ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

MINUTES

JUNE 15, 2022

A meeting of the Conway Zoning Board of Adjustment was held on Wednesday, June 15, 2022 at the Conway Town Office, 23 Main Street, in Conway, NH, beginning at 7:00 pm. Those present were: Chair, John Colbath; Vice Chair, Andrew Chalmers; Luigi Bartolomeo; Richard Pierce; Jonathan Hebert; Planning Director, Jamel Torres; and Planning Assistant, Holly Whitelaw. Alternate Steven Steiner was in attendance.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

A public hearing was opened at 7:00 pm to consider a VARIANCE requested by STANLEY ANTHONY AND LYNN PARKHURST [FILE #22-05] in regards to §190-28.B.(1) of the Conway Zoning Ordinance to allow the construction of a 12-foot addition to the rear of the building within the Wetland and Watershed Protection Overlay District at 45 Main Street, Conway (PID 276-279). Notice was published in the Conway Daily Sun and certified notices were mailed to abutters on Friday, April 8, 2022. This hearing was continued from April 20, 2022; May 18, 2022; and May 25, 2022.

Lynn Parkhurst appeared before the Board. Stanley Anthony was in attendance. Mr. Colbath read the application and the applicable section of the ordinance. Ms. Parkhurst stated the current building is now being leased and Mr. Anthony has his own inspection license. Ms. Parkhurst stated to comply with the State, we need a separate office with a separate entrance to continue to use their dealer license for the used car dealership because there are two state licensed businesses operating on the same property.

Ms. Parkhurst stated the addition would allow an office and a stairwell to the second floor to utilize that space as well. Ms. Parkhurst stated the building is a cinderblock building, so there is a cinderblock wall between the two-bays and the office. Ms. Parkhurst stated the stairwell is within the variance space for the second floor; it cannot move any further in because it would be in the bays of the auto repair shop.

Mr. Colbath asked for Board comment; Mr. Chalmers asked how far into the setback. Ms. Parkhurst stated the current building is 56-feet from the shoreline; the new addition would also be 56-feet. Mr. Hebert stated the building is not going to encroach any more than it already does. Ms. Parkhurst agreed. Mr. Pierce asked if they are increasing the non-conformity. Ms. Parkhurst answered in the affirmative and stated, but not into the setback. Ms. Parkhurst stated the space between the current building and wetland is currently parking space.

Mr. Colbath asked for public comment; David Weathers stated it is not a wetland, it is not a hydric area; it is parallel to the actual water body itself. Mr. Weathers stated they would be expanding the western side of the building which is the nearest edge to the pond, extending that line straight back.

Mr. Weathers stated in reality in will probably be a benefit to the environment for any surface runoff because there are tires stored in that area as well as the dumpster and that will be removed and under cover. Mr. Weathers stated this area is not within the 100-year floodplain. Mr. Bartolomeo stated the hardship exists in the fact that it is a grandfathered building that is already encroaching within the water setback.

Mr. Colbath read item 1. Mr. Chalmers made a motion, seconded by Mr. Hebert, that the variance will not be contrary to the public interest. Mr. Colbath asked for Board comment; there was none. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Colbath read item 2. Mr. Chalmers made a motion, seconded by Mr. Hebert, that the spirit of the ordinance is observed. Mr. Colbath asked for Board comment; there was none. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Colbath read item 3. Mr. Chalmers made a motion, seconded by Mr. Hebert, that substantial justice is done. Mr. Colbath asked for Board comment; there was none. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Colbath read item 4. Mr. Chalmers made a motion, seconded by Mr. Hebert, that the values of surrounding properties are not diminished. Mr. Colbath asked for Board comment; there was none. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Colbath read item 5.a.i. Mr. Chalmers made a motion, seconded by Mr. Hebert, that no fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property. Mr. Colbath asked for Board comment; there was none. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Colbath read item 5.a.ii. Mr. Chalmers made a motion, seconded by Mr. Hebert, that the proposed use is a reasonable use. Mr. Colbath asked for Board comment; there was none. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Chalmers made a motion, seconded by Mr. Hebert, that based on i and ii above literal enforcement of the provisions of the ordinance would result in an unnecessary hardship. Mr. Colbath asked for Board comment; there was none. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Chalmers made a motion, seconded by Mr. Hebert, that item 5.b. is not necessary for this application. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Chalmers made a motion, seconded by Mr. Hebert, that, based on the forgoing findings of fact, the variance from §190-28.B.(1) of the Town of Conway Zoning Ordinance to allow the construction of a 12-foot addition to the rear of the building within the Wetland and Watershed Protection Overlay District be granted. Motion carried unanimously.

