

ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT	December 16, 2021, 7:00 PM
TOWN OF HAMPTON FALLS	TOWN HALL

DRAFT

A. CALL TO ORDER

John DeLeire, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

B. ROLL CALL

5 PRESENT: John DeLeire, Chairman; Steve Bryant, Vice-Chairman; Mark Call, Alex Dittami, Members; James Hasenfus, Alternate

2 ABSENT: Scott Almeda, Member; Patricia Young, Alternate

2 NON-VOTING: Mark Sikorski, Building Inspector; Rachel D. Webb, Town Secretary.

C. PUBLIC HEARING

Case # 21-03: Application from **Richard M. Marchese** for relief from Building Code Requirements Section 7.1.1.1 b) Septic Reserve Area (SRA) to allow the use of a Test Pit with a result of 16-inches to the estimated Seasonal High-Water Table, in Zone A/R, at property located at **9 LaFiesta Drive, Map 1, Lot 30-1 (continued from November 18, 2021).**

Richard Scarano introduced himself as Attorney for the applicant, Richard Marchese. He said that Henry Boyd of Millennium Engineering has been previously shepherding this application through the ZBA, and he spoke with him earlier in the week.

R. Scarano prepared a memo to the Zoning Board (which he distributed) because he noticed a couple of things that H. Boyd was proceeding on that seemed to be procedurally incorrect. R. Scarano stated that the publication of the application has been for sixteen-inches (16") in the test hole, and actually the plans, the logs, and all of the information is actually for a twenty-inch (20") test hole. The Town has been advertising this application for 16-inches, and all along it has been 20-inches that was the testing in the field, as well as on the plan itself. The applicant has a 20-inch test hole, that is on the proposed plan, it is on the soil logs, and that is a significant difference in the relief being requesting. He said that he was not sure how the ZBA board wanted to address the issue, which he summarized as issue #1 in his memo. Additionally, R. Scarano said that this issue is probably the applicant's fault. He said that the way to correct it, and to correct the record, is to make sure that the public, the ZBA board, and anyone else who may make a decision on the application, understands that the actual test hole was 20-inches. This means that the 20-inch is a four (4") inch deviation from the ordinance requirement of 24-inches, or 86% compliance with the regulations; whereas a 16-inch (16") test hole has an 8-inch (8") deviation from the ordinance, for a compliance rate of 66%. R. Scarano thought that from an administrative and procedural standpoint that re-advertising the application with the correct number of 20-inches would correct the error. For example, he cited the agenda for the meeting tonight referenced the 16-inches, and not the 20-inch correct distance.

J. DeLeire proposed that the ZBA board discuss the possibility of making a motion to amend the application from 16-inches to 20-inches, as requested by the applicant, in order to take a vote on it tonight, as opposed to re-advertising the application and delaying the vote to another meeting.

A. Dittami asked if the application says 20-inches, or if it says 16-inches. J. DeLeire referenced the original application material, which noted the dimension requested for waiver of 16-inches.

ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT	December 16, 2021, 7:00 PM
TOWN OF HAMPTON FALLS	TOWN HALL

DRAFT

R. Scarano said that he does not know from where the 16-inch dimension originated, because, he said, that it is not on the plans, nor on the soil logs, it is nowhere to be found in the testing in the field, and he thinks it is a “Scrivener’s error” that has resulted in a representation that is inaccurate.

S. Bryant said that unfortunately it is not the error of the ZBA. And R. Scarano said that his applicant is taking full responsibility for the error, and that is why he thought that the best way to approach the issue would be to amend the petition, and possibly re-advertise it, so that no one is prejudiced, including the applicant. R. Scarano said that the applicant would absorb the cost of re-advertising. A. Dittami asked how the applicant would be prejudiced, if the ZBA implemented J. DeLeire’s discussion proposal to amend the application tonight from 16-inches to 20-inches. R. Scarano responded that right now the proposed plan says 20-inches, and the soil log says 20-inches, that’s an 86% compliance with the ordinance requirement at 24-inches. A 16-inch hole would be a 66% compliance with the ordinance requirement at 24-inches. So, if it would affect anyone’s decision on the waiver, the applicant is very close to meeting the requirement of the ordinance, or a lot closer than what is represented on the application.

A. Dittami asked if the prejudice would affect the general public, and R. Scarano responded that yes, because granting relief for something that is not, in fact, part of the actual application prejudices the public. If the public were to appeal, they could base their appeal on the fact that the information was erroneous. The relief being considered is in fact erroneous because the correct facts were not being considered. As an attorney, he stated that he does not want to put any facts out to the public that are not accurate. He does think there is no harm in re-advertising to 20-inches so that the applicant can move forward.

