

**LONDONDERRY ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
268B MAMMOTH ROAD
LONDONDERRY, NH 03053**

MINUTES FROM 02/15/23 MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. Members introduced themselves. The following members were present: Jacqueline Benard, Chair; Suzanne Brunelle, Vice Chair; Brendan O'Brien, Clerk; Mitch Feig, member; Irene Macarelli, member; and Chris Moore, alternate member. Also, participating was Kellie Caron, Assistant Town Manager/Director of Economic Development; Nick Codner, Chief Building Inspector; Mike Malaguti, Town Manager; and Beth Morrison, Recording Secretary.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES –

S. Brunelle made a motion to accept the September 21, 2022, meeting minutes as presented.

The motion was seconded by B. O'Brien

The motion was granted, 5-0-0.

I. Macarelli made a motion to accept the November 16, 2022, meeting minutes as presented.

The motion was seconded by B. O'Brien.

The motion was granted, 5-0-0.

S. Brunelle made a motion to accept the December 21, 2022, meeting minutes as presented.

The motion was seconded by M. Feig.

The motion was granted, 5-0-0.

M. Feig made a motion to accept the January 18, 2023, meeting minutes as amended.

The motion was seconded by B. O'Brien.

The motion was granted, 5-0-0.

II. REPORT BY TOWN COUNCIL – Councilor Deb Paul informed the Board that she had nothing for them this evening.

III. REGIONAL IMPACT DETERMINATIONS: K. Caron informed the Board that she had three projects for their consideration.

1. CASE NO. 02/15/2023-1: Request for a variance from LZO 4.12 Use Table to allow a manufacturing use in the AR-1 zone which is otherwise prohibited, 83 Litchfield Road, Map 11 Lot 85, Zoned AR-1, Michaela Waldron (Owner) and John Thompson (Applicant)
2. CASE NO. 02/15/2023-2: Request for a variance from LZO 4.2.1.3.A.1 to allow a duplex on a lot with only 100 feet of frontage where 150 feet are required, 532 Mammoth Road, Map 15 Lot 222, Zoned AR-1, Patricia and David Robbins (Owners & Applicants)
3. CASE NO. 02/15/2023-3: Request for a variance from LZO 4.1.2 Use Table to allow vehicle sales (wholesale) in the C-I zone which is otherwise prohibited, 184 Mammoth Road (Unit 3), Map 6 Lot 72C, Zoned C-I, MKZ Auto, LLC (Owner) and Rahul Talwar (Applicant)

B. O'Brien made a motion that the cases are not of regional impact.

The motion was seconded by M. Feig.

The motion was granted by, 5-0-0.

IV. PUBLIC HEARING OF CASES

A. CASE NO. 02/15/2023-1: Request for a variance from LZO 4.12 Use Table to allow a manufacturing use in the AR-1 zone which is otherwise prohibited, 83 Litchfield Road, Map 11 Lot 85, Zoned AR-1, Michaela Waldron (Owner) and John Thompson (Applicant)

B. O'Brien read the case into the record noting there is no previous zoning. Michaela Waldron, owner, addressed the Board. M. Waldron informed the Board that she would like to convert her garage to be able to manufacture the brewing of beer. She said that they are not looking for any employees, but would like to obtain a license from the state to be able to go to local farmers markets. She added that they are changing the garage door to allow for easier access. She said that they are not changing traffic.

She then read the criteria for granting the variance:

- (1) The granting of the variance is not contrary to the public interest: because it will not an increase in traffic flow through Litchfield Road or an increase in visitors to the current residence. She added that it will not cause any visual disturbances to the property.
- (2) The spirit of the ordinance is observed: because it will not alter building structure or create any hazards to the community.
- (3) Substantial justice is done: because there is no harm to the community, as it will not obstruct traffic and there are no hazardous materials used.
- (4) Values of surrounding properties are not diminished: because they are not bringing in any outsiders to the area, so everything will stay the same.

- (5) There is 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 there will be no hardship or any negative effects to the overall construction of the property. She said that the proposed use is reasonable.