A public hearing was opened at 7:11 pm to consider a VARIANCE requested by CHRIS AND ANNE DUDUCH [FILE #22-12] in regards to §190-13.D of the Conway Zoning Ordinance to allow the construction of a garage 10-feet within the front setback at 196 Rebecca Lane, Center Conway (PID 259-58). Notice was published in the Conway Daily Sun and certified notices were mailed to abutters on Friday, May 6, 2022. This hearing was continued from May 18, 2022; and May 25, 2022. The application was withdrawn by the applicant.

A public hearing was opened at 7:12 pm to consider a **SPECIAL EXCEPTION** requested by **JULIE BARKALOW/GAYLE LOCKE/DONALD LAFONTAINE/BRIAN LAFONTAINE** [FILE #22-15] in regards to §190-13.K(13) of the Conway Zoning Ordinance **to allow a mobile home as a residence of an immediate family member** at 1171 Eaton Road, Conway (PID 288-29). Notice was published in the Conway Daily Sun and certified notices were mailed to abutters on Friday, June 3, 2022.

The applicant was not in attendance. Mr. Chalmers made a motion, seconded by Mr. Hebert, to continue the hearing for Julie Barkalow/Gayle Locke/Donald Lafontaine/Brian Lafontaine until July 20, 2022 at 7:00 pm. Motion carried unanimously.

A public hearing was opened at 7:15 pm to consider a **SPECIAL EXCEPTION** requested by **GREGORY AND NICOLE STANLEY** [FILE #22-16] in regards to §190-13.B(4)(b) of the Conway Zoning Ordinance **to allow an accessory dwelling unit** at 160 Robinwood Road, Center Conway (PID 260-85). Notice was published in the Conway Daily Sun and certified notices were mailed to abutters on Friday, June 3, 2022.

Greg and Nicole Stanley appeared before the Board. Mr. Colbath read the application and the applicable section of the ordinance. Mr. Stanley stated they plan to construct a garage and would like to build an apartment above it. Mr. Stanley stated it would be a long-term rental, and will not be an Airbnb. Mr. Stanley stated it is a 2.6-acre lot, but a portion of the lot is wetland and requires one acre per dwelling.

Mr. Colbath asked for Board comment; Mr. Colbath asked about the architecture. Mr. Stanley stated it would be the same design as the house, so it will match. Mr. Pierce asked if the trees on the picture are accurate. Mr. Stanley stated there has been some clearing. Mr. Hebert asked how many parking spaces do you have now before the addition. Mr. Stanley stated the driveway is approximately two cars wide, and 200-feet long; ample parking there now. Mr. Pierce stated garage bays count as parking spaces, and there will be four garage bays.

Mr. Colbath asked for public comment; Ed Alkalay stated he wishes he were his neighbor, and anything he builds I'm sure he will do a great job. Chet Walden of 124 Robinwood Road stated they have been his neighbor for a few years and is in favor of this application.

