



# ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT BELMONT, NH

Wednesday, November 17, 2021  
Belmont Mill & Zoom  
Belmont, NH 03220

Members Present: Chairman Peter Harris; Vice Chair Norma Patten; Members David Dunham  
Mark Mastenbrook and Sharon Ciampi.

Alternates Present: John Froumy.

Staff: Elaine Murphy, Candace Daigle and Sarah Whearty.

The Chairman opened the meeting at 6pm and welcomed those in attendance. He announced that the Belmont Selectmen have adopted a mask mandate for public buildings. He announced that as Chairman of the Belmont Zoning Board of Adjustment, this public body is authorized to meet using electronic means. He said that the Board gave notice to the public of the necessary information for accessing the meeting using Zoom or telephone, and he announced that any party experiencing any difficulty in accessing the meeting at any point, should call 603-267-8300 x 101, and the meeting will be recessed until access can be restored for all parties.

The Chairman appointed John Froumy as a voting member for tonight's meeting. He asked the Board to start the meeting by taking a roll call attendance, with each attendee stating their name and that they report if they are attending via Zoom.

Chairman Peter Harris, meeting room

Norma Patten, zoom

Mark Mastenbrook, meeting room

John Froumy, meeting room

David Dunham, meeting room

Sharon Ciampi, meeting room

Sarah Whearty, Candace Daigle and Elaine Murphy meeting room

## **ABUTTERS HEARING – JENNIFER BOUCHARD FOR SUNSET BEACH**

**CONDOMINIUM:** Continuation of a request for two Variances of Article 5 Table 2 of the Zoning Ordinance to allow a carport.

A. Closer (4.3') to the side property line than allowed (25'). ZBA # 3621Z

B. Closer (19.4') to an unrelated structure (garage) than allowed (30'). ZBA  
#3721Z

Property is located at 72 Sunset Drive in an "RS" Zone, Tax Lot 107-150-000-002.

Mr. & Mrs. Chris Bouchard, Atty. Philip Hastings and Mr. Norman Skantze presented the application.

Fire Chief Mike Newhall and Assistant Fire Chief Deb Black were also present.

C. Daigle asked Atty. Hastings if he wanted to continue with N. Patten attending via zoom as she lost her zoom connection at the last meeting. N. Patten stated that she has read the minutes of the last meeting and is up to date on the case. Atty. Hastings stated they would proceed with N. Patten as a sitting member of the Board.

Atty. Hastings stated that Fire Chief Newhall met with Mr. Chris Bouchard and Mr. Norman Skantze on site. The Fire Chief stated that he has no problems with this standing structure. It is made of noncombustible material and does not impede firefighting. He is comfortable with the proposal at this time.

S. Ciampi stated that we send every application out to the Town's Departments and there was no response from the Fire Department on this application. The Fire Chief stated that there was a misunderstanding and miscommunication on the procedure but that has been corrected and will move forward in the future.

J. Froumy explained that at the conclusion of the last meeting all that was needed was to make a determination was to get the Fire Department's input.

P. Harris stated this is a difficult application because they are reducing the setback by a large number. He has been on the Board for a long time and similar variance request have been denied. There have been comments made that there have been smaller units on smaller lots that have been denied based on similar situations. We have to take into consideration the expert's opinions and make a determination solely on the merits of this request.

J. Froumy wanted to know if the Board grants the variances would the applicant object to conditions that the structure could not be enclosed. The Fire Chief stated that Mr. Bouchard assured him that there would be no changes to the structure, the structure would not have walls or be turned into a garage. J. Froumy stated he is concern about a dumpster or something similar that could impede access for the fire department. S. Ciampi stated that the variance stays with the property and not the owner. She stated she would not want anyone putting anything 4' from her property. J. Froumy agreed he wouldn't want anything within 4' of his property either but the issue is the ordinance, the law, and the purpose of the law. S. Ciampi stated that overcrowding is the issue. J. Froumy stated we can't quantify what overcrowding is it is subjective. The RSAs guide us and clarify what is and is not allowable. It gives us some way to look at it. We can't just give a number to overcrowding.

