



Town of Wilton, NH Zoning Board of Adjustment MINUTES

Masks are requested to be worn at all Town of Wilton ZBA meetings.

Tuesday, October 8, 2024

7 PM

Wilton Town Hall Courtroom

42 Main Street

ATTENDEES

Board Members Present:

Neil Faiman (chairperson); Joanna Eckstrom (co-chairperson; remote); Jeff Stone (remote); Peg Duggan (alternate); Linda Jennings (alternate)

Board Members Absent:

Andy Hoar; Judith Klinghoffer

Board Secretary:

Caryn Case (land use administrator)

Attendees:

Roy Tilsley, Esq; Michael Boggs; Joseph Coffey; Nikki O'Neil; Jon Rokeh; Lynne Pentler; Kristine Suminski

TABLE of CONTENTS

1. Call to Order
2. Minutes
 - a. 09.10.2024
 - b. 08.05.2024
3. 08/13/2024-05, Isaac Frye Holdings, Inc. Isaac Frye Highway
4. 10/08/2024-01, The Coffey Family Trust, Joseph & Shannen Coffey Trustees
5. Other Business
 - a. HAB Appeal
6. Adjournment

MINUTES

1. Call to Order

Chairperson called the meeting of the Town of Wilton Zoning Board of Adjustment order at 7:07 p.m. He asked those in the room to sign in. He asked those who would be speaking to identify themselves by name, address, and to state their interest in the case.

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73

Chairperson Faiman noted that RSA 91-A:2, Meetings Open to Public, permits Board members to remotely participate should it not be reasonably practical for them to be physically present. He stated that Co-chairperson Joanna Eckstrom and Jeff Stone would be participating in the hearings remotely due to health reasons that cause it to be impractical for them to be physically present. He stated that a quorum of the Board was physically present: himself, Neil Faiman, Chairperson; Peg Duggan, alternate; and Linda Jennings, alternate, noting the latter two board members were sitting for Andy Hoar and Judith Klinghoffer, Board members who are out sick and/or out on extended medical leave.

Chairperson Faiman said no new cases would be heard after 9:30 p.m., and adjournment would be at 10 p.m. He explained this could be extended by a unanimous decision by the Board.

2. Minutes

a. September 10, 2024

The Board made edits to lines 91, 117, 154, 155, 157, 164, 166, 313, 375, 428, 483, 511, and 532.

P Duggan made a MOTION to accept the minutes with edits to lines 91, 117, 154, 155, 157, 164, 166, 313, 375, 428, 483, 511, and 532.

L Jennings SECONDED the motion.

There was no DISCUSSION.

ROLL Call Vote:	L Jennings	yea
	N Faiman	yea
	P Duggan	yea
	J Stone	yea
	JK Eckstrom	yea

Motion CARRIED. 5/0/0

b. October 5, 2024 (site visit)

The Board made edits to lines 11, 55, 82, 101, 103, and 112.

P Duggan made a MOTION to accept the minutes with edits to lines 11, 55, 82, 101, 103, and 112.

L Jennings SECONDED the motion.

There was no DISCUSSION.

ROLL Call Vote:	L Jennings	yea
	N Faiman	yea
	P Duggan	yea
	J Stone	abstain
	JK Eckstrom	abstain

74 **Motion CARRIED.**

74 **3/0/2**

75
76 **3. Isaac Frye Holdings, Inc.**

77 Public Hearing, *continued from a previous meeting*

78 **Case 08/13/2024-05**

79 *Isaac Frye Holdings, LLC has requested variances to sections 9B.6.1, 9B.6.2, and 9B.6.4 of the Wilton*
80 *Zoning Ordinance to allow a proposed gravel excavation on Lot F-3-2, Isaac Frye Highway, where the*
81 *excavation would be closer to lot lines than allowed by the Ordinance, would be reclaimed with steeper*
82 *slopes than allowed by the Ordinance, and the access for the removal of the excavated material would be*
83 *to Isaac Frye Highway rather than to Greenville Road.*

84
85 Chairperson Faimon opened the public hearing by reading the public notice and gave a brief history of the
86 application received in August 2024. He said the hearing had been continued on September 10, 2024, and a
87 site visit was held on October 5, 2024.

88
89 Roy Tilsley, Esq., said the excavation site plans and supporting documents, approved by the Planning Board,
90 had been submitted for review. He described a detailed process that involved multiple meetings with the
91 Planning Board, peer engineering reviews, and reclamation discussion with John Rokeh, to obtain the
92 excavation site plan permit.