Mr. Colbath read item 1. Mr. Chalmers made a motion, seconded by Mr. Hebert, that the accessory dwelling unit is no less than 300 square feet and no greater than 800 square feet. Mr. Colbath asked for Board comment; there was none. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Colbath read item 2. Mr. Chalmers made a motion, seconded by Mr. Hebert, that the accessory dwelling unit is architecturally compatible with the neighborhood. Mr. Colbath asked for Board comment; there was none. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Colbath read item 3. Mr. Chalmers made a motion, seconded by Mr. Hebert, that sufficient parking is located on site. Mr. Colbath asked for Board comment; there was none. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Colbath read item 4. Mr. Chalmers made a motion, seconded by Mr. Hebert, that both the primary single-family dwelling and the accessory dwelling unit shall be used for long-term residency, and short-term transient occupancy of either dwelling unit is prohibited. Mr. Colbath asked for Board comment; there was none. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Chalmers made a motion, seconded by Mr. Hebert, that, based on the forgoing findings of fact, the Special Exception pursuant to §190-13.B.(4)(b) of the Town of Conway Zoning Ordinance for an accessory dwelling unit be granted. Motion carried unanimously.

A public hearing was opened at 7:26 pm to consider a **SPECIAL EXCEPTION** requested by **BLUEBIRD PROJECT, LLC** [FILE #22-17] in regards to §190-19.B(5)(c) of the Conway Zoning Ordinance to allow 12 dwelling units per acre [construction of 7 residential dwelling units] at 109 Pine Street, North Conway (PID 218-69). Notice was published in the Conway Daily Sun and certified notices were mailed to abutters on Friday, June 3, 2022.

Kate Richardson of Bergeron Technical Services appeared before the Board. Shawn Bergeron, Eliza Grant and Kit Hickey were in attendance. Mr. Colbath read the application and the applicable section of the ordinance. Ms. Richardson stated this building was known as the Bunker Building and The North Conway House, and they want to develop long-term rentals. Ms. Richardson stated this site is serviced by municipal water and sewer. Ms. Richardson stated the deed restricted apartments will be located on the first floor; apartment 1 is 750 square feet and apartment 2 is 460 square feet.

Mr. Colbath asked for Board comment; Mr. Colbath asked if the exterior of the building is going to change. Ms. Richardson stated there will be some minor changes, and a front porch will be added back on. Ms. Richardson stated the rear addition will be removed and replaced in-kind. Mr. Colbath asked about life safety. Ms. Richardson stated the building will be sprinkled and will have a fire alarm system.

Mr. Colbath asked about parking. Ms. Richardson stated there will be enough parking on-site. Mr. Hebert asked if the largest unit is a 3-bedroom. Ms. Richardson answered in the affirmative and stated it is 1,350 square feet and located on the second floor.

Mr. Colbath asked if the first floor is handicap accessible. Mr. Richardson stated they are not proposed to be, but could be depending on requirements for the grant through the New Hampshire Housing Finance Authority.

Mr. Bartolomeo stated these old buildings are energy hogs, and asked if they would be bringing the building up to thermal standards. Ms. Richardson answered in the affirmative, and stated they will have to do some pretty significant energy insulation. Mr. Bartolomeo asked if they are replacing the windows. Ms. Grant stated they have to adhere to the Secretary of Interior standards for renovating historical buildings.

Mr. Colbath asked for public comment; there was none.

Mr. Colbath read item 1. Mr. Chalmers made a motion, seconded by Mr. Hebert, that each structure must contain at least three dwelling units. Mr. Colbath asked for Board comment; there was none. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Colbath read item 2. Mr. Chalmers made a motion, seconded by Mr. Hebert, that not less than 25% of all dwelling units shall be designated as full-time rental apartments. At the time of Planning Board approval, the units designated as full-time rental apartments must be shown on the plan with a condition that they are leased for twenty years from the date of Planning Board approval by the developer and a deed restriction shall be recorded in the Registry of Deeds as evidence of the same. Mr. Colbath asked for Board comment; there was none. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Colbath read item 3. Mr. Chalmers made a motion, seconded by Mr. Hebert, that all lots must be serviced by municipal water and sewerage. Mr. Colbath asked for Board comment; there was none. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Colbath read item 4. Mr. Chalmers made a motion, seconded by Mr. Hebert, that Rental/Deed restricted units shall be a maximum of 1,000 square feet and a minimum of 300 square feet. Mr. Colbath asked for Board comment; there was none. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Colbath read item 5. Mr. Chalmers made a motion, seconded by Mr. Hebert, that architectural design plans must be submitted to the Zoning Board of Adjustment at the time of application to ensure compliance with the zoning regulations. Mr. Colbath asked for Board comment; there was none. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Chalmers made a motion, seconded by Mr. Hebert, that, based on the forgoing findings of fact, the Special Exception pursuant to §190-19.B.(5)(c) of the Town of Conway Zoning Ordinance to allow up to 12 dwelling units per acre [construction of 7 residential dwelling units] be granted. Motion carried unanimously.