Chairwoman Benard asked for questions from the Board. B. O'Brien asked how the garage's appearance from the road will change. M. Waldron replied that they will be removing the garage door and putting in French doors. M. Feig asked if they use any chemicals when brewing. M. Waldron replied that they use food grade sanitizer, outside of natural food such as grain, water and flavorings. M. Feig asked if there are smells. M. Waldron replied that they currently brew for friends and there have been no smells observed. S. Brunelle asked her to explain the licensing requirements of the state. M. Waldron replied that in order to get the nanopub brewing license you have to have a space that is separated from the main house. C. Moore asked if the license is necessary and I. Macarelli asked who they are looking to sell to. M. Waldron replied that they need the license from the state to be able to sell at farmers markets in the summer and local stores. M. Feig asked if anyone would be coming to the house to pick up the beer. M. Waldron replied that they would not. S. Brunelle asked for more clarification on the fifth point of law regarding hardship, as she does not see any material presented that would make this property unique to this situation. M. Waldron asked for the question to be repeated. Chairwoman Benard reviewed why an applicant needs to demonstrate a hardship of their property that makes it different from the surrounding properties. S. Brunelle asked why M. Waldron should be allowed to manufacture beer on her property versus all the surrounding properties in her neighborhood. M. Waldron replied that her garage is the only place that they can do this. She added that they are unable to continue down the path if they cannot do this from their garage. B. O'Brien asked if the lot to the left has a house. M. Waldron replied that it does not. Chairwoman Benard asked what they are brewing. M. Waldron replied they are brewing beer. Chairwoman Benard asked for the byproduct of brewing beer. M. Waldron replied the byproducts are used grain, sugar and water runoff. Chairwoman Benard asked how they dispose of used grain. M. Waldron replied that right now they throw it in the trash, but she would like to partner with local farmers for them to be able to use it on their farm. Chairwoman Benard asked where the water runoff flows. M. Waldron replied that is collected and then they can use it to clean the machinery. Chairwoman Benard asked where the food grain sanitizer is stored. M. Waldron replied that this is just like what is used in a restaurant to clean and it is stored in a cabinet. Chairwoman Benard asked if they have a septic system and well water. M. Waldron replied that is correct.

Chairwoman Benard asked for public input.

Alan Saulnier, 81 Litchfield Road, addressed the Board neither for or against the variance. A. Saulnier replied that his only concern is regarding the manufacturing as the variance runs with the land. He said that if it was a special exception for a home occupation, he would have no problem with this, but this can set a precedent. He added that he enjoys her as a neighbor. He reiterated that his concern is manufacturing, as this is a serious change in zoning for the town. He asked if it was considered light manufacturing.

Deb Paul, 118 Hardy Road, addressed in opposition to the variance. D. Paul echoed the concerns of the previous neighbor. She asked if the applicant had her well tested for PFOAs, as it does not cook out of the

water. She noted that there is a place in Derry that allows a person to use their facilities for such purposes. She asked if the Fire Department has looked at this, as the tanks have a lot of pressure and can be a safety concern.

M. Waldron replied that they are in the process of getting the water tested for a house filter. She noted that they are currently getting their water delivered and if it continues to be a problem they will increase the water demands. She said that they have not reached out to the Fire Department. K. Caron explained that the Fire Department would get involved in the permitting process for an inspection.

Chairwoman Benard asked if the Board had any other comments. C. Moore asked why the applicant filed for a variance versus a special exception. M. Waldron replied that she is representing the applicant this evening, but noted that the applicant felt this was the best choice. M. Feig asked if the applicant talked to K. Caron or anyone else regarding variance versus special exception. K. Caron replied that the applicant spoke to Nick Codner, Zoning Administrator, who came to this determination. N. Codner told the Board that he suggested a variance because the town would not have any control over growth with a special exception. C. Moore asked if that would be the case with a variance. N. Codner replied that the Board can place conditions with a variance and not a special exception, especially if it was a home occupation by right.

Chairwoman Benard asked if there was anyone else wishing to speak.

Rahul Talwar, 184 Mammoth Road, addressed the Board. R. Talwar suggested that if in fact the business were to grow, he believed that the applicant would need a bigger space than the converted garage.

Walter Bandurski, 294 High Range Road, addressed the Board. W. Bander asked if she could expand on her property if the business were to grow. He added that he would have a problem with water runoff as he abuts the property in the back.

Deb Paul, 118 Hardy Road, addressed the Board. D. Paul if the garage was going to be the same size or if they are expanding it. She asked where the equipment would be stored. M. Waldron replied that they are not expanding the garage and all the equipment will be housed inside the garage. She said that the garage door would be replaced with French doors.