M. Mastenbrook stated they are here because the applicant built without a permit. If it was denied prior to building they would not be here for a third time. He stated that he made the motion to deny the application because of overcrowding and space issues. We have stopped other projects in Mallards Landing and Winnisquam Beach Association because of overcrowding. He is concerned that they are going to overturn their decision because the Fire Department attended tonight's

meeting. In his opinion nothing that has been presented has changed since the first meeting. We have a 25' setback and they want a 4' setback. They would not be here if the Fire Department had commented at the first meeting and the applicant didn't build it without a permit. D. Dunham stated that on a personal issue he had a neighbor that was before the Board because his pool was only 3.6' from his property and they were granted relief. Fire Chief Newhall stated realistically it is not in the realm of the fire department to address zoning issues. They didn't have issue with this proposal. M. Mastenbrook stated that he is concern that they are setting a precedence because this is the first time, since he has been on the Board, that the Fire Department is here and we are changing direction because they are here. Fire Chief Newhall stated that the Board asked him to attend the meeting.

Atty. Hastings stated that even though the Board denied the original application they went through the proper channels to get here tonight. When the application was denied, they applied for a rehearing and that was granted. They then submitted a new application and that is what is before the Board tonight. At the last meeting the chairman closed the public hearing to allow the Fire Department to give their professional opinion on fire safety.

P. Harris stated they are here to determine if the carport is too close to the property line and abutting structure. They cannot expand the carport without coming back to the Board. They have looked at the parking with and without the carport. They have to look at this case as if the carport was not built, not that it was built without a permit. There is no bathroom or storage in this structure.

J. Froumy stated that M. Mastenbrook is having an issue with the 4' from the property line. The objective is for safety and that is why the Fire Chief is here. They have to look at substantial justice and the welfare of the abutters and if their rights have been violated. The neighbors commented that they are in favor of the proposal and they don't feel that their common rights are violated. No one's public rights have been violated.

The meeting paused at 6:30pm as N. Patten disconnected and reconvened at 6:38 pm with N. Patten via zoom. N. Patten explained that the last she heard was J. Froumy talking about the public rights. It was the consensus that she did not miss any of the meeting.

J. Froumy stated the most difficult criteria is the last one, unnecessary hardship. To meet that criteria they have to successfully distinguish the uniqueness of the property from others in the area. At the last meeting Atty. Hastings mentioned that it is a condominium that borders the property line. There is little room to put a carport or any other structure. The carport is a reasonable use of the property. J. Froumy stated the condominium survey shows the property is 50' wide by 100'-104' deep. They granted other variances to shoreline properties but that doesn't set precedent. We look at the uniqueness of each lot. He compared the lots along Tucker Shore Road and noted that 15 out of 20 lots are larger. They are deeper and that addresses the uniqueness criteria. A reasonable use of the property has to be considered. The dimensions of the property is the bases for uniqueness, there are only five other lots that are smaller than this property.

There being no further questions or comments the chairman closed the public hearing.

### **BOARD ACTION – JENNIFER BOUCHARD FOR SUNSET BEACH CONDOMINIUM:**

**MOTION:** J. Froumy moved to grant approval for a Variances of Article 5 Table 2 of the Zoning Ordinance to allow a carport a closer (4.3') to the side property line than allowed (25') as it meets all the criteria.

1. The variance will not be contrary to the public interest because it does not alter the essential character or the neighborhood and is similar to others in the neighborhood. It is one of the smaller lots in the area. They cannot alter the addition. Overcrowding is a concern if it is an occupied structure. This structure is open and will not be occupied per discussion between the applicant and the Fire Department. It is not contrary to the public interest or rights of the neighbors as it is the collative opinion of the neighbors that their rights are not interfered with.
2. The spirit of the ordinance is observed because it does not alter the essential character or the neighborhood and is similar to others in the neighborhood. It is one of the smaller lots in the area. They cannot alter the addition. Overcrowding is a concern if it is an occupied structure. This structure is open and will not be occupied per discussion between the applicant and the Fire Department. It is not contrary to the public interest or rights of the neighbors as it is the collative opinion of the neighbors that their rights are not interfered with.
3. Substantial justice will be done because it will be a benefit to the applicant and is not outweighed by loss to the public.
4. The variance would not diminish the value of surrounding properties because it is aesthetically pleasing. It is a stand-alone structure and will not diminish surrounding property values or interfere with fire safety.
5. Owing to special conditions of the property, that distinguish it from other properties in the area, denial of the variance would result in unnecessary hardship because of the following:
  - a. no fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purpose of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property because literal enforcement of the provisions of the ordinance would result in an unnecessary hardship. The propose use of a carport is reasonable because it is in the corner of the property. The size of the property 52' x 100' makes it unique. It is the smallest lot on the western shoreline of Sunset Drive for 2/3 of a mile. With smaller properties variances are allowed.  
and
  - b. the proposed use is a reasonable one because the structure is not fastened to the ground. There is access to go through or around the carport.