J. DeLeire said that before the ZBA considers going through that exercise of potentially re-advertising the application, that he wanted to share, with R. Scarano, some context of this application, over the past several months. Henry Boyd did a great job of presenting the application and the ZBA took the opportunity to allow the petitioner to produce some type of evidence to prove that the 24-inch requirement of the ordinance was overburdensome. R. Scarano stated that issue #2 of his letter addresses that saying that on August 26, 2021 the ZBA voted (in an amended motion) to have Mike Cuomo of Rockingham County Conservation District (RCCD) issue an opinion to the ZBA that the 16-inch hole was somehow more detrimental to the environment than the 24-inch requirement of the ordinance.

S. Bryant said that he did not recall the word detrimental used in the motion, but rather that the ZBA wanted to hear evidence from an authority that the 16-inches provides a “*commensurate level of protection to the town’s ordinance requirement*”, which is 24-inches. That is what was asked for, and there was absolutely no determination. Additionally, S. Bryant continued that the ZBA had asked the petitioner several times to provide the ZBA with that type of evidence so that the ZBA could support the petitioner’s position. The statement from the petitioner was that 16-inches is just as good as the 24-inch requirement, so the ZBA’s response to the petitioner was to help us understand and appreciate that with some level of science, or have M. Cuomo of RCCD

ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT	December 16, 2021, 7:00 PM
TOWN OF HAMPTON FALLS	TOWN HALL

DRAFT

communicate with the ZBA that the 16-inch proposal is just as good as the 24-inch requirement, and to date the ZBA has seen no evidence of that evidence nor opinion.

R. Scarano agreed because on August 26, 2021 the ZBA made an amended motion (and he quoted from the minutes): “To determine if the plan submitted provides a commensurate level of environmental protection as the current Hampton Falls ordinance requires.” It was Mr. Cuomo’s burden to tell us whether or not there was a deficiency that could be scientifically brought forward for the consideration of the ZBA, but that did not happen.

J. DeLeire corrected R. Scarano on two points, namely, first, that it was not M. Cuomo’s responsibility, but rather the responsibility of the petitioner to address the issue, and second, that the ZBA did not choose M. Cuomo. The ZBA gave the petitioner the opportunity for any and all scientific evidence to be submitted to the ZBA to indicate that the 16-inches was as good, if not better than, the 24-inches required by ordinance, to convince the ZBA that the relief would be warranted and that there would be no detriment. R. Scarano responded that he did not think that that was an undue burden for the applicant, but that is not what the record says, and it is not what was ordered nor paid for by the applicant. R. Scarano continued that it was clear in the amended motion of August 26th what was supposed to be done, and it was not done, in neither of the two correspondences from M. Cuomo. M. Call asked for confirmation from R. Scarano that his point was that the question detailed in the amended motion was never answered by M. Cuomo, and R. Scarano agreed.

R. Scarano tried to figure out if there was a misunderstanding, that maybe M. Cuomo did not see the amended motion, and maybe he did not understand what his obligation was to the ZBA, so he told his client that he would come to the ZBA meeting tonight and find out why M. Cuomo did not address the issue. The reason M. Cuomo is involved is because the original inquiry was to bring an expert, without bias to the ZBA, to make the determination.

A.Dittami asked R. Scarano if he is asking the ZBA to withdraw the petition of his client, and R. Scarano responded that that is one of the options. A second option is to amend the current application, because it is already before the ZBA and re-advertise it. He said that either one of those two options would put the applicant back where they could move forward. The second step of either option is to have M. Cuomo answer the question from the amended motion of August 26th.

S. Bryant said to A. Dittami, that if the applicant wants to withdraw their current application to the ZBA, then everything is a moot point and the applicant starts from scratch again. A. Dittami clarified that it is up to the applicant to make that determination, and to request the withdrawal. A.Dittami asked R. Scarano what he wanted to do, did he want to either 1) withdraw the application, or 2) amend the current application, and R. Scarano responded that *“there is a third option. The third option is that the lot is a “Lot of Record” and, as such, is “grandfathered”, so the applicant is not sure if the ZBA, in fact, has jurisdiction over a Lot of Record for this type of septic system because a Lot of Record is exempt. You can’t have a 1988 bylaw apply to a Lot that has been in existence for thirty-years with a roadway in front of it.”*

ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT	December 16, 2021, 7:00 PM
TOWN OF HAMPTON FALLS	TOWN HALL

DRAFT

J. DeLeire asked R. Scarano if he was suggesting that the ZBA use the septic regulations that were in place when the lot was created, instead of today. R. Scarano responded, no, that is not a suggestion that would stand legal scrutiny. R. Scarano stated that *“it is just grandfathered, period”*. Regulations that are passed after something that is “of Record”, are exempt generally from the regulations, and this is not a debatable point. The NH Supreme Court has ruled on this subject several times, and that is the issue here. R. Scarano apologized that this has gone in this direction.

