

**Town of Milford
Zoning Board of Adjustment
May 2, 2019
Case #2019-05
Leisure Acres Mobile Home Park Associates
Special Exception**

Present: Steve Bonczar, Chair
Michael Thornton
Joan Dargie
Rob Costantino
Wade Scott Campbell
Karin Lagro, Alternate

Lincoln Daley, Community Development Director

Absent: Tracy Steel
Laura Dudziak, Board of Selectman Representative

Secretary: Peg Ouellette

Richard Cane/Leisure Acres Mobile Home Park Associates, for property located at 26 Melendy Road, #5, Milford, NH, Tax Map 42, Lot 73 M-5, in the Residential R district, is seeking a Special Exception of the Milford Zoning Ordinances per Article II, Section 2.03.C1, to allow for the change from a 14' x 72' sq. ft manufactured home to a 27' x 52' ft. manufactured home with a with a 10' x 12' sq. ft. deck.

APPROVED 6/20/19

Motion to Approve: _____

Seconded: _____

Signed: _____

Date: _____

1
2 Steve Bonczar, Chair, opened the meeting and introduced the Board members. He informed all of the
3 procedures of the Board. He made a correction in the notice of hearing, which he said was Sec. 2.0.1.C.1.
4 S. Bonczar read the notice of hearing and invited the applicant to present the case.
5 Richard Cane of 22 Sandpiper Lane, Merrimack, NH, partner of Leisure Acres Mobile Home Park
6 (LAMHP), which owns the mobile home park, came forward. He stated they were seeking a special
7 exception to allow replacement of a 14 x 72 ft manufactured home with a double wide 27 x 52 ft.
8 manufactured home with a 10 x 12 ft. deck. Like the last property he was before the Bd on, this was let
9 go and conditions were quite severe. It was abandoned. Always a problem with hot water heat. Severe
10 mold problem in the unit. Since manufactured homes are no longer permitted in the R zone, and they
11 were increasing the square footage, they were seeking an expansion of a nonconforming use. Existing
12 unit was three bedrooms and two baths. New one will be same, with more square footage. It was an
13 expansion of a nonconforming use. He then read the responses to the five criteria in the application. On
14 Ques. 5, he added that on the maps provided it was a unit at the end of the short cul-de-sac. He offered to
15 answer any questions from the Bd.
16 S. Bonczar stated he had forgotten to identify W. Campbell as a full voting member and K. Lagro as
17 alternate.
18 S. Bonczar said he had looked at the material sent to him. It was going on the existing footprint as closely
19 as possible, using the same septic and water. A little further away from one of the lot lines, on a cul-de-
20 sac.
21 R. Costantino hadn't seen it. He wanted to know if it would be in the same location.
22 J. Dargie said it was a different profile.
23 S. Bonczar said a little more angled across the yard with deck on the smaller side. He read from the
24 ordinance, Sec. 2.03.0, Non-Conforming Use and Structures down to 2.0-3.1 Re Intent and 2.03.C1 re
25 Alteration, Expansion or Change. He asked for questions from the Bd.
26 J. Dargie said there were no pictures of the new unit.
27 R. Cane said it was the same as the one on Lot 63 [in a previous case]. He didn't include it. He had a
28 copy of the floor plan. It was a double wide vs. single wide which are very long and narrow. Had a
29 master bedroom at one end and the other two bedrooms at the other end. It was an asset to the park and to
30 the community and tax base because of higher value than with the single wide.
31 S. Bonczar said it was updated and an improvement.
32 W. Campbell agreed, it was modernization of the area.
33 R. Cane said the difference was night and day.
34 S. Bonczar opened the meeting for public comment.
35 Mary Pert of #4 had a question. She wanted to know the exact position since she lived at #4. Didn't want
36 #5 sitting in her yard.
37 R. Cane showed her the unit and existing unit and new unit would be moved even further away as they
38 could.
39 M. Pert was satisfied.
40 S. Bonczar said it looked like the positioning was better from her unit.
41 S. Bonczar asked for any further questions from the public. None.
42 He closed public comment.
43 W. Campbell asked how old the existing unit was.
44 R. Cane said he believed it was built in 1982 or 1983.
45 W. Campbell asked how long manufactured homes lasted.
46 R. Cane said like any property, if you maintain it, it will last. Unfortunately some older people are unable
47 to. There were a large number in the park in great condition because residents have been able to maintain
48 them.
49 M. Thornton asked if the mold was tested to see whether it was toxic. Will unit be disposed of easily?
50 R. Cane said yes [it was not a problem]
51 S. Bonczar asked for any other questions. None.

1 S. Bonczar asked for discussion of the criteria. Since he already read the ordinance re nonconforming use
2 and structures, they could talk about the proposal.

3
4 **1. Was the proposed use similar to those permitted in the District?**

5 J. Dargie said it was.

6 S. Bonczar asked if anybody felt it was not. Even outside of the park it represented a
7 single family home.

8 M. Thornton said if you saw it placed on a typical lot you would think nothing of it.

9 No one saw an issue with this criteria

10
11 **2. Was the specific site an appropriate location for the proposed use?**

12 R. Costantino said it was just an exchange.

13 S. Bonczar agreed. Replacing something there to something new and better. If it was
14 appropriate before it was appropriate now.

15
16 **3. Would the use as developed not adversely affect the adjacent area?**

17 M. Thornton said there was more separation from the nearest neighbor.

18 R. Costantino said it was also the same distance from the road - might be an issue if it
19 was right up against it. Setbacks were not included

20 S. Bonczar said it improved the situation in the park with the adjacent units but outside
21 the park it didn't affect anything.

22
23 **4. There will be no nuisance or serious hazard to vehicles or pedestrians.**

24 M. Thornton said they were swapping it.

25 J. Dargie said it was the same bedrooms. Same number of people who could be at the old
26 one could be at the new one.

27 S. Bonczar said they were exchanging one for another similar unit.

28
29 **5. Adequate appropriate facilities will be provided for the proper operation of the proposed**
30 **use.**

31 M. Thornton said it was existing.

32 J. Dargie agreed

33 S. Bonczar said it was same septic, street, driveway.

34 R. Costantino agreed.

35
36 S. Bonczar asked if anyone had anything to add. None.

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

38
39 **VOTE: On Special Exception:**

40
41 **1. Is the Special Exception allowed by the ordinance?**

42 **J. Dargie – yes**

43 **R. Costantino – yes**

44 **W. Campbell – yes**

45 **M. Thornton – yes**

46 **S. Bonczar – yes**

1
2 **2. Are all the specified conditions present under which the Special Exception may be**
3 **granted?**

4 **W. Campbell – yes**

5 **M. Thornton – yes**

6 **R. Costantino – yes**

7 **J. Dargie – yes**

8 **S. Bonczar - yes**
9

10 S. Bonczar said, based on the vote being unanimous, the criteria for special exception were satisfied and
11 the application was unanimously approved. He reminded applicant of the 30-day appeal period.
12