**Town of**
**RAYMOND**
Home of the Landlocked Salmon
INCORPORATED 1803

**Raymond Zoning Board of Appeals**
423 Webbs Mills Road
VIA ZOOM
**Minutes**
**Wednesday, March 13, 2025**
**7:00 pm**

**Call to order:** David Murch called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.   Roll was called and a quorum declared
**Present:**  David Murch, Chair; Greg Dean, Vice Chair; Tom Hennessey, Fred Miller and Pete Lockwood
**Staff:**  Chris Hanson, CEO; Jason Williamson, Assistant CEO;  Grady Burns, Attorney for Code Enforcement; John Hamer, Attorney for the Zoning Board of Appeals and Sandy Fredricks, Administrative Assistant PB & ZBA

Murch read the Agenda and the Opening Statement into the Record.

**Old Business**
### Request for Reconsideration of Administrative Appeal

| APPLICANT | Todd Roma |
|---|---|
| LOCATION | 141 Raymond Hill Road – Map 13/Lot 29 |
| DESCRIPTION | Request for Reconsideration of Administrative Appeal Decision dated February 3rd, 2025 of Notice of Violation dated October 29, 2024 for Land Use Violation |

Murch moved to accept the January 28th, 2025 and February 3rd, 2025 Minutes as written.
Dean seconded.
Any discussion?  None.
All in favor?  5 yes/0 no/0 abstain

Murch asked Hamer to set out the procedure for the Board and those present.  Hamer explained the procedure in depth and the reasons why the Board could allow a Reconsideration.  He further stated it is the Board's discretion if they wish to reconsider.  Murch asked if the request passes the timeliness test, does the Appellant give the Board a summary or does the Board proceed from the papers submitted.  Hamer explained again that they first need to decide if they are going to allow the reconsideration.

Murch explained the dates for consideration.  He advised the Board that he confirmed the Appellants were given ten (10) business days not calendar days and therefore per ordinance it came in late.  Murch further explained the dates and how it was determined to be late.  Miller asked for clarification of it is late, does it end there.  Hamer explained that the Board can allow them to give their presentation and then decide if they are going to allow

FOR DETAILS, PLEASE SEE VIDEO, THE OFFICIAL RECORD OF THE MEETING

reconsideration. Murch would like to allow Appellant to speak and confers with the rest of the Board. All Board members agree to allow Appellant to speak as to why they feel the Board should entertain a Reconsideration of their prior Decision.

Appellants gave a list of their reasons for requesting Reconsideration and spoke about the issue of the Request for Reconsideration being late. They stated they were told by Town representatives when it was due and the only other answer they got from the Board was to speak to their attorney. Appellants further stated they were here tonight because at the last meeting everything was skewed and has been for a long time. He continued that there were facts accepted that were not correct. Appellants spoke about a letter from a former CEO telling them they could have no weddings on their property and issues with the neighbor behind them and assault on his wife. Appellant further stated the current CEO and the Town have a relationship with Floyd Brown and that Brown was hired to do work by the Town and that Brown was given "a wink and a nod to do whatever he wanted". Appellants spoke at length about themselves, what they've done for the Town and their property. They further spoke about Kingsley Pines and that they reviewed the files for that property and found nothing in there allowing them to be a wedding venue.

Murch stopped the summation at this point and stated that they are not rehashing things now. The Board needs to determine if they will allow a Reconsideration. Appellants stated the Finding of Facts was incorrect; they also stated they are able to park cars safely off the street. Murch again stopped the Appellants stating that, to be clear, the filing was late, however, we are doing what we would do had it been on time.

Burns stated the Board received the letter he sent and are asking the right questions. He further stated there are two things he is asking; first for the Board to keep in mind that the decision they made is their decision. He continued that all parties had time to present their evidence and that was the exact process you needed to do and you'd done; reconsideration is discretionary; the Board has done enough and the decision to reconsider, as you were told by your attorney, is up to you.

Murch asked Hamer to provide the next step. Hamer stated the Board needed to discuss and vote if they wish to reconsider. Murch stated his perspective is the Board spent five (5) hours reviewing all the evidence, the information submitted with the request for reconsideration is the same and there is no need to reconsider. Dean stated he felt the issues appellant is requesting be reconsidered are out of the scope of the Board's authority. Lockwood stated he was thinking along the same lines as Murch and Dean. Hennessey stated he didn't hear anything new or why they made an error. He continued he is sorry they have problems with their neighbor but saw nothing here to open the door to reconsideration. Miller agreed with Dean, but he thought it could have been resolved in the past. He further asked if the Board should be considering the past Decision and it was not; the Board is there to review the NOV appeal. He continued that the Board was to review the event last year if it was a violation and he doesn't see anything that changed for them to reconsider.

FOR DETAILS, PLEASE SEE VIDEO, THE OFFICIAL RECORD OF THE MEETING

Murch moved to deny the Request for Reconsideration.
Dean seconded.
Any discussion?  None.
All in favor?  5 yes/0 no/0 abstain

Hamer suggested the Board direct Sandy to send a letter denying the request and sign on behalf of the Board.  The Board gave that direction.

CEO Communications:  Hanson gave an update on the proposed Ordinance amendments.

Dean moved to adjourn.
Murch seconded.
Any discussion?  None.
All in favor?  5 yes/0 no/0 abstain