

ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT PUBLIC HEARING AND MEETING
Tuesday, April 14, 2026

A public hearing of the Zoning Board of Adjustment was held on Tuesday, April 14, 2026 at 6:30 PM, at City Hall.

Jay Minkarah, Chair, asked for a Roll Call:

Jay Minkarah, Chair
Josh Nehiley, Vice Chair
JP Boucher
Rob Shaw
Steve Lionel
Joseph Patry - Alternate

Carter Falk, Deputy Planning Manager

Mr. Minkarah explained the Board's procedures, stating that the public is encouraged to submit their comments for future meetings via email to the Planning Department, which is zb@nashuanh.gov, or by mail, at P.O. Box 2019, Nashua, NH, 03061. Mr. Minkarah identified the points of law required for applicants to address relative to variances and special exceptions. Mr. Minkarah explained how testimony we will be given by applicants, those speaking in favor or in opposition to each request, as stated in the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA) By-laws.

- 1. Edward M. & Hannah M. Perciballi (Owners) 36 Roy Street (Sheet 107 Lot 17) requesting special exception from Land Use Code Section 190-112 to work in the 75-foot prime wetland buffer of Salmon Brook to remove an existing deck and construct an attached 8'x12' mudroom addition. RA Zone, Ward 6.**

Voting on this case:

Jay Minkarah
Josh Nehiley
Rob Shaw
JP Boucher
Steve Lionel

Edward Perciballi, 36 Roy Street, Nashua, NH. Mr. Perciballi stated that they are proposing to build a one-story mudroom, there is currently a deck there, and just want to enclose it. He said that they've been to the Conservation Commission already, and there

was no opposition towards the plan, and it will meet all foundation requirements.

Mr. Nehiley said that he drove by, and it looks like the construction has already started.

Mr. Perciballi said yes.

Mr. Nehiley said it looks as if most of the house is in the 75-foot wetland buffer, so nothing can be done without obtaining a special exception.

Mr. Perciballi said yes.

Mr. Nehiley asked if they are amenable to the couple stipulations from the Conservation Commission.

Mr. Perciballi said they are.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR:

Mr. Minkarah read emails in support from:

Elizabeth Zellers, 38 Roy Street, Nashua, NH
Janet Valuk, 41 Roy Street, Nashua, NH
Diane Fontas, 9 Boggs Circle, Nashua, NH

SPEAKING IN OPPOSITION OR WITH QUESTIONS OR CONCERNS:

No one.

END OF PUBLIC HEARING, BEGINNING OF PUBLIC MEETING:

Mr. Boucher said that this request is straightforward, and a lot of the homes in this area are within the 75-foot wetland buffer, he said that a mudroom is common, and it's a reasonable addition, and it received Conservation Commission approval, and sees no reason to deny this application.

Mr. Minkarah agreed, it's very straightforward, and there is no other alternative location to put the addition.

MOTION by Mr. Boucher to approve the special exception on behalf of the applicant as advertised. He said that the use is listed in the Table of Uses, Section 190-112.

Mr. Boucher said that the use will not create undue traffic congestion or unduly impair pedestrian safety.

Mr. Boucher said that it will not overload public water, sewer, drainage or other municipal systems.

Mr. Boucher said that special regulations are fulfilled, the wetland affidavit with the nine stipulations was signed by the owner, it was approved by the Conservation Commission on 3-17-2026 with two stipulations of approval.

Mr. Boucher said that the use will not impair the integrity or be out of character with the neighborhood, or be detrimental to health, morals or welfare of residents.

SECONDED by Mr. Shaw.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY 5-0.

2. Douglas J. Dichard (Owner) 6 White Avenue (Sheet 35 Lot 75) requesting variance from Land Use Code Section 190-16, Table 16-3 for minimum land area, 5,834 sq.ft existing - 6,970 sq.ft required - to remove existing garage and construct a two-family residential building. RC Zone, Ward 4. [Approved by ZBA on 7-14-20, approval has expired, same request].