Additional conditions:

- A. No other structures or additions (incl. decks, porches, landings, etc.) that do not meet setback are allowed by this approval.
- B. No other fixed appliance, walls or anything fastened to the ground are allowed by this approval and things stored cannot impede access to the carport, fence or house.
- C. For reduced setbacks between structures, no fuel source or accessory structure shall be placed between the structures.
- D. Comply with Floodplain Ordinance.

- E. All representations made by the applicant during the public hearing are incorporated as a condition of this approval.
- F. The applicant and owner are solely responsible to comply with the approved plan and conditions of approval. Contractors should be sufficiently warned regarding same.
- G. Approval expires on 11/17/23 if use is not substantially acted on and if an extension is not granted. Approval also expires if use ceases for more than two years.
- H. Submit final plan sets (3 paper, 1 reduced). Submit one copy for approval prior to submitting all required copies. Make the following changes/corrections:
  - 1. In all instances where a tax map and lot number is used for condo units (subject lot, abutter, etc.), correct numbering sequence to map=107, lot=150, subplot=000, unit=004 etc.
  - 2. Note 2, there is no “parcel” area; remove .122ac note or identify it as limited common area. Within the graphic of the limited common area you have .111ac; correct one of these.
  - 3. Note 4 correct side setback to 25’. There is no rear setback on this lot. Delete second paragraph as this is not a preexisting, nonconforming lot.
  - 4. Use a different line type/identify limited common areas. These look like property (in fee) lines.
  - 5. In the title block identify as “A Condominium”.

The motion was seconded by D. Dunham and carried. Roll Call D. Dunham aye, P. Harris aye, J. Froumy aye, S. Ciampi nay and N. Patten nay. (3-2)

**MOTION:** J. Froumy moved to grant approval for a Variance of Article 5 Table 2 of the Zoning Ordinance to allow a carport closer (19.4’) to an unrelated structure (garage) than allowed (30’) as it meets all the criteria.

- 1. The variance will not be contrary to the public interest because it does not alter the essential character or the neighborhood and is similar to others in the neighborhood. It is one of the smaller lots in the area. They cannot alter the addition. Overcrowding is a concern if it is an occupied structure. This structure is open and will not be occupied per discussion between the applicant and the Fire Department. It is not contrary to the public interest or rights of the neighbors as it is the collative opinion of the neighbors that their rights are not interfered with.
- 2. The spirit of the ordinance is observed because it does not alter the essential character or the neighborhood and is similar to others in the neighborhood. It is one of the smaller lots in the area. They cannot alter the addition. Overcrowding is a concern if it is an occupied structure. This structure is open and will not be occupied per discussion between the applicant and the Fire Department. It is not contrary to the public interest or rights of the neighbors as it is the collative opinion of the neighbors that their rights are not interfered with.
- 3. Substantial justice will be done because it will be a benefit to the applicant and is not outweighed by loss to the public.
- 4. The variance would not diminish the value of surrounding properties because it is aesthetically pleasing. It is a stand-alone structure and will not diminish surrounding property values or interfere with fire safety.

5. Owing to special conditions of the property, that distinguish it from other properties in the area, denial of the variance would result in unnecessary hardship because of the following:
  - a. no fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purpose of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property because literal enforcement of the provisions of the ordinance would result in an unnecessary hardship. The proposed use of a carport is reasonable because it is in the corner of the property. The size of the property 52' x 100' makes it unique. It is the smallest lot on the western shoreline of Sunset Drive for 2/3 of a mile. With smaller properties variances are allowed.  
and
  - b. the proposed use is a reasonable one because the structure is not fastened to the ground. There is access to go through or around the carport.

