

TOWN OF THORNTON
Zoning Board of Adjustment
Hearing Date: June 23, 2008

Board Members present: Jim Demeritt, Chairman, David Gravel, Vice Chairman, Giff Kriebel and Marianne Peabody, Clerk.

Others present: Ralph Perron, James Boyd, Russ Gilman, Darlene King, Gene Meier, W.J. Zarowski, Jon Capuzzo, William Wallace, Carole Wallace, Chris Bolan, Don MacIntosh, Sandy MacIntosh, Tom Mullen.

The Thornton Zoning Board of Adjustment met and held a hearing concerning an
“AREA VARIANCE”

Under the Thornton Zoning Ordinance, Article VI. Basic Development Requirements
C. Recreational Zones Development East & West

(1) Lot Size & Density

- a. The basic density of 1 acre per dwelling shall apply and the maximum number of dwellings, either single family multiple family or a mix shall be computed on that basis.

At 6:15 PM this hearing was called to order by Chairman Jim Demeritt. The minutes of the June 9, 2008 hearing were reviewed and approved as written. Chris Bolan of Neighborfest re-capped the prior hearing dated June 9, 2008. . He explained how they met with Mr. Mullen of Owls Nest as requested by the Board and is reporting that Owls Nest does not have suitable land available to accommodate this project. He submitted from Owl’s Nest a letter of support that was read aloud by Chairman Demeritt. Chairman Demeritt informed the Neighborfest Committee that this hearing for an “area variance could not be heard this evening without an application for the “USE VARIANCE”. The Use Variance application was given to the applicant and was not returned back to the town. According to Darlene King of the Neighborfest Committee, Southern NH Services is pursuing another project in an effort to meet federal application deadline dates. They are not giving up on this project in Thornton and will be back at a later date. A brief history up to this point was re-capped, and Darlene requested that the Chairman ask for a consensus of the abutters present.

Comments from abutters:

1. Not excited over the project. It is better suited in another location.
2. The building is considered to be to close to the road.
3. Another abutter mentioned that he was not excited with the project. Concerned with loosing his view.
4. Could there be a surface water issue?

This hearing adjourned at 6:50PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Marianne Peabody

Clerk

Posting Date: 06-25-08