A public hearing was opened at 7:39 pm to consider a VARIANCE requested by BLUEBIRD PROJECT, LLC [FILE #22-18] in regards to §190-19.B(1) of the Conway Zoning Ordinance to allow an eighth residential dwelling unit at 109 Pine Street, North Conway (PID 218-69). Notice was published in the Conway Daily Sun and certified notices were mailed to abutters on Friday, June 3, 2022.

Kate Richardson of Bergeron Technical Services appeared before the Board. Shawn Bergeron, Eliza Grant and Kit Hickey were in attendance. Mr. Colbath read the application and the applicable section of the ordinance. Mr. Richardson stated the lot is .32-of an acre short of the density for eight units.

Ms. Richardson stated the building is existing, and the size of the building footprint is 2,200 square feet. Ms. Richardson stated that is the square footage of the first floor, the second floor and the third floor. Ms. Richardson stated the fourth floor is 1,600 square feet, making the entire building 8,200 square feet. Ms. Richardson stated the layout of the building works great for this additional unit; this would allow for a 630 square foot single-bedroom apartment on the fourth floor.

Mr. Colbath asked for Board comment; Mr. Colbath asked if the eighth unit replaces the storage area on the fourth floor. Ms. Richardson answered in the affirmative.

Mr. Hebert asked what is different with this lot compared to all the other small lots around there. Ms. Richardson stated this is an existing building that is rather large, it is four-stories, and it has been sitting vacant for a while. Ms. Richardson stated given the size and the height of the building, it takes up less area on the property. Ms. Richardson stated a dilapidated building on the back of the property will be removed. Ms. Richardson stated the site will comply with parking, greenspace and landscaping requirements while keeping the built space quite small.

Mr. Bartolomeo stated the concessions made to the developers for work force housing are more than generous, the 12 units per acre. Mr. Bartolomeo stated he understands there is the room under this roof and they want to take advantage of it, but the concessions are already taken advantage of. Ms. Richardson stated they would request under this application that a third unit be deed restricted as required by the special exception so three units would be deed restricted for 20-years. Mr. Bartolomeo stated for .32 he could accept a deal like that; the town gets a third long-term lease and they get their eighth unit on the top floor. Mr. Richardson stated for the grant they are receiving all the units will be long-term rentals for a certain amount of time.

Mr. Chalmers stated they gave a historical structure in Town, and gaining more housing; we are not bulldozing another old building. Mr. Hebert stated we are not a Planning Board. Mr. Colbath stated he believes that is a Planning Board issue. Mr. Hebert stated whether we like or dislike this is not an issue, we are here to apply the zoning ordinance as it is drafted, and if you meet the conditions; it is not a negotiation. Mr. Colbath stated that is for the Planning Board to negotiate.

Mr. Pierce stated this is a great use of the space, it does not affect anyone; if any of the abutters have an issue with it, then he would go with the abutters. Mr. Pierce stated this is what he thinks variances are about; we don't set precedent, and this is a good application for this.

Mr. Bartolomeo asked if the Board is voting on the application as it sits in front of us; the eighth unit on the fourth floor, but still only two deeded workforce units. Mr. Colbath answered in the affirmative.