Additional conditions:

- A. No other structures or additions (incl. decks, porches, landings, etc.) that do not meet setback are allowed by this approval.
- B. No other fixed appliance, walls or anything fastened to the ground allowed by this approval and things stored cannot impede access to the carport, fence or house.
- C. For reduced setbacks between structures, no fuel source or accessory structure shall be placed between the structures.
- D. Comply with Floodplain Ordinance.
- E. All representations made by the applicant during the public hearing are incorporated as a condition of this approval.
- F. The applicant and owner are solely responsible to comply with the approved plan and conditions of approval. Contractors should be sufficiently warned regarding same.
- G. Approval expires on 11/17/23 if use is not substantially acted on and if an extension is not granted. Approval also expires if use ceases for more than two years.
- H. Submit final plan sets (3 paper, 1 reduced). Submit one copy for approval prior to submitting all required copies. Make the following changes/corrections:
  1. In all instances where a tax map and lot number is used for condo units (subject lot, abutter, etc.), correct numbering sequence to map=107, lot=150, subplot=000, unit=004 etc.
  2. Note 2, there is no "parcel" area; remove .122ac note or identify it as limited common area. Within the graphic of the limited common area you have .111ac; correct one of these.
  3. Note 4 correct side setback to 25'. There is no rear setback on this lot. Delete second paragraph as this is not a preexisting, nonconforming lot.
  4. Use a different line type/identify limited common areas. These look like property (in fee) lines.
  5. In the title block identify as "A Condominium".

The motion was seconded by D. Dunham and carried. Roll Call D. Dunham aye, P. Harris aye, J. Froumy aye, S. Ciampi nay and N. Patten nay. (3-2)

**ABUTTERS HEARING – JEFFREY & HEATHER DEARDORFF:** Request for 3 Variances of Article 5 Table 2 of the Zoning Ordinance to construct two additions to a preexisting nonconforming single-family structure.

- A. Front-entry way closer (9.3') to the side property line than allowed (12.5'), not closer than the preexisting structure (6.5') but combined expansions exceed 40%. ZBA # 4221Z
- B. Front-entryway closer (14.1') to the front property line than allowed (50') existing setback (17.4'). ZBA # 4321Z
- C. Garage/expanded living area closer (26.6') to the front property line than allowed (50'), not closer than the preexisting structure (17.4') but combined expansions exceed 40%. ZBA # 4421Z

Property is located at 6 Rodin Road in an "RS" Zone, Tax Lot 111-055-000-000.

The chairman stated the following definition will be used to determine if the applications before the Board tonight have a regional impact. He explained that in order to provide timely notice, provide opportunities for input and consider the interests of other municipalities, the Board shall act to determine if the development has a potential regional impact as defined by RSA 36:55. Impacts may include, but are not limited to: relative size or number of dwelling units as compared with existing stock; proximity to the borders of a neighboring community; transportation networks; anticipated emissions such as light, noise, smoke, odors, or particles; proximity to aquifers or surface waters which transcend municipal boundaries; shared facilities such as schools and solid waste disposal facilities.

**MOTION:** P. Harris moved that the proposal does not have a potential regional impact.

The motion was seconded by N. Patten and carried. Roll Call D. Dunham aye, P. Harris aye, J. Froumy aye, S. Ciampi aye and N. Patten aye. (5-0)

The chairman read the history of the lot. August 6, 2021 there was a DES Shoreland permit application. The current owner purchased the property in December 2, 2010. October 2, 1998 there was a building permit for an addition. A Special Exception was granted September 16, 1998 for a one-story, 12'x 20' addition to the property closer to the sideline than allowed but not closer than the existing structure. In September 1996, there was a permit to remove a 8'x 8' shed. He stated the department responses included the Code Enforcement Officer response that it is the same as before everything is on top of each other as it is.

Mr. Jon Rokeh presented the application.

Mr. Rokeh stated that they have a shoreland permit to build the addition, upgrade the walkway and improve the landscaping. They have owned the property for the last 7 years.

The unique shape of the lot is the side property line angles towards the existing house. The house is located in the setbacks the same as others in the area. They want a covered front entry porch. The expansion is the only thing closer to Rodin Road. It will not impede traffic or pedestrians. The second part of the application is they want to park on the side of the house. They want to construct a garage. They are not creating an accessory apartment just an extension on the house. It is

a single-family not a rental. They want to have a spot on the side of the garage to park a camper. The side setbacks are 20' and they meet all the regulations. They are closer to the front setback because of the angle of the property line. The setback gets better as they go down the garage, they get further from Rodin Road. They are not parking cars on the street.

M. Mastenbrook wanted to make sure that there is no apartment above the garage. Mr. Rokeh stated there will be no separate living space or bathroom.

P. Harris stated this is preexisting in the front setback. Mr. Rokeh stated they are not changing that; they are trying to get the addition on the house at the rear of the property. J. Froumy stated the property drops off. Mr. Rokeh stated it is impossible for an addition anywhere else on the property this is the only flat area. This is a reasonable use of the property and is not a massive addition. They are consolidating everything into useable space in the house.

