

**Town of Milford
Zoning Board of Adjustment
June 7, 2018
Case #2018-20
Chantel Fulmer
Special Exception**

Present: Steven Bonczar, Chair
Jason Plourde, Vice Chair
Rob Costantino
Wade Scott Campbell, Alternate

Robin Lunn, Zoning Administrator

Absent: Joan Dargie
Michael Thornton
Karin Lagro, Alternate
Tracy Steel, Alternate
Laura Dudziak, Board of Selectmen Representative

Secretary: Peg Ouellette

Case #2018-20

Chantel Fulmer, for the property located at 61 West Meadow Court, Milford Tax Map 39, Lot 70-13, in the Residential A district, is seeking a Special Exception of the Milford Zoning Ordinances per Article X, Section 10.02.3 to allow for a Home Occupation for a virtual business support service in an existing single family dwelling.

APPROVED August 16, 2018

S. Bonczar, Chair, opened the meeting and introduced the Board members. He informed all of the procedures of the Board. Two Board members were absent. R. Costantino moved to seat W. Campbell, Alternate, as a voting member. Seconded by J. Plourde. All in favor.

S. Bonczar read the notice of hearing and invited the applicant to present her case.

Chantel Fulmer came forward and said her goal was to assist business owners virtually. Would include but not limited to e-mail, management, data entry, proofreading, etc. As she learned more skills, business would grow. Will be working solely on line. No physical product involved. None of the clients

will come to her home. Will be by video chat. No extra traffic generated. If a local client preferred she would go to their home or a neutral location. Office will be in a third bedroom on the second floor. As stated in R. Lunn's (Planning and Zoning Administrator) review, the square footage was approximately 10 to 11 percent of the area, but she was only using half of the room. She said she didn't require signage. Would like it to continue to look like a house. Didn't intend to hire anyone. She would subcontract individuals as needed; didn't want to manage payroll. Abutters were all in favor. One said he would not be attending this meeting because he approved and wished her the best.

S. Bonczar asked for questions from the Bd.

J. Plourde asked if there was a demand for this service.

C. Fulmer said very much.

J. Plourde said in his office they had an IT specialist. Was that what she would be doing? A virtual IT?

C. Fulmer said not IT. Bookkeeping and social media management where owners would rather do their creative work and have somebody manage social media platform for a month or two.

J. Plourde asked what was involved.

C. Fulmer said client relations management system. Re social media, some people don't know how to leverage it to best further the business. Instead of making a plan for doing this on this day and this on that day they could have somebody else fire those out. Or write an article and have somebody else chop that into reusable content.

W. Campbell thanked her for clarifying that.

S. Bonczar referred to Planning and Zoning letter that it met the criteria. He made a mistake on the previous case on the square footage. It was this case that was 256 SF out of 2, 424, which was 10.6 percent.

J. Plourde said that the other case was also below the maximum allowed.

S. Bonczar said it was but not those numbers. Just clarifying the record those were for this case. Any comments or questions? None.

S. Bonczar opened public comment. None. He closed public comment and asked Bd. for any further questions. None.

S. Bonczar said it was pretty clear and a great presentation. This case was quite simple. In his opinion there didn't seem to be any issue re home occupation.

W. Campbell and J. Plourde agreed. Everything was covered.

S. Bonczar felt some of these simple ones could be done by administrative decision. That should be looked at in the future. He moved on to discussion of the criteria.

1. Is the proposed use similar to those permitted in the district?

All members said yes. S. Bonczar said a home occupation allowed in Res. A.

2. Is the specific site an appropriate location for the proposed use?

All agreed. S. Bonczar said she had space in her home.

3. Will the use as developed not adversely affect the adjacent area?

R. Costantino said it was just computer work.

W. Campbell agreed.

S. Bonczar said there would be no noticeable change.

4. There will be no nuisance or serious hazard to vehicles or pedestrians.

J. Plourde said nothing would be taking place outside.

W. Campbell and R. Costantino agreed.

S. Bonczar said there would be no deliveries.

5. Adequate appropriate facilities will be provided for the proper operation of the proposed use:

S. Bonczar said, based on the application, it met all criteria and ability to provide adequate and appropriate facilities.
All agreed.

S. Bonczar moved on to vote on the Special Exception:

VOTE: On Special Exception:

1. Is the Special Exception allowed by the ordinance?

R. Costantino – yes
J. Plourde - yes
W. Campbell – yes
S. Bonczar - yes

2. Are all the specified conditions present under which the Special Exception may be granted?

J. Plourde – yes
W. Campbell – yes
R. Costantino – yes
S. Bonczar - yes

S. Bonczar said due to the voting, the criteria for special exception were satisfied and the application was unanimously approved. He reminded applicant of the 30-day appeal period.

S. Bonczar said there was no other business on the agenda and asked for motion to adjourn.

W. Campbell made motion to adjourn.

R. Costantino seconded.

Meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.