Ms. Grant stated the CDBG grant they are pursuing through the town for this property requires 51% to be affordable units deeded for a period of time as determined. Ms. Grant stated if there are seven units, they would be required to have four affordable to their CDBG standards, but if there are eight, they are required to have five. Ms. Grant stated whatever the Board decides those strings will come with it regardless based on whether the Selectmen choose to sponsor this project. Mr. Bartolomeo asked if the grant is in hand. Ms. Grant stated they are pursuing it now as a possibility.

Mr. Colbath asked for public comment; there was none.

Mr. Colbath read item 1. Mr. Chalmers made a motion, seconded by Mr. Bartolomeo, that the variance will not be contrary to the public interest. Mr. Colbath asked for Board comment; there was none. Motion carried with Mr. Chalmers, Mr. Bartolomeo, Mr. Pierce and Mr. Colbath voting in the affirmative and Mr. Hebert voting in the negative.

Mr. Colbath read item 2. Mr. Chalmers made a motion, seconded by Mr. Bartolomeo, that the spirit of the ordinance is observed. Mr. Colbath asked for Board comment; there was none. Motion carried with Mr. Chalmers, Mr. Bartolomeo, Mr. Pierce and Mr. Colbath voting in the affirmative and Mr. Hebert voting in the negative.

Mr. Colbath read item 3. Mr. Chalmers made a motion, seconded by Mr. Bartolomeo, that substantial justice is done. Mr. Colbath asked for Board comment; there was none. Motion carried with Mr. Chalmers, Mr. Bartolomeo, Mr. Pierce and Mr. Colbath voting in the affirmative and Mr. Hebert voting in the negative.

Mr. Colbath read item 4. Mr. Chalmers made a motion, seconded by Mr. Hebert, that the values of surrounding properties are not diminished. Mr. Colbath asked for Board comment; there was none. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Colbath read item 5.a.i. Mr. Chalmers made a motion, seconded by Mr. Bartolomeo, that no fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property. Mr. Colbath asked for Board comment; there was none. Motion carried with Mr. Chalmers, Mr. Bartolomeo, Mr. Pierce and Mr. Colbath voting in the affirmative and Mr. Hebert voting in the negative.

Mr. Colbath read item 5.a.ii. Mr. Chalmers made a motion, seconded by Mr. Hebert, that the proposed use is a reasonable use. Mr. Colbath asked for Board comment; there was none. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Chalmers made a motion, seconded by Mr. Bartolomeo, that based on i and ii above literal enforcement of the provisions of the ordinance would result in an unnecessary hardship. Mr. Colbath asked for Board comment; there was none. Motion carried with Mr. Chalmers, Mr. Bartolomeo, Mr. Pierce and Mr. Colbath voting in the affirmative and Mr. Hebert voting in the negative.

Mr. Chalmers made a motion, seconded by Mr. Bartolomeo, that item 5.b. is not necessary for this application. Motion carried with Mr. Chalmers, Mr. Bartolomeo, Mr. Pierce and Mr. Colbath voting in the affirmative and Mr. Hebert voting in the negative.

Mr. Chalmers made a motion, seconded by Mr. Bartolomeo, that, based on the forgoing findings of fact, the variance from §190-19.B.(1) of the Town of Conway Zoning Ordinance to allow an eighth residential dwelling unit be granted. Motion carried with Mr. Chalmers, Mr. Bartolomeo, Mr. Pierce and Mr. Colbath voting in the affirmative and Mr. Hebert voting in the negative.

A public hearing was opened at 8:00 pm to consider a VARIANCE requested by STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE/DOUG MULLEN [FILE #22-19] in regards to §190-30.B(1) of the Conway Zoning Ordinance to allow an upward vertical expansion of two existing structures within the floodplain conservation overlay district at 137 Skimobile Road, North Conway (PID 219-107). Notice was published in the Conway Daily Sun and certified notices were mailed to abutters on Friday, June 3, 2022.

Ed Alkalay of Alkalay & Smillie and Doug Mullen appeared before the Board. Stacy Mullen was in attendance. Mr. Colbath read the application and the applicable section of the ordinance. Mr. Alkalay stated that the section of the ordinance should be §190-26.D.(1). The Board determined that the application would need to be re-notified.