Voting on this case:

Jay Minkarah
Josh Nehiley
Rob Shaw
JP Boucher
Steve Lionel

Douglas Dichard, 6 White Avenue, Nashua, NH. Mr. Dichard said that he went through this in 2020 and received approval, but had Covid and was unable to pursue this request. He said that he is now back to good health, and is requesting approval to do the same thing as approved.

Mr. Nehiley asked what the history of the building is.

Mr. Dichard said it is six garages, it has always been a separate lot, and was just used for garages, which he used for a variety of

things, one was that he was a lobsterman, and stored items there.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR:

No one.

SPEAKING IN OPPOSITION OR WITH QUESTIONS OR CONCERNS:

No one.

END OF PUBLIC HEARING, BEGINNING OF PUBLIC MEETING:

Mr. Lionel said that he remembers this case from when it was here in 2020, and has no objections.

Mr. Nehiley said that it is a very unique building, but with the need for housing stock in the City, this will become a better use for housing, and will fit very well in the neighborhood.

Mr. Minkarah said that he drove by this property again, and saw no measurable changes in the neighborhood that would warrant a different decision.

MOTION by Mr. Nehiley to approve the variance application on behalf of the owner and applicant as advertised. Mr. Nehiley stated that granting of the variance would not be contrary to the public interest, as there is a need for housing in Nashua, and it will be a better use than the existing six garages.

Mr. Nehiley said that the request is within the spirit and intent of the Ordinance, because the proposed use will be consistent with the neighborhood, which is primarily multi-family housing.

Mr. Nehiley stated that substantial justice will be served, as the applicant will be able to use this property for a better use, and will be more consistent with the neighborhood for multi-family housing, as compared to the six garages.

Mr. Nehiley stated that the Board did not have any testimony about the value of surrounding properties being diminished, but based on the Boards knowledge and experience, do not believe that property values will be diminished by this request.

Mr. Nehiley stated that for unnecessary hardship, the building that is currently there is not in character with the neighborhood,

it's primarily a residential area and the six garages are a stand-alone building that does not fit in with the area, and that should be replaced with housing. He said that this same request was approved by the Zoning Board in July, 2020.

SECONDED by Mr. Lionel.

MOTION TO APPROVE CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY 5-0.

3. Nirmitt Agarwala & Surabhi Sharma (Owners) Surabhi Sharma (Applicant) 10 Sweet William Circle (Sheet C Lot 2577) requesting special exception from Land Use Code Section 190-47 (B) for a major home occupation for an in-home tutoring educational enrichment activity (STEM) in residence. FUOD Zone, Ward 5.

Voting on this case:

Jay Minkarah
Josh Nehiley
JP Boucher
Steve Lionel
Joseph Patry

Rob Shaw - recused

Surabhi Sharma, 10 Sweet William Circle, Nashua, NH. Ms. Sharma said that she is requesting approval to allow a small tutoring use in her home, the sessions will be one hour long and it would be 3-4 students at one time. She said that there would be no overlap between sessions, it will be an indoor, quiet study group, there will be no employees, no signage. She said that her goal is to provide a meaningful education for the students.

Mr. Patry asked about parking, if parents would drop their children off, and wouldn't park on the street for an hour.

Ms. Sharma said that the plan is to have the children be dropped off and picked up, but the kids would be between 6-8 years old, if the parents want, they can park in her driveway, there is sufficient space.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR:

No one.

SPEAKING IN OPPOSITION OR WITH QUESTIONS OR CONCERNS:

Rob Shaw, 14 Sweet William Circle, Nashua, NH. Mr. Shaw said that he doesn't necessarily have opposition, but just a couple concerns, and wants to ensure that the applicant was sufficiently aware, as one of the concerns was for signage, but understands that there is no intention of them having signage. He said the other thing is that they indicated very specific operating hours, and that there wouldn't be any scope creep, or any expansion of this, because what they've specified is very specific to those days and times, and it seems like it's a fairly limited use, whereas if it were to expand to more sessions and more days, that would be a concern. He said if they want more than what was applied for, they'd have to come back to the Board for further approval.