Chairwoman Benard brought the discussion back to the Board. She asked about odor created by brewing beer. M. Waldron replied that it is akin to baking bread in the house, noting that you cannot smell it from the driveway. Chairwoman Benard asked how many gallons they would be manufacturing. M. Waldron replied that they are looking to make two batches a week and one batch makes about five gallons of beer. Chairwoman Benard asked about the byproduct of making 20 gallons of beer. M. Waldron replied that when done brewing there is a four-pound bag of grain for one batch, so roughly 16 pounds of grain. Chairwoman Benard asked how much water runoff they would anticipate. M. Waldron replied that she is unsure, but could get back to her on this. Chairwoman Benard asked for the best guess of water run off for five gallons. M. Waldron replied less than a gallon of water runoff. Chairwoman Benard asked when they manufacture it. M. Waldron replied during the day, twice a week. Chairwoman Benard asked about water. M. Waldron replied that they have 25 gallons delivered a week and do not use their well water currently. Chairwoman Benard asked if the equipment made a noise. M. Waldron replied that it makes a

low humming noise. C. Moore asked if this will all be done in the garage. M. Waldron replied that is correct. C. Moore mentioned that the variance could be limited to the existing garage structure with no manufacturing anywhere else, if he were voting. Chairwoman Benard pointed out that this would open up the door for things other than beer if this were to be granted.

The Board closed public input and began deliberation:

- (1) The variance would be contrary to the public interest: because it would alter the essential character of the neighborhood by allowing manufacturing in the AR-I zone.
- (2) The spirit of the ordinance would not be observed: because manufacturing would have potential safety issues including fire, byproducts and impact on ground water.
- (3) Substantial justice would not be done: because the possible loss to the general public would outweigh any gain to the general public.
- (4) Values of the surrounding properties would be diminished: because the introduction of manufacturing could create a loss in value of the surrounding properties.
- (5) There is a fair and substantial relationship that exists between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property: because the property is not unique to allow it to be used for the purpose of manufacturing. The proposed use is not a reasonable one, as manufacturing is not allowed in the AR-I zone.

B. O'Brien made a motion in CASE NO. 02/15/2023-1 to DENY the request for a variance from LZO 4.12 Use Table to allow a manufacturing use in the AR-1 zone which is otherwise prohibited, 83 Litchfield Road, Map 11 Lot 85, Zoned AR-1, Michaela Waldron (Owner) and John Thompson (Applicant).

I. Macarelli seconded the motion.

The motion was granted, 5-0-0. The applicant's request for a variance was DENIED for the following reasons:

The variance would be contrary to the public interest: because it would alter the essential character of the neighborhood by allowing manufacturing in the AR-I zone. The spirit of the ordinance would not be observed: because manufacturing would have potential safety issues including fire, byproducts and impact on ground water. Substantial justice would not be done: because the possible loss to the general public would outweigh any gain to the general public. Values of the surrounding properties would be diminished: because the introduction of manufacturing could create a loss in value of the surrounding properties. There is a fair and substantial relationship that exists between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property: because the property is not unique to allow it to be used for the purpose of manufacturing. The proposed use is not a reasonable one, as manufacturing is not allowed in the AR-I zone.

B. CASE NO. 02/15/2023-2: Request for a variance from LZO 4.2.1.3.A.1 to allow a duplex on a lot with only 100 feet of frontage where 150 feet are required, 532 Mammoth Road, Map 15 Lot 222, Zoned AR-1, Patricia and David Robbins (Owners & Applicants)

B. O'Brien read the case into the record noting the previous zoning. Patricia and David Robbins, owners and applicants, addressed the Board. D. Robbins told the Board that in this location the lot lines were laid down long before the zoning ordinance was created. He pointed out that they have 100-feet in width on Mammoth Road diminishes to the east to 22-feet, giving it a pie shape parcel. He explained that the prior variance restricted the house to three bedrooms. He noted that they bought the house nine years ago and their only tenant has been their youngest child, whom recently welcomed their first granddaughter, so they are looking to add a bedroom to the house. He added that he is asking the Board to lift the bedroom restriction on the house. He mentioned that the house is on both municipal sewer and public water, so the only two issues left are parking and overcrowding. He reviewed a photograph in his application of Mammoth Road, noting that they can accommodate plenty of parking in front of the house. He explained where they want to put the addition and noted that it should not be visible from the street, so it will not contribute to overcrowding. He said it will be a two-level addition, with the bedroom added for 532b Mammoth and a three season porch for upstairs.