Mr. Hebert made a motion, seconded by Mr. Bartolomeo, to continue the hearing for the State of New Hampshire/Doug Mullen until July 20, 2022 at 7:05 pm. Motion carried unanimously.

A public hearing was opened at 8:08 pm to consider a VARIANCE requested by STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE/DOUG MULLEN [FILE #22-20] in regards to §190-30.B(2) of the Conway Zoning Ordinance to allow the vertical increase of the 3D footprint of the two structures to permit a garage and two floors above the garage on each structure within the floodplain conservation overlay district at 137 Skimobile Road, North Conway (PID 219-107). Notice was published in the Conway Daily Sun and certified notices were mailed to abutters on Friday, June 3, 2022.

Ed Alkalay of Alkalay & Smillie and Doug Mullen appeared before the Board. Stacy Mullen was in attendance. Mr. Colbath read the application and the applicable section of the ordinance. Mr. Alkalay stated currently there are two buildings, 20-feet by 88-feet, which are in awful shape. Mr. Colbath stated these were once known as the Alpine Apartments. Ms. Mullen showed a picture of the property.

Mr. Alkalay stated they are proposing to reduce the two-dimensional footprint to make it 20-feet by 68-feet, and increase as it goes up to add a second floor and a smaller third floor. Mr. Alkalay stated reducing the two-dimensional and expanding upward will enable there to be more parking space, emergency vehicles easier access to the units, and the windows on the structure to be increased making them overall safer. Mr. Alkalay stated there are a number of health and safety issues with the buildings as they exist right now, and they would be rectified inside and out.

Mr. Alkalay submitted drawings [in file] and reviewed them with the Board. Mr. Alkalay stated there currently is an illegal deck that will be removed; the screen porch is a legal structure. Mr. Colbath asked if these buildings are non-conforming. Mr. Torres answered in the affirmative and stated they are within the floodplain conservation district.

Mr. Bartolomeo asked given the buildings are dilapidated, will they be torn down. Mr. Mullen stated he would prefer to tear them down. Mr. Colbath asked if these are intended to be rental units. Mr. Mullen stated their intent is to sell them. Mr. Alkalay stated what exists is non-conforming and what he proposes is still non-conforming, but in a different, better way.

Mr. Colbath asked for public comment; Steven Steiner stated he likes the presentation; what's important is to clean up what can be cleaned up. Mr. Colbath asked Mr. Steiner where he sees the hardship inherit in the land. Mr. Steiner stated the hardship is more for our community, how are we going to clean up this mess. Mr. Alkalay stated the hardship is leaving those structures as they are right now; they don't provide enough area for emergency vehicles. Mr. Alkalay stated reducing the two-dimensional footprint will allow emergency vehicles more access.

Mr. Chalmers stated he thinks they are putting the cart before the horse; we have not addressed moving the building out of the base flood elevation. Mr. Hebert agreed. Mr. Pierce stated he would like to see a plot plan; he is not convinced all other avenues have been explored. Mr. Hebert stated we have to make a decision based on the evidence and if it fits the criteria.

Mr. Colbath stated he thinks there is information in the first application that is needed to move this application forward. Mr. Bartolomeo stated he thinks the benefit to the Town is so clear here. The Board requested a plot plan; footprints relative to boundaries, the floodplain zone, setbacks and difference in two-dimensional footprints.

Mr. Hebert made a motion, seconded by Mr. Chalmers, to continue the hearing for the State of New Hampshire/Doug Mullen until July 20, 2022 at 7:05 pm. Motion carried unanimously.

REVIEW AND ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES

Mr. Hebert made a motion, seconded by Mr. Bartolomeo, to approve the Minutes of May 18, 2022 as written. Motion carried with Mr. Colbath abstaining from voting.

Mr. Hebert made a motion, seconded by Mr. Chalmers, to approve the Minutes of May 25, 2022 as written. Motion carried unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Holly L. Whitelaw Planning Assistant