Mr. Minkarah read an email from Denise Amigo, 8 Sweet William Circle, Nashua, NH.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR - REBUTTAL:

Ms. Sharma said that she understands the concerns, but this will be a very small scale tutoring type of activity, it won't be like a Kumon facility, it will be a very low impact enrichment activity, where students come, meet for an hour, and leave after that, it is not similar to a daycare or a camp, and understands about the scope creep, but does plan on keeping it exactly like she said, three days a week, and for one hour.

SPEAKING IN OPPOSITION OR WITH QUESTIONS OR CONCERNS - REBUTTAL:

No one.

END OF PUBLIC HEARING, BEGINNING OF PUBLIC MEETING:

Mr. Lionel said as long as the Board can put into the motion what the applicant has said in terms of the number of sessions per day, per week, and number of students, and say that if there is going to be any change in that, they'd need to come back to the Board, and it would satisfy the concerns from the neighbors. He said that he understands the concerns of the neighbors, they have a quiet street, but as presented, would be in favor.

Mr. Nehiley said that he agrees with Mr. Lionel, and is in favor.

He said that he lives in a similar type of cul-de-sac, and took note of the number of delivery vehicles that come by, and even though delivery trucks come by, it's still considered a quiet road. He said that Sweet William Circle has a sidewalk on one side, which is nice to have. He said he didn't hear anything that would cause him to believe that there would be a lot of concern here, and the applicant is well aware of the neighbors' concerns, and is in favor.

MOTION by Mr. Lionel to approve the special exception on behalf of the applicant as advertised. He said that the use is listed in the Table of Uses, Section 190-47 (B).

Mr. Lionel said that the Board has considered the amount of traffic, and believe that the requested use will not create undue traffic congestion or unduly impair pedestrian safety, as noted, there is a sidewalk on one side of the street.

Mr. Lionel said that it will not overload public water, sewer, drainage or other municipal systems.

Mr. Lionel said that special regulations are fulfilled.

Mr. Lionel said that the use will not impair the integrity or be out of character with the neighborhood, or be detrimental to health, morals or welfare of residents, as long as the applicant maintains the load level of customers to what is specified in the application, and if that ever needs to increase, the applicant will need to come back to the Board and request additional relief.

SECONDED by Mr. Patry.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY 5-0.

4. **Clint & Mary S. Licqurish (Owners) 19 Vista Way (Sheet D Lot 23) requesting special exception from Land Use Code Section 190-112 to work in a 40-foot critical wetland buffer to remove 21 trees identified as a danger to the house. R40 Zone, Ward 5.**

POSTPONED TO 6-9-2026 ZBA MEETING/ CONSERVATION COMMISSION 2nd OPINION REQUEST.

5. **Joseph A Boise (Owner) Bryanna Mastroelli (Applicant) 22 Pond Street (Sheet 18 Lot 76) requesting use variance from Land**

Use Code Section 190-15, Table 15-1 (#27) to allow a dog daycare in an existing building. D-3/MU Zone, Ward 7.

Voting on this case:

Jay Minkarah
Josh Nehiley
Rob Shaw
JP Boucher
Steve Lionel

Brynna & Kyle Mastroelli, 3 Ninth Street, Nashua, NH. Mrs. Mastroelli said that they're planning on having a dog daycare at 22 Pond Street, it would all be interior to the building, nothing exterior, and they do require up-to-date vaccinations for every dog.

Mr. Mastroelli said that the dog waste will be regularly picked up, a company will come twice a month, and everything is indoors, no play area outside. He said that they will not have dogs with behavioral issues, safety is big, and every dog must go through a temperament screen.

Mr. Nehiley asked if the dog care is a chain.

Mr. Mastroelli said no.

Mr. Nehiley asked if they are taking the whole building.

Mr. Mastroelli said they are taking one-third of the building. He said that the owner is still going to retain the remaining two-thirds of the building.