He then read the criteria for granting the variance:

- (1) The granting of the variance is not contrary to the public interest: because the essential character of the neighborhood would not change and it will not impact the health, safety or welfare of the general public.
- (2) The spirit of the ordinance is observed: because it will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood.
- (3) Substantial justice is done: because the loss to the applicant would be greater than any gain to the public.
- (4) Values of surrounding properties are not diminished: because the proposed use is consistent with other homes in the neighborhood. He added that he might anticipate an increase in property values.
- (5) There is 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 the property is unique because the property lines in the village were drawn before the zoning ordinance was established and because the frontage diminished from 100-feet wide to 22-feet wide on Mammoth Road. He said that the proposed use is reasonable.

Chairwoman Benard asked for questions from the Board. S. Brunelle asked if they meet all other setbacks. D. Robbins replied that is correct. S. Brunelle asked if there are at least four parking spaces. D. Robbins replied that there are at least four parking spaces. S. Brunelle asked if the addition will be visible from the street. D. Robbins replied it will not be visible from the street.

Chairwoman Benard asked for public input and there was none.

The Board closed public input and began deliberation:

- (1) The variance would not be contrary to the public interest: because it does not alter the essential character of the neighborhood, as there are other two-family houses in the neighborhood.
- (2) The spirit of the ordinance would be observed: because it appears they have adequate parking and are already on municipal sewer and public water.
- (3) Substantial justice would be done: because the loss to the applicant outweighs any gain to the general public.
- (4) Values of the surrounding properties would not be diminished: because the addition will not impact the other surrounding properties values.
- (5) There is not a fair and substantial relationship that exists between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property: because the property is unique as is in an old area of town that existed pre-zoning and it is pie-shaped parcel. The proposed use is a reasonable one.

B. O'Brien made a motion in CASE NO. 02/15/2023-2 to grant the request for a variance from LZO 4.2.1.3.A.1 to allow a duplex on a lot with only 100 feet of frontage where 150 feet are required, 532 Mammoth Road, Map 15 Lot 222, Zoned AR-1, Patricia and David Robbins (Owners & Applicants)

I. Macarelli seconded the motion.

The motion was granted, 5-0-0. The applicant's request for a variance was GRANTED.

C. CASE NO. 02/15/2023-3: Request for a variance from LZO 4.1.2 Use Table to allow vehicle sales (wholesale) in the C-I zone which is otherwise prohibited, 184 Mammoth Road (Unit 3), Map 6 Lot 72C, Zoned C-I, MKZ Auto, LLC (Owner) and Rahul Talwar (Applicant)

B. O'Brien read the case into the record noting the previous zoning. Rahul Talwar, applicant, addressed the Board. R. Talwar told the Board that he applied for wholesale auto dealer license and he was denied, so he is here for a variance this evening. He pointed out that he does not want to bring in any trucks or do anything at the location other than to be able to obtain the wholesale license. He mentioned that the wholesale license allows him to be able to buy cars from auctions and sell the car to other auctions or other wholesale dealers, as well as exporting the car out of the country.

He then read the criteria for granting the variance:

- (1) The granting of the variance is not contrary to the public interest: because although the application is for a wholesale dealer license, there will be no selling, repairing, refurbishing or working on automobiles, trucks or SUVs or any kind of motor vehicle whatsoever at the office location. He said that it is merely an office wherein employees will conduct transactions through outside dealer to dealer online sales through auctions. He added that there will be no trucks, trailers or extra cars being driven through town, so there will be no effect on pollution, traffic or over development of the town in any way.
- (2) The spirit of the ordinance is observed: because there is no alteration of the parking lot, traffic, or roadways and all transactions will be conducted at dealer to dealer nationwide auctions. He said

that the spirit of the C-I zone is to foster business centers and the units at 184 Mammoth Road do just that, and will continue to do so.

- (3) Substantial justice is done: because the variance will not have any harmful effect to the general public due to the nature of the way the business will be performed.
- (4) Values of surrounding properties are not diminished: because it is all done online.
- (5) There is 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 the building is designed for office work, similar to what he needs based on the state requirements and all transactions are done through an online portal . He said that the proposed use is reasonable.

