TOWN OF LONDONDERRY
ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MEETING
MOOSE HILL COUNCIL CHAMBERS
268B MAMMOTH ROAD
JUNE 17, 2026, 7:00 P.M.

I. CALL TO ORDER

Members Present: Jacqueline Benard, Chair; Brendan O'Brien, Clerk; Lisa Sussman, Alternate Member; Ariana McQuarrie, Alternate Member

Members Absent: Suzanne Brunelle, Vice Chair; Mitchell Feig, Member; Greg Carson, Member; Andria Hansen, Alternate Member

Also Present: Nick Codner, Chief Building Inspector/Zoning Administrator

Chair Benard called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and reviewed the meeting procedure. She appointed Ariana McQuarrie and Lisa Sussman as full voting members for this meeting. She informed the applicants of their option to defer to the July 15th meeting, to present their case to a full Board.

II. ROLL CALL

III. APPROVAL OF DRAFT MINUTES

A. McQuarrie moved to accept the minutes of the May 20, 2026, meeting as written. B. O'Brien seconded the motion. The motion carried 4-0-0.

IV. REPORT BY TOWN COUNCIL LIAISON

There was no report by Town Council Liaison.

V. REGIONAL IMPACT DETERMINATIONS

Staff determined that none of the cases being heard were of regional impact.

B. O'Brien moved to accept the regional impact determination. L. Sussman seconded the motion. The motion carried 4-0-0.

VI. PUBLIC HEARING OF CASES

A. Case No. 06-17-2026-1 Request For Special Exception From LZO 5.15.1 To Allow A Portable Structure In The Agricultural Residential (AR-1) Zoning District. The Parcel Is Located At 82 Wiley Hill Road In The Agricultural Residential I (AR-I) Zoning District, Tax Map 5, Lot 015-2, Nicholas And Melissa Cannata (Owner/Applicant).

B. O'Brien read the case into the record.

Nicholas and Melissa Cannata appeared before the Board to request approval of this application regarding placement of an 8' x 20' portable structure at the rear of their 1.5-acre property.

Chair Benard asked for public comment.

B. O'Brien read a letter into the record from Lee Breslow, 78 Wiley Hill Road, in support of this application.

Donna Mannarini, 91 Wiley Hill Road, spoke in support of this application.

Chair Benard asked for Board comment. The Board asked about combustible items being stored in the structure and the presence of wetlands on the property. N. Cannata said they were not aware of any wetlands, and a snowblower is stored in the structure.

Chair Benard closed the public hearing and the Board went into deliberation.

B. O'Brien reviewed the special exception criteria:

1. Is the use detrimental to the health or safety of residents? *No.* The Board agreed.
2. Will the use create undue traffic congestion or a traffic safety hazard in the vicinity of the proposed development? *No*. The Board agreed.
3. Will the use be incompatible with the surrounding neighborhood*?* *No.* The Board agreed.
4. Will the use be a detriment to property values in the vicinity of the proposed development, with consideration given to the location or scale of buildings, structures, parking areas, or other access ways? *No.* The Board agreed.
5. Will a nuisance be created by such use by way of emission of odors, smoke, gas, dust, noise, glare, heat, vibration, or other pollutants, or the unsightly outdoor storage of equipment, vehicles, or other materials*?* *No.* The Board agreed. L. Sussman agreed, predicated on the fact that other than the snowblower and other small engines, there is no combustible material stored in the structure.
6. Will the use create a hazard to the public or adjacent property on account of potential fire, explosion, or release of toxic materials? *No.* The Board agreed.
7. Will the use result in the degradation of existing surface and groundwater quality standards, or have adverse effects on the natural functions of wetlands on the site which would result in the loss of significant habitat or flood control protection? *No.* The Board agreed.
8. Will there be more than one portable structure per property? *No.* The Board agreed.

9. Will the portable storage structure be larger than 10 feet wide, 20 feet long, and 10 feet high? *No.* The Board agreed.
10. Will the portable storage structure be located to the side or rear of the principal structure on the property? *Yes.* The Board agreed.
11. Will the portable storage structure be set back a minimum of 15 feet from a side or rear lot line, and 40 feet from any front property line? *Yes.* The Board agreed.
12. Will the portable storage structure be set back a minimum of 5 feet from the nearest wall of a building? *Yes.* The Board agreed.
13. Will the portable storage structure be placed on a paved, concrete, other appropriate impervious surface, or be placed on blocks? *Yes.* The Board agreed.
14. Will adequate and appropriate facilities will be provided for the intended use? *N/A.* The Board agreed.
15. Will all necessary state and federal permits be obtained? *N/A.* The Board agreed.
16. Please state the length of time the portable storage structure will remain on the property: The structure is intended to remain as a long-term accessory storage structure supporting household, property maintenance, and personal. The Board agreed.