Mr. Minkarah asked if they will be doing any boarding.

Mr. Mastroelli said that they will not.

Mr. Lionel asked what their experience is with dog day care operations are.

Mr. Mastroelli said that they've both worked with dogs for about ten years now.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR:

No one.

SPEAKING IN OPPOSITION OR WITH QUESTIONS OR CONCERNS:

No one.

END OF PUBLIC HEARING, BEGINNING OF PUBLIC MEETING:

Mr. Nehiley said that he is in favor of the application. He said it will be completely enclosed, no one will know they're there, and likes how they check the dogs out for their behavior. He said it's a good use in the building.

Mr. Minkarah agreed, and it's a really mixed area, many different uses going on, and this use would be compatible.

MOTION by Mr. Nehiley to approve the use variance application on behalf of the owner and applicant as advertised. Mr. Nehiley stated that the granting of the variance would not be contrary to the public interest, this is a very diverse area, there are quite a few different businesses in the area, and this use will be a good addition.

Mr. Nehiley said that the request is within the spirit and intent of the Ordinance, this is a growing area with quite a bit of different commercial uses, so this will fit in.

Mr. Nehiley stated that substantial justice will be served, the property owner actually is renting out one-third of the building, and the dog care business is growing.

Mr. Nehiley stated that the Board did not have any testimony about the value of surrounding properties being diminished, but believe that property values will not be diminished by this request.

Mr. Nehiley stated that for unnecessary hardship, this is a very diverse area, it would be contrary to the public interest to not allow the owner to have this type of business in this building, as this street has a lot of different businesses.

SECONDED by Mr. Boucher.

MOTION TO APPROVE CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY 5-0.

6. Abdelaziz & Touabi Hadouche (Owners) 4 Kingston Drive (Sheet

104 Lot 37) requesting variance from Land Use Code Section 190-16, Table 16-3, to encroach 5 feet into the 10 foot required right side yard setback to construct an attached 20'x20' garage. RA Zone, Ward 6.

Voting on this case:

Jay Minkarah
Josh Nehiley
Rob Shaw
JP Boucher
Steve Lionel

Abdelaziz Hadouche, 4 Kingston Drive, Nashua, NH. Mr. Hadouche said that he would like to build a garage with a 5 foot setback to the side property line, instead of 10 feet. He said that it would not be contrary to the public interest, and it will not negatively impact anyone's property values.

Mr. Nehiley asked if the shed will be moved.

Mr. Hadouche said it will.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR:

Mr. Minkarah read a letter in support from Peter Lussier, 6 Kingston Drive, Nashua, NH.

SPEAKING IN OPPOSITION OR WITH QUESTIONS OR CONCERNS:

No one.

END OF PUBLIC HEARING, BEGINNING OF PUBLIC MEETING:

Mr. Shaw said that he is generally in support, the key is the most affected abutter wrote a letter in support.

Mr. Minkarah said that there are other homes in the neighborhood that appear to be the same design with a garage added, so it's pretty common in the neighborhood.

MOTION by Mr. Boucher to approve the variance application on behalf of the owner and applicant as advertised. Mr. Boucher stated that the granting of the variance would not be contrary to the public interest, the request for the garage is normal and many already

exist in the neighborhood.

Mr. Boucher said that the request is within the spirit and intent of the Ordinance, because the construction of the garage would not be out of character with the neighborhood, in fact, there are several homes with garages in the neighborhood and encroach just as much, or more.

Mr. Boucher stated that substantial justice will be served, it will allow the homeowner to build a garage and use it for his intended use.

Mr. Boucher stated that the Board did not have any testimony about the value of surrounding properties being diminished, but believe that property values will not be diminished by this request.

Mr. Boucher stated that for unnecessary hardship, owing to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area, the Board said that the home is situated in such a way that adding a normal sized garage would create the incursion, and that the proposed use is reasonable, as it is normal and customary to have a garage.