93
94 John Rokeh said stamped engineering plans, regarding the two to one reclamation slope and plantings, were
95 reviewed by the Planning Board as stable and sufficient and factored into their approval of the excavation
96 site plan permit. He said the other issue had been the need to create an independent driveway in lieu of
97 using the easement over Mr. Dillon's property. He noted that the Board had previously approved the
98 variance to section 9B.6.4 to allow this excavation in 2021 and urged the Board to do so again citing that
99 the spirit of the ordinance and substantial justice would be met for the development of this difficult lot, and
100 not leave it valueless, for the property owner.

101
102 John Rokeh said the purpose of the excavation was not to strip the lot for commercial purposes but rather
103 to prepare it for development. He noted the previous approval allowed 5,000 cubic yards of excavated
104 material even though 30,000 cubic yards of excavated material were proposed to build a much larger
105 residential dwelling unit. He said this approval forced the scaling of the project to a manufactured housing
106 unit in the location where material had already been removed from the site. He added that there would be
107 no further removal of material from that site, but they would be moving material that had been stockpiled
108 around the site.

109
110 John Rokeh cited that the proposed driveway is about 1,500 feet from the proposed manufactured housing
111 unit to the right-of-way through the 58-foot wide 'flagpole' making it difficult to meet the 300-foot natural

112 wooded buffer as required by section 9B.6.1. He said the shape of this lot creates hardship, as would the
113 use of the required easement located about six feet from Mr. Dillon's front door. He said the development
114 of the driveway as proposed would not impair the character of the neighborhood, but rather improve value
115 for all. He added that the Planning Board granted this relief.

116

117 John Rokeh then discussed the matter of transporting excavated material pursuant to section 9B.6.42
118 noting that the parcel is not in the excavation overlay district and not accessible to Route 31. He said this
119 criterion does not make sense for this type of development which validates that it is not applicable in this
120 case. He added that since there will be no additional removal of material there is no reason for the Town
121 to be concerned about an impact on local roadways.

122

123 Joanna Eckstrom asked Mr. Rokeh to show, on the plan, where the building envelope was going to be and if
124 there would be a garage. John Rokeh described the building setback as starting about 50 feet off the
125 northerly property line because the back of the manufactured housing unit sits up against the slope to be
126 reclaimed. He said that a garage, as a separate structure, was not being proposed at this time.

127

128 Michael Boggs, abutter, asked that his property be respected. He stated he has no issue with a house as the
129 proposed development, but he does not want a gravel pit next door. Neil Faiman assured Mr. Boggs a
130 gravel pit would require a new application.

131

132 Chairperson Faiman said he was a spectator to the Planning Board's review of the application and noted
133 that the Planning Board was concerned that the applicant might not end up with an acceptable decision.

134

135 Joanna Eckstrom asked if the lot would be further subdivided. Neil Faiman said it would not be practical as
136 the efforts to do so would be monumental.

137

138 Chairperson Faiman reviewed the facts as they had been discussed:

139

- 140 1. Lot F-3-2 is an 8.84-acre lot in the General Residential and Agricultural District and the Aquifer
141 Protection overlay district.
- 142 2. The lot was created, along with Lot F-3-1, by the subdivision of Lot F-3 in 2016.
- 143 3. The lot has 50 feet of frontage on Isaac Frye Highway, and a "flagpole," 50 feet wide and 410 feet
144 long, running east from Isaac Frye Highway to the body of the lot.
- 145 4. The lot is located at the top of a very steep hill, approximately 45 feet above the lot entrance,
146 making the lot effectively inaccessible without an extravagant amount of earth work.
- 147 5. The 2016 subdivision created an access easement over the northeast corner of Lot F-3-1 to allow
148 access to the body of Lot F-3-2, which passes a few feet from the existing house on Lot F-3-1.
- 149 6. The Applicants began excavating and removing earth materials from Lot F-3-2 in 2020.