B. O'Brien moved in Case No. 06-17-2026-1 to grant the request for a special exception. L. Sussman seconded the motion. The motion carried 4-0-0.

B. Case No. 06-17-2026-2 Request For Variance From LZO Section 4.2.1.3.C.1 To Allow A Structure – Carport To Encroach 18 Feet Into The 40-Foot Front Setback In The Agricultural Residential (AR-1) Zoning District. The Parcel Is Located At 7 King John Drive, Map 9, Lot 066-22, In The Agricultural Residential (AR-1) Zoning District, Roger And Susanne French (Owner/Applicant).

B. O'Brien read the case into the record.

Roger French appeared before the Board to discuss this request to construct a 20' x 12' carport that encroaches 18 feet into the front setback. It is intended to house a van that has parked in this location for 30-40 years.

R. French read the variance criteria.

Chair Benard asked for Board comment. The Board noted that financial cost is not considered a hardship; however, the features of the property do present a hardship.

Chair Benard asked for public comment; there was none.

Chair Benard asked for Board comment. The Board asked about the construction of the carport and ability to bear a snow load. N. Codner verified the plans would be reviewed and it would be inspected.

Chair Benard closed the public hearing and the Board went into deliberation.

B. O'Brien reviewed the variance criteria:

1) Granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest because it does not threaten the public health, safety, or general welfare and would not alter the character of the neighborhood. There is no impact to the right-of-way and visibility.
2) The spirit of the ordinance would be observed because it does not threaten the public health, safety, or general welfare and would not alter the character of the neighborhood.
3) Granting the variance would do substantial justice because not granting it would result in a greater loss to the applicant than any gain to the public.
4) The values of surrounding properties would not be diminished due to the testimony of the applicant that the carport will match the existing home.
5) Owing to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area, denial of the variance would result in an unnecessary hardship because:
(a) for purposes of this subparagraph, "unnecessary hardship" means that, owing to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area,
(i) there is not a fair and substantial relationship between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property due to the location of the leach field, being a corner lot, and having a slope in the back.
(ii) the proposed use is a reasonable one, as carports are reasonable.

B. O'Brien moved in Case No. 06-17-2026-2 to grant the request for a variance, with the condition that the carport should not be any larger than 12 feet x 20 feet. A. McQuarrie seconded the motion. The motion carried 4-0-0.

C. Case No. 06-17-2026-3 Request For Variance From LZO 4.2.1.3.C.2 To Allow A Structure – Carport To Encroach 14 Feet Into The 15-Foot Side Setback In The Agricultural Residential (AR-1) Zoning District. The Parcel Is Located At 7 King John Drive, Map 9, Lot 06622, In The Agricultural Residential (AR-1) Zoning District, Roger And Susanne French (Owner/Applicant).

B. O'Brien read the case into the record.

Roger French appeared before the Board to discuss this request to construct a 20' x 12' carport that encroaches 14 feet into the side setback. He verified that his

testimony from Case 06-17-2026-2 is the same for this case. He spoke with the neighbor, who had no problem with the location of the carport.

R. French read the variance criteria.

Chair Benard asked for public comment; there was none.

Chair Benard closed the public hearing and the Board went into deliberation.

B. O'Brien reviewed the variance criteria:

1) Granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest because it does not threaten the public health, safety, or general welfare and would not alter the character of the neighborhood. There is no overcrowding and a significant treeline buffer between the two properties, the abutter has no concerns, and a fence blocks any view.
2) The spirit of the ordinance would be observed because it does not threaten the public health, safety, or general welfare and would not alter the character of the neighborhood.
3) Granting the variance would do substantial justice because not granting it would result in a greater loss to the applicant than any gain to the public.
4) The values of surrounding properties would not be diminished, given the nature and the structure of the carport.
5) Owing to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area, denial of the variance would result in an unnecessary hardship because:
(a) for purposes of this subparagraph, "unnecessary hardship" means that, owing to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area,
(i) there is not a fair and substantial relationship between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property due to the location of the leach field, being a corner lot, and having a slope in the back.
(ii) the proposed use is a reasonable one, as carports are reasonable.

B. O'Brien moved in Case No. 06-17-2026-3 to grant the request for a variance, with the condition that the carport should not be any larger than 12 feet x 20 feet. L. Sussman seconded the motion. The motion carried 4-0-0.

VII. COMMUNICATION AND MISCELLANEOUS

VIII. OTHER BUSINESS

IX. ADJOURN

B. O'Brien moved to adjourn the meeting. A. McQuarrie seconded the motion. The motion carried 4-0-0.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:44 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Beth Hanggeli
Recording Secretary