SECONDED by Mr. Shaw.

Mr. Shaw said that they're only asking for a 20-foot wide garage, where a 24-foot wide garage is more typical, but a 24-foot wide garage would only leave a setback of 1 foot, so they're already putting up a smaller sized garage which is a good balanced approach with the setback. He said that there is no other place on the property to put the garage.

MOTION TO APPROVE CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY 5-0.

- 7. The Colleen Brady Revocable Trust, Colleen Brady, Trustee (Owner) Greatscapes by R & R Landscaping, Inc. (Applicant) 149 Shore Drive (Sheet F Lot 1651) requesting variance from Land Use Code Section 190-16, Table 16-3 to encroach approximately 12 feet into the 30 foot required rear yard setback to construct an attached 12' x 21' deck. R9 Zone, Ward 5.**

Voting on this case:

Jay Minkarah

Josh Nehiley

Rob Shaw

JP Boucher

Steve Lionel

Paul Chisholm, Keach-Nordstrom Associates, Bedford, NH. Mr. Chisholm said that the plan is a small dining room expansion addition of 230 square feet, it would go where there is currently a deck, and a related part to the request is a deck off the house 12 feet back, going into the 30 foot rear yard setback. He said that the property was part of a conservation subdivision, and in the packet, is a copy of the plan. He said in back of the lot, there is a 50 foot buffer, and in back of that, is the AHEPA-35 Assisted Living Facility.

Mr. Chisholm said that the house was built in 2018, and while Shore Drive is relatively flat, there is a grade difference in the back of the lot. He said that the owner wants this building expansion for some additional living space on the first floor, they prefer single-floor living. He said that their basement is unfinished, and there are no foreseeable plans in the future to finish it. He said that the back yard is a large lawn area, and beyond that, is a 50-foot wide thickly vegetated buffer area. He said that they've submitted a picture from AHEPA looking at the subject lot to show the buffered area.

Mr. Chisholm said that the request will not be against the public interest, as in this case, it is a modest addition and will not overcrowd or bother any of the abutting neighbors, and neighbors on each side have submitted letters of support.

Mr. Chisholm stated that the proposed use will observe the spirit and intent of the Ordinance, as the proposed deck will be about 96 feet from the back corner of that assisted living facility building. He said that no tree clearing or shrub material will be removed, and the deck will not alter the public health and safety.

Mr. Chisholm said that substantial justice will be served, as the older property owners are looking to age in place, and want to enjoy an accessible outdoor space, and there will be no adverse impact to abutters. Further, he said that the proposed use will not negatively impact property values of surrounding properties.

Mr. Chisholm stated that for hardship, the property grade does drop off towards the rear, and if this deck were under four feet

in height, it would be allowed by right, and that is the reason why the variance is needed. He said that there is no reason to deny this application, as it will improve values, will not impact any abutters, and is a reasonable addition to the rear of the home.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR:

Mr. Minkarah read a letter in support from Douglas and Marie Cutchin, 151 Shore Drive, Nashua, NH, and, Thomas & Lorraine Cargill, 147 Shore Drive, Nashua, NH.

SPEAKING IN OPPOSITION OR WITH QUESTIONS OR CONCERNS:

No one.

END OF PUBLIC HEARING, BEGINNING OF PUBLIC MEETING:

Mr. Shaw said that this is very straightforward, and doesn't see any issues, and there is support from the abutting neighbors who would be most impacted. He said that the topography forces the deck to be higher.

Mr. Nehiley said that 96 feet between the back of the subject house and the building to the rear is quite significant, along with the conservation easement. He said that there is the grade drop-off in the rear, and is in favor of this application.

MOTION by Mr. Minkarah to approve the variance application on behalf of the owner and applicant as advertised. Mr. Minkarah stated that the granting of the variance would not be contrary to the public interest, as adding a deck addition would be consistent with the neighborhood, and will not alter the character of the neighborhood.