A.Dittami redirected the discussion back to the beginning, stating that the ZBA is here to act on something that your applicant wants the ZBA to do. You have outlined three different courses, but you have not told us which one your applicant wants the ZBA to pursue. So deal with them one at a time, and make your choice, and the ZBA votes on it, and we are done.

R. Scarano clarified that since M. Cuomo was asked and hasn’t ruled on, or provided the information paid for by the applicant, that it is R. Scarano’s opinion that the application needs to go back to M. Cuomo to determine that the lot of record is not jurisdictional to this type of relief. So there are two issues, namely: 1) to withdraw, without prejudice, if the ZBA will allow the withdrawal, without paying another fee, and then make a new application to the ZBA with the 20-inch information, and simultaneously 2) the applicant could contact M. Cuomo, and supply the plan, and ask if it is grandfathered, so that M. Cuomo can make a decision.

R. Scarano apologized that right now his applicant is part of the confusion of the record, and that R. Scarano takes all of the responsibility for the confusion because he is the lead counsel on it. Unfortunately, R. Scarano stated that H. Boyd started this process when R. Scarano was not able to appear previously, but he is present tonight to try to correct it. To answer A. Dittami’s question, yes, one of the choices is to withdraw the application without prejudice. A. Dittami asked R. Scarano if he was asking the ZBA to do that (withdraw without prejudice), and R. Scarano said, no, not yet, because it would be conditioned upon the applicant getting an answer from M. Cuomo, one way or another, whether this application is so environmentally bad that it can not be looked at by the ZBA.

S. Bryant interjected asking how is one part of the other because either you withdraw it, and resubmit it, and the applicant goes to M. Cuomo, or you amend it.

R. Scarano said that his question was whether the applicant can go to M. Cuomo and ask him whether or not the lot is grandfathered. Additionally, R. Scarano asked who determines whether the lot is a grandfathered lot of record, is it M. Cuomo, or is it the Building Inspector.

J. DeLeire described that the ZBA had made very clear to H. Boyd that he could go and obtain whatever scientific evidence that he could to suggest to the ZBA that the scenario he was proposing would satisfy the requirements of the ordinance and that it would not be detrimental.

ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT	December 16, 2021, 7:00 PM
TOWN OF HAMPTON FALLS	TOWN HALL

DRAFT

J. DeLeire continued describing that the ZBA had previously told H. Boyd that even if he did provide that evidence, that there was no guarantee that the ZBA would vote in favor of granting the relief sought.

R. Scarano recognized that the ZBA board has to consider the evidence in front of them and make an informed decision. He stated that the applicant is not looking for a guarantee, but he is not looking to prejudice anyone either, the public or ourselves. J. DeLeire said that he does not want there to be a reliance factor. R. Scarano said that he completely understood the ZBA board's position they are in, as he himself has served on boards as well. He said that he thinks that correcting the record is the first thing, so withdrawing this application without prejudice is probably not the way to go. There is a hearing in front of this board, and there has not been a decision. There is still an open issue with M. Cuomo. This should be re-advertised and put back in front of the ZBA board. Nothing would stop this applicant from approaching M. Cuomo and saying that this is a Lot of Record, so why does the ZBA have jurisdiction, why isn't it the Board of Health.

S. Bryant said that he did not understand why R. Scarano doesn't want to withdraw this application, because it is clear that he does not believe that it belongs in front of the ZBA. So, if the application does not belong in front of the ZBA, then let's withdraw it, and then if the applicant needs to refile, then refile with the appropriate and accurate information.

J. DeLeire added that there is another option available, that the ZBA could make the determination that the ZBA finds that the application does not belong before the ZBA.

S. Bryant encouraged the applicant to withdraw the application with prejudice, and seek whatever remedies are necessary, seek input from M. Cuomo and if he finds in the applicant's favor, then the applicant may not even need to return to the ZBA. R. Scarano said that he fully understands that, but that he can not make that determination at the drop of a hat. S. Bryant said that the ZBA can not make that determination for the applicant.

