an Appeal to an Administrative Decision
- 28 made by the Building Inspector on June 20, 2019. The decision is in regards to enforcement of
- 29 the Zoning Ordinance Article IV Section W.9a &b The properties are located on Raymond Road
- 30 in Nottingham NH and are identified as Tax Map 64 Lot1 and Lot 1 Sub 5 and Tax Map 66 Lot 1
- 31 Sub 3 and Lot1 Sub 4.
- 32 The Chair read the applicants letter submitted with the application (File).
- **Board Discussion:**
- 34 The applicant's letter pointed out the language noted in the Zoning Ordinance Article IV, Section
- W. 9.b which the Board discussed whether that led points to an exemption. The Board discussed
- another point that was mentioned in the letter, past Subdivisions that have received waivers/
- exemptions, as well as the topic of "grandfathering".
- 38 Mrs. Bascom and Mr. Bassett agreed that a discussion about the previous developments should
- 39 not be applicable to this case including what the other Building Inspectors said or did because
- 40 that looks at precedence which is not anything the Zoning Board should be looking at.
- 41 Mrs. Bascom also stated that there is no such thing as "grandfathering", that term was removed
- 42 from the Zoning Ordinance in March. The Chair stated "that is semantics, it is still a commonly
- 43 used word to express the notion that things are exempt if they existed before the ordinance."
- The applicant's letter also noted a difficulty in selling the lots. However, proof of this hardship
- 45 was not given.

NOTTINGHAM ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT July 16, 2019

- The topic of hardship raised the question as to what criteria should be applied to a case like this.
- 47 The Land Use Clerk stated that criteria is not given for Administrative Appeals, the Board is to
- look at the facts and determine if based on the facts the request should be denied or approved.
- 49 **Public Comment:**
- 50 The Building Inspector, Dale Sylvia, spoke to his interpretation of the RSA and the Town
- Zoning Ordinance which led to his decision to apply the Impact Fee. He agreed with Mrs.
- Bascom that "grandfathering" indeed does not exist, whether the applicant used it or not. There
- is a five year exemption after the passing of the Impact Fee Ordinance which ended in March of
- 54 2016. The exceptions have some specific requirements, such as a majority of the project being
- done. Mr. Sylvia stated that neither the applicant nor the Town could produce anything in
- writing stating that a waiver for the Impact Fee was ever granted.
- 57 An internal meeting had been held regarding the Impact Fee for 108 Raymond Road. Although
- 58 the decision was not put in writing, staff (although the final decision was his own as the new
- 59 Building Inspector at the time, and not knowing the full history of the development) decided to
- waive the fee for 108 Raymond Road due to the lack of proof as to whether the applicants were
- 61 informed of the requirement to pay the fee. However, future builds would require payment of
- the Impact Fee due to the 5 year exemption after Impact Fees were voted in by the Town having
- 63 expired in 2016.
- He added that the cistern being a Capital Improvement could be taken into consideration. He
- went further to add that residential sprinklers are often accepted in exchange for a cistern but that
- may not necessarily be the case with this subdivision.
- 67 Mr. Sylvia was asked if he could comment on his knowledge regarding the Langdon/ Falzone
- subdivision. What he knows is that the five year exemption was granted however he doesn't
- 69 know what that timeline is for certain. He concluded that he doesn't have the full details before
- 70 him and that he cannot speak to the past.
- 71 Mr. Sylvia stated that there is a plan to include new verbiage indicating that "Impact Fees will
- apply" on the Building Permits. Mrs. Bascom suggested having that note signed by the applicant
- 73 to indicate the applicant read and understands it.
- 74 The Chair stated that if the Board agrees to have a legal opinion on the case, than she will contact
- 75 the Town Administrator regarding the issue; due to the unique qualities of this application,
- 76 specifically, no applicant or representative was present which had not happened in anyone's
- 77 memory. Additionally the Board had no experience with questions of this nature; Impact Fee
- 78 waivers in a partially completed subdivision which began before the Impact Fee Ordinance, as
- well as no guidelines from which to draw a conclusion as is provided with Variances and Special
- 80 Exception applications. This was agreed to by a consensus.
- 81 Mr. Sylvia asked the Board- If this were to be considered to be overturned what would the
- 82 implications be to future applications in respect to impact fees? The Chair stated that the Board
- doesn't set precedence therefore it would not affect future applications.
- 84 Wendy Greenleaf of 93 Raymond Rd.- Stated that she agreed with Mr. White in that the
- applicants are seeking to get out of the Impact Fees. Additionally, she stated the applicants
- inappropriately pointed out other people's business. The cistern issue is in her opinion the "cost
- of doing business". If the project had been completed by 2016 the case would not be before the
- 88 Board. Ms. Greenleaf recommends that the Board deny the request.
- 89 **Public Comment Closed:** 8:10pm

NOTTINGHAM ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT July 16, 2019

- 91 **Motion Made By:** Ms. MacKinnon to continue the case to the next regularly scheduled August
- 92 20th meeting at 7pm "and consult with an attorney about guidance or making decisions in cases, I
- 93 mean, all of the cases are objecting a decision usually made by a building inspector but this one
- 94 is asking for a decision in an area that we don't have guidelines for."
- 95 **Discussion:** Mr. Sylvia asked if the Board wanted him to attend the next meeting. The Board
- agreed his presence as well as the applicant's presence would be appropriate.
- 97 **Seconded By:** Mr. Bonser
- 98 **Vote:** 4-1-0 **Motion Passed**
- 99 Staff/ Board Members Update

100

- 101 **ADJOURNMENT**
- 102 **Motion Made By:** Mrs. Bascom
- 103 **Seconded By:** Mr. White
- 104 **Vote:** 5-0-0 **Motion Passed**
- 105 **Adjourn at:** 8:17pm
- For the Nottingham Zoning Board of Adjustment
- 107 JoAnna Arendarczyk; Land Use Clerk