Mr. Minkarah said that the request is within the spirit and intent of the Ordinance, as it is consistent with the neighborhood, and this will not overcrowd any other property to the rear yard, and there is adequate distance to the nearest property to the rear, as noted, there is a substantial distance to the building to the rear, at 96 feet, and there is a significant vegetated buffer area in the rear as well.

Mr. Minkarah stated that substantial justice will be served, as it would allow the owner reasonable use of the property, and they wish to age in place.

Mr. Minkarah stated that the Board did not have any testimony about the value of surrounding properties being diminished, but believe that property values will not be diminished by this request, and there is support from the two immediate neighbors on each side.

Mr. Minkarah stated that for unnecessary hardship, owing to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area, the Board stated that there is a significant grade change, and just a simple deck at ground level would be allowed by right, but the elevation change requires it to be higher, which draws the need for the variance, and the proposed use of a deck is reasonable.

SECONDED by Mr. Lionel.

MOTION TO APPROVE CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY 5-0.

8. Family Realty Investments, LLC & 78 Amherst Street, LLC (Owners) Family Realty Investments, LLC (Applicant) 78 Amherst Street & 3-13 Putnam Street (Sheet 62 Lots 83 & 85) requesting variance from Land Use Code Section 190-16, Table 16-3 for minimum land area, after lot consolidation of Lots 83 and 85, to allow a total of 10 multifamily units on 29,045 sq.ft of land, where 62,228 sq.ft is required (6 units existing). RB Zone, Ward 2.

Voting on this case:

Jay Minkarah
Josh Nehiley
Rob Shaw
JP Boucher
Steve Lionel

Attorney Morgan Hollis, Gottesman and Hollis, P.A., 39 East Pearl Street, Nashua, NH. Atty. Hollis said that this matter was before the Board two years ago, and a variance was granted for an additional three units. He said that the property has two lots, one lot has three duplex buildings, and the other lot, on the corner, has a single-family house, it is in rather poor condition, and the proposal is to demolish that house, combine the two lots, and construct two more duplex units, instead of the three-unit building that was approved already by the Board, so this request is really for one additional dwelling unit. He said that the

proposed duplex units would look like the other three buildings, and they would face Amherst Street, but would have access off of Putnam Street.

Atty. Hollis said that the first plan shown in the application shows the three buildings, with the single-family house. He said that the second drawing shows what is proposed, which would be the three existing duplex buildings, and the removal of the house, with the proposed two duplex units. He said that the new units would look the same as the existing ones.

Atty. Hollis said that this request will not be against the public interest, as multi-family use is permitted in the RB zone, and there are duplex units, triplex units and multi-family units all around the subject property, so this use will be consistent with the neighborhood. He said that adding additional housing stock is also within the public interest, it will remove a driveway off of Amherst Street, and there will be adequate parking for all the units.

Atty. Hollis said that this will observe the spirit and intent of the Ordinance, the use will be consistent with the existing structures, the proposed density will be consistent with the neighborhood. He said that the neighborhood is densely populated multi-family, and the submitted density comparison indicates that the proposal is right in character with what exists in the neighborhood.

Atty. Hollis stated that substantial justice will be done. He said that this will allow a coordinated, cohesive development at a difficult property. He said that there will be no harm to the public if this is approved.

Atty. Hollis said that property values of surrounding parcels will not be negatively impacted, the new units will be identical in size and shape with the existing ones, and one more unit on the property will not negatively impact property values. He referred the Board to a letter from Chet Rogers, Property Appraiser, attesting that values will not be diminished from this proposal.

Atty. Hollis said that for hardship, the Board has found hardship on this lot in the recent past. He said that there are unique conditions, especially the topography, and it's a corner lot as well, it's an unusual lot. He said that the Board allowed nine units just a couple years ago, and this request only adds one unit,

and there is no fair and substantial reason to not support this request. He said the use is permitted and reasonable.

Mr. Shaw asked if the proposed four units would be added to the existing six unit condominium agreement, or would be stand-alone.

Atty. Hollis said that they'd be added.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR:

No one.