- 150 7. The Applicants were notified that the Town believed that ongoing excavation activity was in
151 violation of various Town regulations, including the Zoning Ordinance
- 152 8. The Applicants suspended excavation in 2021 and applied to the ZBA for variances to sections 4.1
153 and 12.4 of the Wilton Zoning Ordinance, to allow excavation outside the Gravel Excavation
154 District (ZBA Case #5/11/21-1).
- 155 9. The Applicants subsequently altered their application, to permit only the excavation that had
156 already occurred. The ZBA granted the amended variance request on November 9, 2021, with the
157 condition that no more material would be removed from the property, and the understanding that
158 the excavation was subject to Excavation Site Plan Review by the Wilton Planning Board.
- 159 10. The Applicants applied to the Planning Board for Excavation Site Plan Review on November 17,
160 2021, and were told that the excavation would need additional variances.
- 161 11. The Applicant appealed that determination to the ZBA on March 17, 2022 (ZBA Case #4/12/22-
162 1).
- 163 12. The Applicants subsequently withdrew the appeal without prejudice after reaching a settlement
164 agreement with the Town which would allow the Excavation Site Plan Review to proceed and
165 require the Applicants to apply for variances to section 9B.6.1, 9B.6.2, and 9B.6.4 of the Zoning
166 Ordinance.
- 167 13. The Planning Board conditionally approved the Excavation Site Plan, June 19, 2024.
- 168 14. The Applicants submitted this application to the ZBA on July 23, 2024.
- 169

170 J Rokeh clarified that the excavation started when they applied and were granted a driveway permit. He
171 said they started work on the driveway then applied for a building permit and paid the fees for the house
172 proposed at the time. He said it was at the time work being done on the driveway when the Town
173 stopped the process, revoking the driveway permit and refunding the building permit fees.

174

175 Chairperson Faiman noted the Board heard the position of the applicant.

176

177 **JK Eckstrom made a MOTION to close the public hearing.**

178 **L Jennings SECONDED the motion.**

179 **There was no DISCUSSION.**

180 **ROLL Call Vote: L Jennings yea**

181 **N Faiman yea**

182 **P Duggan yea**

183 **J Stone yea**

184 **JK Eckstrom yea**

185 **Motion CARRIED. 5/0/0**

186

187 Joanna Eckstrom commented that the applicants had done their required diligence. She stated the lot is not
188 an excavation or gravel pit, but rather a residential lot someone will enjoy.

189
190 Chairperson Faiman delved into the definition of the term excavation citing the term is two-fold. He said
191 excavation is the act of digging things out of the ground and transporting them elsewhere for a specific use
192 meeting these three rules:

- 193
194 1. that excavation areas have to be set back 300 feet from all lot lines;
195 2. that excavation of earth materials must be transported in a private way from the excavation area;
196 and
197 3. that the reclaimed slope can be no steeper than three to one.

198
199 He also said that excavation includes normal activity that pertains to the development of a lot for its
200 intended use. He observed the applicant had been in violation of the former.

201
202 Chairperson Faiman asked the Board to imagine the site and consider the impact on neighbors and abutting
203 properties before all the work, known to be done, was done. He said people are allowed to build a home
204 on their lot. In this case, the property would not be suitable for placing a house upon without some level of
205 excavation and reclamation. He identified the cleared level area as appropriate for the location of the house
206 and said measures to stabilize the area behind the proposed house, as well as along the driveway, had been
207 addressed. He said the 50-foot-wide flagpole driveway makes meeting the 300-foot buffer requirement for
208 excavation impossible. He added that the applicant did the minimum amount of work to make the lot
209 usable for a single-family home, which is certainly a reasonable use of the property,

210
211 Referring to the five requirements necessary to obtain the requested variances, Chairperson Faiman, noted
212 that while the excavation had generated noise, dust, traffic and in general was a burden to the
213 neighborhood, that time has passed. He added that the long-term effect of the project will be a new home
214 site in a nice neighborhood. He noted that the standard for hardship was easily met by the topography and
215 shape of the lot, which was not suitable for home construction and required leveling, excavation,
216 reclamation and retention to achieve.

217
218 **P Duggan made a MOTION to grant the variance to section 9B.6.1 of the Town of**
219 **Wilton Zoning Ordinance to allow excavation closer to the lot lines than allowed.**
220 **L Jennings SECONDED the motion.**

221
222 **P Duggan made a MOTION to reopen the public hearing.**
223 **JK Eckstrom SECONDED the motion.**
224 **There was no DISCUSSION.**

225 **ROLL Call Vote:** **L Jennings yea**
226 **N Faiman yea**
227 **P Duggan yea**
228 **J Stone yea**
229 **JK Eckstrom yea**
230 **Motion CARRIED.** **5/0/0**

231
232 Chairperson Faiman asked attendees for comments and/or questions on the deliberations.

