

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

**TOWN OF LONDONDERRY  
ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MEETING  
MOOSE HILL COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
268B MAMMOTH ROAD, LONDONDERRY, NH 03053**

**JANUARY 21, 2026, 7:00 P.M.**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

**Members Present:** Suzanne Brunelle, Vice Chair; Brendan O'Brien, Clerk (left at 8:00 p.m.); Mitchell Feig, Member; Greg Carson, Member; Andria Hansen, Alternate Member

**Members Absent:** Jacqueline Benard, Chair; John Grennon, Alternate Member; Lisa Sussman, Alternate Member

**Also Present:** Kristan Farr, Town Planner; Nick Codner, Building Inspector & Zoning Administrator

Acting Chair Brunelle called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and reviewed the meeting procedure. She noted she would be stepping down for the first five cases, so there would not be a full board. She offered applicants the opportunity to request a continuance to the next meeting where there is a full board.

**II. ROLL CALL**

**III. APPROVAL OF DRAFT MINUTES**

Review of the December 17, 2025 draft minutes was tabled due to lack of quorum.

**IV. REPORT BY TOWN COUNCIL LIAISON**

Councilor Faber was not present.

**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. M. Feig seconded the motion. The motion carried 4-0-0.**

Acting Chair Brunelle appointed Andria Hensen as a full voting member for this meeting.

**VI. PUBLIC HEARING OF CASES**

Acting Chair Brunelle recused herself from the Board.

49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95

**A. Case No. 12-17-2025-2 Request For Variance From LZO Section 4.6.6.5 Of The Route 102 Performance Overlay District To Allow The Use Of The Property For The Construction Of Three Single Family Residences. The Parcel Is Located At 296 Nashua Road In The Commercial II (C-2) Zoning District. Tax Map 002, Lot 25-0, Vigeant Family Properties, LLC (Owner), Leonard Vigeant (Applicant).**

**B. Case No. 12-17-2025-3 Request For Variance From LZO Section 4.6.6.7.D.4.D.i Of The Route 102 Performance Overlay District To Allow Encroachment Into The 75-Foot Buffer For A Proposed Single-Family Housing Development. The Parcel Is Located At 296 Nashua Road In The Commercial II (C-2) Zoning District. Tax Map 002, Lot 25-0, Vigeant Family Properties, LLC (Owner), Leonard Vigeant (Applicant).**

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

Attorney Morgan Hollis of Gottesman & Hollis, P.A. appeared before the Board representing the applicant. He requested the cases be continued until a full Board is present.

**M. Feig moved to continue Cases No. 12-17-2025-2 and 12-17-202503 to the February 18, 2026, ZBA meeting. G. Carson seconded the motion. The motion carried 4-0-0.**

**C. Case No. 12-17-2025-8 Request For Variance From LZO 4.3.3.B.1 To Allow A Retail Automobile Sales Operation With Buildings And Parking Areas Within The Front, Side And Rear Green Areas. The Parcel Is Located At 6 Dickey Street In The Commercial 2 (C-II) Zoning District. Tax Map 010, Lot 109, Leon And Tamara Lampes (Owner), TF Moran (Applicant).**

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

Jason Hill of TF Moran, Leon Lampes and Tamara Lampes appeared before the Board to present this request to redevelop this property from a wholesale to a retail automobile sales operation. J. Hill described the pre-existing non-conforming property and structures, and the details of the proposed business. T. Lampes reviewed the history of the business and their desire to offer retail sales at this location.

They agreed to move forward with only four Board members hearing their cases.

J. Hill reviewed the variance criteria.

96 The Board questioned whether parking would be expanded. L. Lampes said they are  
97 asking for the same number of parking spaces, noting that at the last meeting, the  
98 ZBA determined the Planning Board would decide the number of permitted spaces;  
99 otherwise, it would be no more than 15 vehicles.

100

101 B. O'Brien asked for public comment.

102

103 **Name:** Wayne MacDonald

104 **Address:** 11 Dickey Street

105 W. MacDonald, abutter, spoke in support of this proposal and the following two  
106 variance requests, noting that the property has offered automobile sales and  
107 service for many years.

108

109 B. O'Brien noted there were seven letters of support for this proposal, three of  
110 which were presented at the December 17<sup>th</sup> ZBA meeting.

111

112 B. O'Brien closed public comment and the Board entered deliberation. They  
113 reviewed the minutes of the December meeting to verify that the number of  
114 parking spaces would be addressed by the Planning Board.

115

116 B. O'Brien reviewed the variance criteria:

117

118 1) Granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest because it  
119 would not alter the character of the neighborhood.

120 2) The spirit of the ordinance would be observed because it does not violate the  
121 basic objectives of protection of health, safety, or general welfare of the public.

122 3) Granting the variance would do substantial justice because not granting it would  
123 result in a greater loss to the applicant than any gain to the public.

124 4) The values of surrounding properties would not be diminished because the  
125 property has supported automobile sales and service for many years.