Chairwoman Benard asked for questions from the Board. S. Brunelle asked why he chose this particular location. R. Talwar replied that this was the most reasonable space he could find. Chairwoman Benard asked where the office space was in relation to the Coach Stop. R. Talwar replied it is across the parking lot. Chairwoman Benard asked if there are two other offices rented out in that space. R. Talwar replied he does not know. Chairwoman Benard asked how many people could work out of his office space. R. Talwar replied it would be a maximum of two employees. Chairwoman Benard asked if he has his wholesale license. R. Talwar replied he does not. Chairwoman Benard asked how the customer would road test the vehicles. R. Talwar replied that because it is a wholesale license, there would be no road testing. Chairwoman Benard asked if he could sell a car to a person that saw it online. R. Talwar replied that he cannot sell it to a person. Chairwoman Benard asked where the cars are garaged. R. Talwar replied that there is no need for a garage, as they are garaged at the auction, and can be moved from one auction to another. Chairwoman Benard asked how many people are working for him now. R. Talwar replied it is only him right now. C. Moore asked if he wanted to have any employees. R. Talwar replied he does not want any employees. Chairwoman Benard asked his hours of operation. R. Talwar replied Monday-Friday 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. S. Brunelle commented that this property is part of a condominium and asked if this use was allowed. R. Talwar replied that he is not sure and asked for more explanation. S. Brunelle noted that he should look at the declaration to see if any other use besides medical is allowed in this location. C. Moore reviewed other businesses in the building, noting that they are not all medical. Chairwoman Benard asked if K. Caron had any pertinent information on the property. K. Caron replied that she would caution the Board on the discussion on the owner of the property, but more on the use that is proposed. N. Codner replied that he is not aware of any. M. Feig asked he was renting this location. R. Talwar replied that he is renting. M. Feig asked if he was aware that he would not be able to do this in the current zone when he rented the property. R. Talwar replied that if he knew this, he would not have chosen this location. C. Moore asked where he operated out of currently. R. Talwar replied that he does not operate currently, as he does not have a license. Chairwoman Benard asked if he rented the office space because he does not live in New Hampshire. R. Talwar replied that he does not live in New Hampshire, but needs a New Hampshire address to obtain the wholesale license. M. Feig asked if there were available rentals in the C-II zone. N. Codner replied that he is not sure. Chairwoman Benard asked if the applicant looked at other areas where this would be a permitted use. R. Talwar replied that he should have called the town first, but did not, and this was priced right. Chairwoman Benard asked how many cars he could park at this site for his rental. R. Talwar replied that he parks his personal vehicle. S. Brunelle asked if the hardship is not sufficient because it does not relate to the property, but is looking for an address for the license. B. O'Brien agreed. Chairwoman Benard asked if the applicant would be requesting a sign. R. Talwar replied that he would be talking to N. Codner about a sign after depending on the outcome of the variance.

Chairwoman Benard asked if the state told him he needed a sign, would put one up. R. Talwar replied that he would. Chairwoman Benard commented that she believes that the property is unique as it shares it with the restaurant. S. Brunelle mentioned that she does not believe that this property is unique at all. C. Moore asked if there was an entrance on both sides of the building.

Chairwoman Benard asked for public input and there was none.

The Board closed public input and began deliberation:

- (1) The variance would not be contrary to the public interest: because it does not alter the essential character of the neighborhood.
- (2) The spirit of the ordinance would be observed: because it does not pose any risk to the health, safety or welfare of the general public.
- (3) Substantial justice would be done: because the loss to the applicant outweighs any gain to the general public.
- (4) Values of the surrounding properties would not be diminished: because it is already a commercial area.
- (5) There is a fair and substantial relationship that exists between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property: because the property does not have special conditions that distinguish it from other properties in the area. The proposed use is a reasonable one.

B. O'Brien made a motion in CASE NO. 02/15/2023-3 to DENY the request for a variance from LZO 4.1.2 Use Table to allow vehicle sales (wholesale) in the C-I zone which is otherwise prohibited, 184 Mammoth Road (Unit 3), Map 6 Lot 72C, Zoned C-I, MKZ Auto, LLC (Owner) and Rahul Talwar (Applicant)

I. Macarelli seconded the motion.

The motion was granted, 4-1-0. The applicant's request for a variance was DENIED for the following reason:

There is a fair and substantial relationship that exists between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property: because the property does not have special conditions that distinguish it from other properties in the area. The proposed use is a reasonable one.