S. Ciampi wanted to know if the garage across the street belonged to them. Mr. Rokeh stated that it doesn't belong to them. S. Ciampi wanted to know where they are going to park the RV. Mr. Rokeh used the plan to show where the RV will be parked. It will be parked next to the garage.

The chairman opened the hearing to public comment. There being no questions or comments the chairman closed the public hearing.

### **BOARD ACTION – JEFFREY & HEATHER DEARDORFF:**

**MOTION:** J. Froumy moved to grant approval for a variance of Article 5 Table 2 of the Zoning Ordinance to construct an addition to a preexisting nonconforming single-family structure a front-entry way closer (9.3') to the side property line than allowed (12.5'), not closer than the preexisting structure (6.5') but combined expansions exceed 40%.as it meets all the criteria.

1. The variance will not be contrary to the public interest because it does not alter the essential character or the neighborhood or threaten the health, safety, general welfare of the public or the constitutional rights of the town.
2. The spirit of the ordinance is observed because it does not alter the essential character or the neighborhood or threaten the health, safety, general welfare of the public or the constitutional rights of the town.
3. Substantial justice will be done because denying the application will injure the applicant without any benefit to the public.
4. The variance would not diminish the value of surrounding properties because the applicant submitted architectural plans and the addition will be more in line with the abutting properties. It will be attractive and may enhance surrounding property values.
5. Owing to special conditions of the property, that distinguish it from other properties in the area, denial of the variance would result in unnecessary hardship because of the following:
  - a. no fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purpose of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the



property because behind the house there is a significant grade change. The northwest side of the house is the only option for the expansion.

and

- b. the proposed use is a reasonable one because the house is a reasonable size keeping with others in the neighborhood.

Additional conditions:

- A. All decks, steps, landings & stairs must be shown on the building permit application and no other structures or additions (incl. decks, porches, landings, etc.) that do not meet setback are allowed by this approval.
- B. Comply with all conditions of Shoreland Protection permit.
- C. All representations made by the applicant during the public hearing are incorporated as a condition of this approval.
- D. The applicant and owner are solely responsible to comply with the approved plan and conditions of approval. Contractors should be sufficiently warned regarding same.
- E. Living space to share a common wall with, and be open to preexisting living space. Proposed living space shall not contain independent cooking, bathroom and sleeping facilities. It shall not constitute a separate, independent housekeeping establishment for owner occupancy, rental or lease, and not be physically separated from other rooms of the preexisting dwelling unit.
- F. Submit 3 full-sized and 1 reduced-size copy of final stamped plan.
- G. Approval expires on 11/17/23 if use is not substantially acted on and if an extension is not granted. Approval also expires if use ceases for more than two years.

The motion was seconded by S. Ciampi and carried Roll Call D. Dunham aye, P. Harris aye, J. Froumy aye, S. Ciampi aye and N. Patten aye. (5-0)

**MOTION:** J. Froumy moved to grant approval for a variance of Article 5 Table 2 of the Zoning Ordinance to construct an addition to a preexisting nonconforming single-family structure a front-entryway closer (14.1') to the front property line than allowed (50') but not closer to the existing setback (17.4') as it meets all the criteria.

- 1. The variance will not be contrary to the public interest because it does not alter the essential character or the neighborhood or threaten the health, safety, general welfare of the public or the constitutional rights of the town.
- 2. The spirit of the ordinance is observed because it does not alter the essential character or the neighborhood or threaten the health, safety, general welfare of the public or the constitutional rights of the town.
- 3. Substantial justice will be done because denying the application will injure the applicant without any benefit to the public.
- 4. The variance would not diminish the value of surrounding properties because the applicant submitted architectural plans and the addition will be more inline with the abutting properties. It will be more attractive and may enhance surrounding property values.
- 5. Owing to special conditions of the property, that distinguish it from other properties

in the area, denial of the variance would result in unnecessary hardship because of the following:

a. no fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purpose of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property because behind the house there is a significant grade change. The northwest side of the house is the only options for the expansion.

and

b. the proposed use is a reasonable one because the house is a reasonable size keeping with others in the neighborhood.