R. Scarano said that it would require (and that the Building Inspector would know this as well) some evidence for him, or anyone else, to make a determination that the grandfather situation of this 30-year-old lot makes it inappropriate for the application to be in front of the ZBA. This was out of an abundance of caution that this application was filed because Millennium Engineering thought that this would be the best way to approach this. Now, here R. Scarano is scrambling after the ZBA has had a few hearings with H. Boyd. R. Scarano said that he does not want to prejudice his client or anyone else, but right now, what is front of the ZBA is defective, and it should be corrected, and that should be done by re-advertising it. Secondly, there is nothing to stop his client from providing M. Cuomo with evidence that maybe this jurisdiction is not proper. Maybe it is grandfathered. Maybe M. Cuomo would agree, but we would still have time to do that between the two meetings. One, get the evidence that the ZBA is looking for, that it is environmentally safe to put four-feet of cover over this hole and not affect the environment with a subsurface disposal system. Two, is this jurisdictional, is it a Lot of Record, and therefore it is grandfathered from this provision under Section 7.1.1.1 b). Those are things that R. Scarano said

ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT	December 16, 2021, 7:00 PM
TOWN OF HAMPTON FALLS	TOWN HALL

DRAFT

that he thinks can be answered now that he is present and can go forward with it. R. Scarano said that he is sorry about the delay, and he is sorry about the prejudice that happened with H. Boyd, but he does not want to compound this without fixing it.

A. Dittami said that this is not a defective record, that the applicant was here over many different meetings and talked about the 16-inch dimension repeatedly. It is pretty disingenuous to come in now and say oops, it was a mistake. There is no mistake, although maybe on R. Scarano's part, but it was clear and represented all of the way through, so there is no need for the ZBA to do anything to correct the record. If the applicant wants to correct the record, he withdraws the petition and puts in a new one with all of the conditions. Don't tell the ZBA that there is a mistake in the record. Your mistake yes, not ours. And your engineer told us and used the 16-inch dimension repeatedly, and it was given to M. Cuomo that way as well. So go back to your client and make a decision and ask the ZBA to do something, but right now it does not look very good.

M. Sikorski, Building Inspector, thanked Chairman DeLeire for his comments earlier in the meeting. M. Sikorski disagreed with R. Scarano's position saying that H. Boyd came to the ZBA meetings and argued vehemently about the 16-inch measurement, calling it stupid and out-of-date, and that there was no reason that we should be at 24-inches. There was never a mention of 20-inches anywhere. Letters went to M. Cuomo, as he reviews our plans. At this point M. Sikorski asked numerous questions of the applicant, as follows:

- 1) How many test pits were on the property (Lot 1)? Answer: Three.
- 2) When were the test pits done? Answer: December 20, 2020.
- 3) Were there ever any other test pits on that lot? Answer: back when it was created in the 1980s.
- 4) Do you have a record of those other test pits? Answer: We do.
- 5) Can I see them? Answer: I don't have them with me.
- 6) Why not? Answer: Are you kidding me, sir?
- 7) Why don't you have them, you told us they were grandfathered.
- 8) How many of the test pits on that lot passed? Answer: 2 of them passed, and one of them was at 20-inches.
- 9) Why is the design such that the septic design needs to be at the lower end of the property behind the house? Answer: the topography.
- 10) Why? Answer: the topography is very steep at the roadway and recedes away to the rear of the lot line, where is the most suitable place for a house. You can not get a house anywhere between the road and the area shown on the plan.
- 11) Can you tell me the reason why there is a shared driveway that crosses this lot? Answer: to avoid moving tons of fill.
- 12) From where? Answer: from the site and altering the site for access.
- 13) Which site? Answer: either way, there has to be two driveways, there are two driveways on the site plan, and the shared driveway eliminates movement of more fill.
- 14) Could a septic system that meets the 24-inches be put anywhere on that site? Answer: where it is currently drawn.
- 15) Could it be placed anywhere else on that site? Answer: not feasibly

ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT	December 16, 2021, 7:00 PM
TOWN OF HAMPTON FALLS	TOWN HALL

DRAFT

16) And by feasibly, you mean it would cost more money to do it? Answer: not only would it cost more money, but it would disturb the environment to a greater degree.

17) Would it create a hardship? Answer: absolutely a hardship in terms of topography, I think you are well aware of that.