233
234 **L Jennings made a MOTION to close the public hearing.**
235 **P Duggan SECONDED the motion.**
236 **There was no DISCUSSION.**

237 **ROLL Call Vote:** **L Jennings yea**
238 **N Faiman yea**
239 **P Duggan yea**
240 **J Stone yea**
241 **JK Eckstrom yea**
242 **Motion CARRIED.** **5/0/0**

243
244 Chairperson Faiman called for a vote on the MOTION.

245
246 **There was no DISCUSSION.**
247 **ROLL Call Vote:** **L Jennings yea**
248 **N Faiman yea**
249 **P Duggan yea**
250 **J Stone yea**
251 **JK Eckstrom yea**
252 **Motion CARRIED.** **5/0/0**

253
254 Chairperson Faiman observed that section 9B.6.2 is intended for the district that it is described for and
255 makes no sense for this application. He noted the Board granted the same variance in their 2021 decision
256 which was not necessary. However, doing that now would not allow excavation at all.

257
258 Jeff Stone said that since the variance doesn't apply to lots outside of the district intended for it cannot be
259 applied to this one.
260

261 Chairperson Faiman expressed that this variance request needs to be granted for all the reasons this
262 variance request was granted in 2021 otherwise the proposed use would be impossible. He added it needs
263 to be granted to effectuate the purpose of the variance.
264

265 **P Duggan made a MOTION to grant the variance to section 9B.6.2 of the Town of**
266 **Wilton Zoning Ordinance to allow access for the removal of excavated material**
267 **to Isaac Frye Highway rather than to Greenville Road.**

268 **J Stone SECONDED the motion.**
269

270 **L Jennings made a MOTION to reopen the public hearing.**

271 **P Duggan SECONDED the motion.**

272 **There was no DISCUSSION.**

273	ROLL Call Vote:	L Jennings	yea
274		N Faiman	yea
275		P Duggan	yea
276		J Stone	yea
277		JK Eckstrom	yea

278 **Motion CARRIED. 5/0/0**
279

280 Chairperson Faiman asked attendees for comments and/or questions on the deliberations.
281

282 Roy Tilsley, Esq. concurred with Chairperson Faiman that the variance needs to be granted to effectuate
283 the purpose of the variance.
284

285 **P Duggan made a MOTION to close the public hearing.**

286 **L Jennings SECONDED the motion.**

287 **There was no DISCUSSION.**

288	ROLL Call Vote:	L Jennings	yea
289		N Faiman	yea
290		P Duggan	yea
291		J Stone	yea
292		JK Eckstrom	yea

293 **Motion CARRIED. 5/0/0**
294

295 Chairperson Faiman called for a vote on the MOTION.
296

297 **There was no DISCUSSION.**

298	ROLL Call Vote:	L Jennings	yea
-----	------------------------	-------------------	------------

299 **N Faiman yea**
300 **P Duggan yea**
301 **J Stone yea**
302 **JK Eckstrom yea**
303 **Motion CARRIED. 5/0/0**

304
305 Chairperson’s Faiman stated that the Planning Board approved a reclamation plan allowing a slope steeper
306 than section 9B.6.4 allows given the conditions of the lot. He said the language in the zoning ordinance is
307 such that the Planning Board can waive the requirement if certain conditions are met. He said he was
308 inclined to deny the requested variance without prejudice on the grounds that the Planning Board already
309 approved the slope, therefore the use is permitted without a variance from the Zoning Board and cited the
310 court justification for this from Barlett vs. The City of Manchester.

311
312 **P Duggan made a MOTION to deny without prejudice the variance to section**
313 **9B.6.4 to allow the excavation to be reclaimed with steeper slopes than allowed**
314 **by the zoning ordinance because the variance is not necessary to allow**
315 **reclamation with the proposed slopes.**
316 **L Jennings SECONDED the motion.**

317
318 **P Duggan made a MOTION to reopen the public hearing.**
319 **L Jennings SECONDED the motion.**
320 **There was no DISCUSSION.**

321 **ROLL Call Vote: L Jennings yea**
322 **N Faiman yea**
323 **P Duggan yea**
324 **J Stone yea**
325 **JK Eckstrom yea**
326 **Motion CARRIED. 5/0/0**

327
328 Chairperson Faiman asked attendees for comments and/or questions on the deliberations.

329
330 Roy Tilsley, Esq. emphasized that the reason for the denial should include language that cites the variance is
331 not required under the zoning ordinance, and that the Planning Board’s approval of the two to one slope
332 has met that requirement.