SPEAKING IN OPPOSITION OR WITH QUESTIONS OR CONCERNS:

Regina Jensen, 3 Putnam Way, Nashua, NH. Ms. Jensen said that she lives on this property, at the end unit. She said that her concerns are that since the new building would be built right at the side of her house, the density does not meet the Code. She said that she is concerned about the integrity of her house as they're building, with digging and drilling. She asked how close her unit would be to the new building. She asked about their decks, and how close they would be to her house. She asked about parking, and was told she had two spaces in front of her unit, and asked if any of her parking spaces would be removed or moved over. She said that she is for the project, but does have some concerns.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR - REBUTTAL:

Atty. Hollis said that his client will meet with Ms. Jensen. He said that this matter will go to the Planning Board if approved here tonight, and many of the issues the abutter raised can be addressed by them. He said that there will not be a staircase coming off the back of the new units, there are decks planned, but they won't have rear access. He said that for parking, they will be increasing the parking, there will be twenty spaces for the ten units, so each unit would get two. He said that Ms. Jensen's parking spots would not change.

Mr. Minkarah asked about the proposed decks for the new units, how would they compare to decks off of the existing duplex closest to the new construction, if they're more at grade.

Mr. Chisholm said they are about the same size, but the applicant said that he'd make them a little bit smaller to have a little bit more clearance from the existing unit on the end. He said he'd be

willing to go down to a 6'x6' deck.

END OF PUBLIC HEARING, BEGINNING OF PUBLIC MEETING:

Mr. Nehiley said that the house there now at the corner is an eyesore, where the three new buildings look beautiful, and is excited to see two new similar buildings. He said that this property is challenging with the topography, and the way they got their parking in is very creative. He said that the city needs this type of entry-level housing, and believes the applicant will work with the neighbors to address any issues, and is in favor.

Mr. Shaw said it will make for a more consistent feel to the overall property once the lots are combined. He said it really will look like the second phase in this development, and it's a very positive use of land, and supports the parking and driveway off of the side street instead of Amherst Street.

Mr. Minkarah agreed, it's going to look more consistent with the neighborhood, instead of the triplex there. He said getting the driveway off of Amherst Street is in the public interest.

MOTION by Mr. Nehiley to approve the variance application on behalf of the owner and applicant as advertised. Mr. Nehiley stated that the granting of the variance would not be contrary to the public interest, the house on the corner is an eyesore, also, there is a large drop-off in topography.

Mr. Nehiley said that the request is within the spirit and intent of the Ordinance, as the six current units will be very similar to the four proposed units, so it will allow for a consistent look.

Mr. Nehiley stated that substantial justice will be served, in that the applicant has been working on this property for eleven years, and found a way to make this happen in a financially feasible way, as well as working with the neighbors.

Mr. Nehiley stated that the Board did not have any testimony about the value of surrounding properties being diminished, but believe that property values will not be diminished by this request.

Mr. Nehiley stated that for unnecessary hardship, there is currently an unlivable house on the corner, there is asbestos there, and the topography is extremely challenging, and the applicant came up with a creative way to have all their parking on

Putnam Street rather than Amherst Street, which eliminates a safety issue.

SECONDED by Mr. Boucher.

Mr. Shaw stated that it is important to note that this will have sufficient parking, especially in these densely populated parts of the City, each unit will have two spaces.

MOTION TO APPROVE CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY 5-0.

MISCELLANEOUS:

REGIONAL IMPACT:

The Board did not see any cases that would have Regional Impact.

MINUTES:

March 24, 2026:

MOTION by Mr. Nehiley to approve the minutes with the aforementioned revision, waive the reading, and place the minutes in the file.

SECONDED by Mr. Lionel.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY 5-0.

REHEARING REQUESTS:

None.

ADJOURNMENT:

MOTION by Mr. Shaw to adjourn the meeting at 7:57 p.m.

Submitted by: Mr. Falk, Clerk.

CF - Taped Hearing