Additional conditions:

- A. All decks, steps, landings & stairs must be shown on the building permit application and no other structures or additions (incl. decks, porches, landings, etc.) that do not meet setback are allowed by this approval.
- B. Comply with all conditions of Shoreland Protection permit.
- C. All representations made by the applicant during the public hearing are incorporated as a condition of this approval.
- D. The applicant and owner are solely responsible to comply with the approved plan and conditions of approval. Contractors should be sufficiently warned regarding same.
- E. Living space to share a common wall with, and be open to preexisting living space. Proposed living space shall not contain independent cooking, bathroom and sleeping facilities. It shall not constitute a separate, independent housekeeping establishment for owner occupancy, rental or lease, and not be physically separated from other rooms of the preexisting dwelling unit.
- F. Submit 3 full-sized and 1 reduced-size copy of final stamped plan.
- G. Approval expires on 11/17/23 if use is not substantially acted on and if an extension is not granted. Approval also expires if use ceases for more than two years.

The motion was seconded by S. Ciampi and carried Roll Call D. Dunham aye, P. Harris aye, J. Froumy aye, S. Ciampi aye and N. Patten aye. (5-0)

**MOTION:** J. Froumy moved to grant approval for a variance of Article 5 Table 2 of the Zoning Ordinance to construct an addition to a preexisting nonconforming single-family structure a garage/expanded living area closer (26.6') to the front property line than allowed (50'), not closer than the preexisting structure (17.4') but combined expansions exceed 40% as it meets all the criteria.

- 1. The variance will not be contrary to the public interest because it does not alter the essential character or the neighborhood or threaten the health, safety, general welfare of the public or the constitutional rights of the town.
- 2. The spirit of the ordinance is observed because it does not alter the essential character or the neighborhood or threaten the health, safety, general welfare of the public or the constitutional rights of the town.
- 3. Substantial justice will be done because denying the application will injure the applicant without any benefit to the public.

4. The variance would not diminish the value of surrounding properties because the applicant submitted architectural plans and the addition will be more in line with the abutting properties. It will be more attractive and may enhance surrounding property values.
5. Owing to special conditions of the property, that distinguish it from other properties in the area, denial of the variance would result in unnecessary hardship because of the following:
  - a. no fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purpose of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property because behind the house there is a significant grade change. The northwest side of the house is the only options for the expansion.
  - and
  - b. the proposed use is a reasonable one because the house is a reasonable size keeping with others in the neighborhood.

Additional conditions:

- A. All decks, steps, landings & stairs must be shown on the building permit application and no other structures or additions (incl. decks, porches, landings, etc.) that do not meet setback are allowed by this approval.
- B. Comply with all conditions of Shoreland Protection permit.
- C. All representations made by the applicant during the public hearing are incorporated as a condition of this approval.
- D. The applicant and owner are solely responsible to comply with the approved plan and conditions of approval. Contractors should be sufficiently warned regarding same.
- E. Living space to share a common wall with, and be open to preexisting living space. Proposed living space shall not contain independent cooking, bathroom and sleeping facilities. It shall not constitute a separate, independent housekeeping establishment for owner occupancy, rental or lease, and not be physically separated from other rooms of the preexisting dwelling unit.
- F. Submit 3 full-sized and 1 reduced-size copy of final stamped plan.
- G. Approval expires on 11/17/23 if use is not substantially acted on and if an extension is not granted. Approval also expires if use ceases for more than two years.

The motion was seconded by S. Ciampi and carried Roll Call D. Dunham aye, P. Harris aye, J. Froumy aye, S. Ciampi aye and N. Patten aye. (5-0)

**OTHER BUSINESS:**

**BOARD'S ACTION -MINUTES:**

**MOTION:** On a motion by J. Froumy seconded by D. Dunham it was voted unanimously to accept the minutes of October 27, 2021 with the following correction.  
The front page under Roll Call for attendance should be D. Dunham, meeting room instead of M. Mastenbrook. Roll Call D. Dunham aye, P. Harris aye, J. Froumy aye, S. Ciampi aye and N. Patten aye. (5-0)

**AUDIO EQUIPMENT:**

J. Froumy stated he has been working on improving the audio at meetings and would like the Board's input on how they feel about expending \$100 each for personal equipment to enhance their hearing at the meetings. He explained the different types of equipment that can be used.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

**MOTION:** On a motion by P. Harris seconded by J. Froumy it was voted unanimously to adjourn at 7:32 pm. Roll Call D. Dunham aye, P. Harris aye, J. Froumy aye, S. Ciampi aye and N. Patten aye. (5-0)

Respectfully submitted,

Elaine M. Murphy  
Administrative Assistant