333
334 Kenny Lehtonen said that the Planning Board’s condition was to pursue the request for the variance and
335 not necessarily to have to obtain it.
336

337 Chairperson Faiman called for a vote on the MOTION.

338

339 **There was no DISCUSSION.**

340 **ROLL Call Vote: L Jennings yea**

341 **N Faiman yea**

342 **P Duggan yea**

343 **J Stone yea**

344 **JK Eckstrom yea**

345 **Motion CARRIED. 5/0/0**

346

347 Chairperson Faiman reminded the applicant that Zoning Board decisions are subject to request for a
348 rehearing within 30 days of the date of decision and must be filed in writing by the applicant to the Town
349 order by an abutter, and that a request for rehearing is a necessary precondition for any subsequent appeal,
350 and in the absence of a request for rehearing, within the statutory 30 day time period, the decision
351 becomes final and unappealable.

352

353 **4. Coffey Family Trust, Joseph & Shannen Trustees, 29 Stagecoach Road**

354 Public Hearing, *NEW*

355 **Case 10/08/2024-01**

356 *The Coffey Family Trust has requested a variance to section 15B.3 of the Wilton Zoning Ordinance to*
357 *allow the installation of a solar collection system on Lot A-49, 29 Stagecoach Road, whose rated capacity*
358 *is greater than is allowed for residential use in the General Residence and Agricultural District.*

359

360 Chairperson Faiman opened the hearing by reading the public notice.

361

362 Joseph Coffey introduced himself as the resident at 29 Stagecoach Road. He lives in a home that was built in
363 1760 and moved to the property in 1980; he also has a carriage shed and a barn. He said these structures are
364 located on a portion of the lot that is not wooded. He said he and his wife, Shannen Coffey, are
365 environmentalists; she is an organic farmer. He described replacing a 40-year-old oil furnace with a heat pump
366 last year, and their goal this year is to install solar panels to offset the cost to run the heat pump, amongst other
367 things. He said they have contracted Granite State Solar to install a solar collection system that meets their
368 current electrical needs. He describes their current use as requiring 59 solar panels which are equal to 22.9
369 KWAC. 39 solar panels are proposed to be installed atop the barn roof which has the southern exposure and is
370 the furthest structure from the road, and the remaining 20 panels are proposed to be installed as a 29 foot long
371 by 10-foot-wide ground solar array behind the carriage. He describes a rise in elevation along Stagecoach Road
372 that would conceal the ground solar array.

373

374 Joseph Coffey acknowledged a letter¹ sent to the Zoning Board of Adjustment from Cori Ryan, abutter, who
375 said that they can see light from within the Coffey home from their home about 300 feet away. He said he too
376 can see lights in other homes as pinpoints through the woods at certain times of the year, especially winter. He
377 feels there will be no visual impact to the character of the neighborhood nor to neighboring property values
378 relative to the proposed ground solar array. He said the spirit of the ordinance is to promote environmental
379 systems which this demonstrates, and the hardship regards the amount of electricity utilized by their home. He
380 said it would not be practical to minimize their solar collection system to meet the requirements on the zoning
381 ordinance.

382
383 Peg Duggan asked if the applicant might ask to increase the proposed solar collection system to accommodate
384 the future interest in electric vehicles. Joseph Coffey said their proposed system supports what their needs will
385 be.

386
387 Joanna Eckstrom noted that while the KWAC requested exceeds what is allowed, it is still a residential solar
388 collection system and not a commercial one.

389
390 Chairperson Faiman noted that the zoning ordinance uses definitions to define the production capacity and area
391 requirement of residential solar collection systems as it does for various other kinds of systems, like
392 commercial, industrial, agricultural, shared and so on, each with a different purpose for the system and with
393 different limitations, however definitions cannot be varied. Regardless, he stated the applicant is proposing a
394 system whose sole purpose is to meet their residential needs and would have to propose a residential system
395 because it does not meet the purpose of the other kinds of systems. Since it does not meet the capacity
396 requirement of a residential system, it does not satisfy the definition of a residential system in our zoning
397 ordinance, therefore, it is not a residential system because it's too big, and therefore it does not meet any of the
398 kinds of systems that are permitted in their district. Because the proposed residential solar collection system is
399 too big and does not meet the qualifications as an agricultural solar collection system, he notes the applicant is
400 requesting the kind of system which they are allowed but a system that is not identified among our permitted
401 systems.