V. Request for a Re-Hearing

A. Remi Fortin Realty Company (Owner) and Audrey & Jason Withee and When I Grow Up, LLC (Applicants) – Request for Re-Hearing regarding CASE NO. 12/21/2022-2 in which the Board denied a variance from LZO 4.1.2 to allow the use of a group child care facility in the C-II zone which is otherwise prohibited. The parcel is located at 298 Rockingham Road (Building J) (Map 17 Lot 24, Zoned C-II).

S. Brunelle recused herself for this case. Chairwoman Benard appointed C. Moore to vote for S. Brunelle. B. O'Brien read the case into the record. Chairwoman Benard asked for guidance as she does not have any notation. K. Caron explained that the applicant has provided new information for the request for a rehearing and that Board should discuss and decide. C. Moore stated that he believes there is significant enough information to approve for a rehearing. M. Feig asked if D. Armstrong was officially not on the Board. M. Malaguti explained that his resignation was an email exchange between Kirby Brown and D. Armstrong. He added that Kirby Brown sent out a group email to the people whose terms were expiring. He read the email, Exhibit 1, to the Board. He said that the Chairman of the Town Council had a letter of resignation, but he did not read it, and then a motion was made to accept the resignation. C. Moore asked if it was stated that the resignation was effective immediately at the Town Council meeting. M. Malaguti replied that he has watched the recording many times and he said he believe it was not stated either way. He added that the motion was to accept the resignation. Chairwoman Benard and B. O'Brien said that the rehearing should be granted.

C. Moore made a motion in CASE NO. 02/15/2023-4 to GRANT the applicant's request for Re-Hearing regarding CASE NO. 12/21/2022-2 in which the Board denied a variance from LZO 4.1.2 to allow the use of a group child care facility in the C-II zone which is otherwise prohibited, 298 Rockingham Road Building J (Map 17 Lot 24, Zoned C-II), Remi Fortin Realty Company (Owner) and Audrey & Jason Withee and When I Grow Up, LLC (Applicants).

B. O'Brien seconded the motion.

The motion was granted, 5-0-0. The applicant's request for a rehearing was GRANTED.

VI. Communication and Miscellaneous – None

VI. Other Business – None

Adjournment:

I. Macarelli made a motion to adjourn at 8:43 p.m.

M. Feig seconded the motion.

The motion was granted, 5-0-0. The meeting adjourned at 8:43 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,


CLERK

TYPED AND TRANSCRIBED BY Beth Morrison, Recording Secretary.

APPROVED (X) WITH A MOTION MADE BY S. Brunelle, SECONDED BY B. O'Brien, 5-0-0.

Exhibit 1

Kellie Caron

From: David Armstrong
Sent: Monday, December 19, 2022 12:03 PM
To: Kirby Brown
Cc: Amy Kizak; Laura Gandia; Amy Furlong
Subject: Re: Board/Committee Re-Appointment

Hi Kirby,

Sorry for the late reply I don't check this mail box too often.

I have enjoyed my time on the zoning Board but i feel it is my time to steep down and give someone else a chance.

Laura, I was going to discuss this with you before the meeting on the 21st.
Kudos to you Laura I don't know where the Zoning board would be without you!

The Zoning board meeting on December 21st will be my last.
Best Regards,
David Armstrong

From: Kirby Brown
Sent: Friday, December 9, 2022 1:45 PM
To: Kirby Brown
Cc: Amy Kizak; Laura Gandia; Amy Furlong
Subject: Board/Committee Re-Appointment

Good afternoon,

I hope everyone is doing well! This email is to remind you that your term is up on the Board/Committee/Commission in which you serve on. If you wish to be re-appointed, please send me an email letting me know. If you wish to step down and not seek re-appointment, please send me an email letting me know. **I will need to know by next Friday, December 16th the latest.** If you have questions, feel free to reach out.

Thank you,

Kirby E. Brown

Town of Londonderry
268B Mammoth Road
Londonderry, NH 03053
PHONE (603) 432-1100 x120
FAX (603) 432-1128