18) Is it a hardship related to the expense of creating a passible system? Answer: I am sure that you could make that case, but he is not before the ZBA for a hardship, he is seeking a waiver.

19) What is the reason for that waiver, is it because of hardship? Answer: No, because we have a proposed septic system that provides the same or better amount of environmental protection.

M. Sikorski said that he had a letter from M. Cuomo that states, in bold letters, that “the wastewater system proposed does not provide a commensurate amount of protection as the current Hampton Falls ordinance provides.” R. Scarano asked the date of the letter, and M. Sikorski responded November 5, 2021. R. Scarano said that that was the second letter. R. Scarano said the first letter did not say that. M. Sikorski said that the second letter says it, and that you requested the review. R. Scarano insisted that M. Cuomo did not submit what was requested to the ZBA. M. Sikorski rebutted that he believes that M. Cuomo did. R. Scarano said that at the ZBA meeting of August 26, 2021 is when the review was requested of M. Cuomo. M. Cuomo was going on the 16-inches dimension for his review, even though the record shows the 20-inch dimension. M. Sikorski said that the difference between the two dimensions is 20%. R. Scarano said that the 20-inch dimension would be 86% compliant with the ordinance requirement. M. Sikorski asked if the applicant could propose a system that could be 100% compliant. R. Scarano said that they should not be arguing like this. M. Sikorski said that R. Scarano sat there and told the ZBA that they have been arguing the wrong dimension over three meetings, where a certified engineer sat here and argued 16-inches over the 24-inch ordinance requirement. R. Scarano said that H. Boyd was mistaken. M. Sikorski said that R. Scarano comes here tonight and says that H. Boyd was mistaken, and asked him if he is disputing his engineer’s findings or arguments? R. Scarano said that he is not disputing anyone’s findings or arguments, what he said, that he is telling the ZBA, is that what was in front of the ZBA previously was incorrect information to make a decision. R. Scarano accused M. Sikorski of becoming an advocate and that he had “stepped over the line”. R. Scarano further reiterated, and insisted that the information in front of the ZBA is wrong, to which M. Sikorski responded that he suggested the applicant withdraw and resubmit his application. R. Scarano thanked M. Sikorski for his suggestion, and said that he is asking the ZBA to modify this application and re-advertise it. And get a response from M. Cuomo about the protection and why.

J. DeLeire said to R. Scarano that it was certainly within his ability to withdraw the application, but that if he does not withdraw it, that the ZBA have a discussion and move toward making a decision. R. Scarano added that the ZBA would be making a decision with the wrong information. J. DeLeire responded saying that this application has been before the ZBA for four months. He referenced the original plan in his packet, that was submitted and discussed by H. Boyd as 16-inches. He further stated that H. Boyd has been around a long time, and he is the engineer, and J. DeLeire is of the opinion that the application before the ZBA is with the 16-inch dimension. The ZBA has a letter from M. Cuomo that indicates in clear fashion that what was

ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT	December 16, 2021, 7:00 PM
TOWN OF HAMPTON FALLS	TOWN HALL

DRAFT

presented to him does not meet the Hampton Falls ordinance requirements. So the ZBA is in a position with no alternative but to move forward.

S. Bryant stated that there was no mistake on the ZBA's part, and how does he know that the dimension should be 20-inches. He said that the applicant's engineer, (H. Boyd) as an authority, is a well-known and respected engineer, who told the ZBA that the dimension is 16-inches. R. Scarano responded that the plan is stamped, the plan has the 20-inch dimension on it, and there is nothing in front of the ZBA that has 16-inches on it, no plans, nothing M. Cuomo could review with 16-inches on it, other than the representations of H. Boyd. J. DeLeire stated that M. Cuomo witnessed the test pits, and R. Scarano said that they were at 20-inches. But J. DeLeire said that M. Cuomo wrote a letter saying that the test pit was at 16-inches, so why would that be so, to which R. Scarano responded that he did not know why, and that he was here to try to correct it.