402
403 **P Duggan made a MOTION to close the public hearing.**

404 **L Jennings SECONDED the motion.**

405 **There was no DISCUSSION.**

406 **ROLL Call Vote: L Jennings yea**

407 **N Faiman yea**

408 **P Duggan yea**

409 **J Stone yea**

410 **JK Eckstrom yea**

411 **Motion CARRIED. 5/0/0**

¹ Email received by the Zoning Board of Adjustment from Cori Ryan on October 8, 2024.

412

413 Linda Jennings positioned the hardship as a financial condition. Neil Faiman said financial reasons cannot play into
414 hardship as they are not a special character or unique feature of the property, making it unreasonably burdened
415 or less productive.

416

417 Joanna Eckstrom asked the Board to confirm that the two proposed solar collection systems would be installed
418 on the same property. Neil Faiman confirmed the cleared area of the lot, approximately three- and one-half
419 acres, is the proposed location of the two systems. He noted there is a substantial wooden buffer between the
420 road and this clearing, and the applicant's home is several hundred feet away from surrounding properties.

421

422 Jeff Stone said the needs of the applicant are limited by the ordinance, even though the use is strictly residential.
423 He said he was aware the Planning Board has been discussing relaxing the energy output requirement that it had
424 written into the ordinance, but it wasn't plausible or fair to ask the applicant to wait for that outcome. He
425 added that residential solar collection systems are going to grow as residential consumption increases. He noted
426 that the amount of power being generated by a system is completely invisible.

427

428 **J Stone made a MOTION to grant the variance to section 15B.3 of the Wilton**
429 **Zoning Ordinance to allow the installation of a solar collection system whose**
430 **rated capacity is greater than allowed for residential use in the General Residence**
431 **& Agricultural District.**

432

JK Eckstrom SECONDED the motion.

433

434 Chairperson Faiman shared his view on the situation stating that he had no objection to the proposed solar
435 collection system and does not understand the limitation set forth in the zoning ordinance but does not
436 feel it is his place to make policy decisions. He said the hardship, as presented, is self-created and not a
437 special feature of the property.

438

439 Jeff Stone argued that without a variance the property owner is prevented from doing what the ordinance
440 allows.

441

442 Chairperson Faiman said that in granting the variance we would be allowing the applicants to build a system
443 which is not in the category of permitted residential systems.

444

445 Joanna Eckstrom said it would be unreasonable for the applicants to wait for the definition of a residential solar
446 collection system to be changed.

447

448 **JK Eckstrom made a MOTION to reopen the public hearing.**

449

L Jennings SECONDED the motion.

450

There was no DISCUSSION.

451 **ROLL Call Vote:** **L Jennings yea**
452 **N Faiman yea**
453 **P Duggan yea**
454 **J Stone yea**
455 **JK Eckstrom yea**
456 **Motion CARRIED.** **5/0/0**

457
458 Joseph Coffey said the Board had been very astute and he agrees with their viewpoints.

459
460 Chairperson Faiman called for a vote on the MOTION.

461
462 **There was no DISCUSSION.**

463 **ROLL Call Vote:** **L Jennings nay**
464 **N Faiman nay**
465 **P Duggan yea**
466 **J Stone yea**
467 **JK Eckstrom yea**
468 **Motion CARRIED.** **3/2/0**

469
470 Chairperson Faiman reminded the applicant that Zoning Board decisions are subject to request for a
471 rehearing within 30 days of the date of decision and must be filed in writing by the applicant to the Town
472 order by an abutter, and that a request for rehearing is a necessary precondition for any subsequent appeal,
473 and in the absence of a request for rehearing, within the statutory 30 day time period, the decision
474 becomes final and unappealable.

475
476 **5. Other Business**

477 a. HAB Appeal Update

478
479 Chairperson Faiman described the current state of the Housing Appeals Board claim against the Town
480 of Wilton. He said Mr. Ryan did not appear for the pretrial conference, but he did show for the hearing
481 held on September 24, 2024. He said the decision on the case has not been finalized.

482
483 b. Other - Decisions

484
485 Peg Duggan made a request to include decisions within the minutes.

486
487 c. Other – File Names

488
489 Jeff Stone made a request to format zoning board files so they could be more searchable.

490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504

6. Adjournment

L Jennings made a MOTION to adjourn at 9:58 p.m.
P Duggan SECONDED the motion.
There was no DISCUSSION.

ROLL Call Vote:

L Jennings	yea
N Faiman	yea
P Duggan	yea
J Stone	yea
JK Eckstrom	yea

Motion CARRIED. **5/0/0**

APPROVED 11.12.2024