A. Dittami presented the original ZBA application material to R. Scarano and asked him to show the ZBA where, in the application materials, does it say 20-inches. R. Scarano said that on page two of the plan shows the logs in the lower right corner table, and that is where the 20-inch dimension is present, in test pit number 3. A. Dittami reviewed, to be clear, the applicant took the time to complete an application, after reviewing and preparing plans, knowing that the dimension was 20-inches, and decided for whatever reason, that 20-inches was not appropriate, that he was going to go with 16-inches. The 20-inch dimension is clearly on the plan, and your engineer knew it was on the plan, and he opted to go with the 16-inches. That is not the ZBA's problem, it is the applicant's problem, but the ZBA's record shows 16-inches. What that tells him (A. Dittami) is that the applicant wanted greater relief than what was needed by the plan. It was not a mistake, it was clear, on the plan. R. Scarano responded saying that there was no mistake but in the advertising of the application, to which A. Dittami objected vehemently saying that what H. Boyd wrote on the application was 16-inches, and that was what was advertised. There was no mistake in advertising.

R. Scarano reiterated that all of the information in front of the ZBA board and M. Cuomo is 20-inches, it is not 16-inches. It (16-inches) is not on the plan, it is not anywhere except in a representation, which is a Scrivener's Error on the application. He does not know how the ZBA can hold anyone responsible, because the ZBA spent a lot of time on this application, and he repeated himself saying that he is trying to correct the record here.

J. DeLeire said that R. Scarano had made his point and that unless he was going to withdraw the application, that the ZBA was going to move forward to discussion. R. Webb commented that in reviewing the original application materials, that there are at least four separate pieces of paper where the dimension of 16-inches is referenced, and nowhere is the dimension 20-inches noted. A. Dittami said that it was a pre-meditated decision by H. Boyd to use the 16-inches, and that it was not a mistake. He further emphasized that H. Boyd referred to the plan, during at least three meetings, with the dimension of 16-inches, and never said 20-inches. Several times he mentioned going back to the plan to make corrections and updates, so A. Dittami believed R. Scarano's accusation of H. Boyd's mistake to be fallacious.

ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT	December 16, 2021, 7:00 PM
TOWN OF HAMPTON FALLS	TOWN HALL

DRAFT

M. Sikorski said that if the availability was there to represent it at 20-inches, that H. Boyd would have done so. H. Boyd does an incredible lot of work in the town of Hampton Falls, and he is here almost monthly before various boards, and that what R. Scarano has said is that either H. Boyd or someone made a grievous error, but that it was not by someone on the ZBA. And A. Dittami said that it was not by the Engineer either. S. Bryant said that more aptly stated that it was not an error.

M. Sikorski said that this lot has been dissected by the matter before the ZBA, and by a driveway that literally cuts it in half. He said that the applicant has taken a lot that was very usable and taken that away by its mere design, and that now you're saying that there is a mistake. There is a shared driveway that basically cuts it in half that removes a huge amount of area that you could develop a property with a septic system that would clearly meet the requirements of Hampton Falls. You seem to be so focused on placing the septic system in the lower corner of the lot when there are multiple other places you could place a system. Now if there was some reason that created a severe hardship, that you needed to come to the ZBA to ask for relief then bring it forth. If not, then find another place to put the septic system on the lot.

R. Scarano said that he will need to have this conversation with H. Boyd. M. Sikorski suggested that there may be other ways to create access to Lot 2 without going across Lot 1.

J. DeLeire summarized the facts of the application and stated that his position was that the town ordinance is 24-inches, and that is what the proposed septic system needs to be.

MOTION: To conclude this portion of the meeting, (unless the applicant had anything else to add), and that the ZBA move to a vote.

MOTION: A. DITTAMI

R. Scarano stated that he thought it was ill-advised to move forward with the error in the application, and J. DeLeire said that the applicant has been heard, and that the ZBA was considering discussing the vote.

R. Scarano requested the ZBA to withdraw the applicant's application without prejudice and allow the applicant to re-submit.

MOTION: To allow the applicant to withdraw his petition Case # 21-03, without prejudice, and to allow him to re-submit.

MOTION: A.DITTAMI

SECOND: J. DELEIRE

UNANIMOUS

D. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MEETING MINUTES: 11/18/2021

MOTION: To approve the minutes of the Zoning Board of Adjustment from November 18, 2021, as written.

MOTION: S. BRYANT

ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT	December 16, 2021, 7:00 PM
TOWN OF HAMPTON FALLS	TOWN HALL

DRAFT

SECOND: A. DITTAMI
UNANIMOUS

E. OTHER BUSINESS: There was no other business.

F. COMMUNICATIONS TO BOARD MEMBERS:

G. ADJOURN

MOTION: To adjourn the Zoning Board of Adjustment meeting at 7:50 pm.

MOTION: A. DITTAMI

SECOND: S. BRYANT

UNANIMOUS

The next meeting of the Zoning Board of Adjustment is scheduled for Thursday, January 27, 2022