126 5) Owing to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other  
127 properties in the area, denial of the variance would result in an unnecessary  
128 hardship because:

129 (a) for purposes of this subparagraph, "unnecessary hardship" means that, owing  
130 to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the  
131 area,

132 (i) there is not a fair and substantial relationship between the general public  
133 purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to  
134 the property because it is a pre-existing use on a very small lot in a mixed-use  
135 area, so is unique.

136 (ii) the proposed use is a reasonable one, as it is a continuation of a non-  
137 conforming use.

138

139 **M. Feig moved in Case No. 12-17-2025-8, the request for variance from**  
140 **LZO 4.3.3.B.1 to allow a retail automobile sales operation with buildings**  
141 **and parking areas within the front, side and rear green areas at 6 Dickey**  
142 **Street be granted. G. Carson seconded the motion. The motion carried 4-0-**  
143 **0.**

144  
145 **D. Case No. 12-17-2025-9 Request For Variance From LZO**  
146 **4.3.3.B.2.A To Allow A Retail Automobile Sales Operation**  
147 **Without The 50-Foot Buffer To The Agricultural Residential**  
148 **(AR-1) Zoning District. The Parcel Is Located At 6 Dickey Street**  
149 **In The Commercial 2 (C-II) Zoning District. Tax Map 010, Lot**  
150 **109, Leon And Tamara Lampes (Owner), TF Moran (Applicant).**  
151

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

153  
154 Jason Hill of TF Moran, Leon Lampes and Tamara Lampes appeared before the  
155 Board to present this request to redevelop this property from a wholesale to a retail  
156 automobile sales operation. J. Hill explained that due to the size of the lot, the  
157 setback extends into the center of the lot. They will be reducing the curb cuts and  
158 increasing the greenspace, including planting trees in the buffer where none  
159 currently exist.

160  
161 T. Lampes noted they have received a letter of approval from the NHDES.

162  
163 J. Hill reviewed the variance criteria.

164  
165 B. O'Brien asked for public comment.

166  
167 Wayne McDonald confirmed his support of this proposal.

168  
169 B. O'Brien closed public comment and the Board entered deliberation.

170  
171 B. O'Brien reviewed the variance criteria:

172  
173 1) Granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest because it  
174 would not alter the character of the neighborhood.

175 2) The spirit of the ordinance would be observed because it does not violate the  
176 basic objectives of protection of health, safety, or general welfare of the public.

177 3) Granting the variance would do substantial justice because it is taking a pre-  
178 existing non-conforming use and bringing it into a more documented use. Not  
179 granting it would result in a greater loss to the applicant than any gain to the  
180 public.

181 4) The values of surrounding properties would not be diminished because there is  
182 not much of a change to the property.

183 5) Owing to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other  
184 properties in the area, denial of the variance would result in an unnecessary  
185 hardship because:

186 (a) for purposes of this subparagraph, "unnecessary hardship" means that, owing  
187 to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the  
188 area,

189 (i) there is not a fair and substantial relationship between the general public  
190 purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to

191 the property because it is a pre-existing use on a very small lot in a mixed-use  
192 area, so is unique.

193 (ii) the proposed use is a reasonable one, as it is a continuation of the same  
194 use for over 30 years.

195  
196 **M. Feig moved in Case No. 12-17-2025-9 to approve the requested**  
197 **variance. A. Hansen seconded the motion. The motion carried 4-0-0.**

198  
199 **E. Case No. 12-17-2025-10 Request For Variance From LZO**  
200 **4.3.3.B.2.B To Allow A Retail Automobile Sales Operation**  
201 **Without A Planted And Maintained 50-Foot Buffer To The**  
202 **Agricultural Residential (AR-1) Zoning District. The Parcel Is**  
203 **Located At 6 Dickey Street In The Commercial 2 (C-II) Zoning**  
204 **District. Tax Map 010, Lot 109, Leon And Tamara Lampes**  
205 **(Owner), TF Moran (Applicant).**

206  
207 B. O'Brien read the case into the record.

208  
209 Jason Hill of TF Moran, Leon Lampes and Tamara Lampes appeared before the  
210 Board to present this request to redevelop this property from a wholesale to a retail  
211 automobile sales operation. J. Hill explained they will comply with requirements  
212 except where there are existing buildings and parking. Impervious coverage will be  
213 reduced and the lot will be brought into greater conformity. New landscaping will be  
214 introduced and drainage improved.

215  
216 J. Hill reviewed the variance criteria.

217  
218 B. O'Brien asked for public comment.

219  
220 Wayne McDonald confirmed his support of this proposal.

221  
222 B. O'Brien closed public comment and the Board entered deliberation.

223  
224 B. O'Brien reviewed the variance criteria:

225  
226 1) Granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest because it  
227 would not alter the character of the neighborhood.

228 2) The spirit of the ordinance would be observed because it does not violate the  
229 basic objectives of protection of health, safety, or general welfare of the public.

230 3) Granting the variance would do substantial justice because not granting it would  
231 result in a greater loss to the applicant than any gain to the public.

232 4) The values of surrounding properties would not be diminished because there is  
233 not much of a change to the property.

234 5) Owing to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other  
235 properties in the area, denial of the variance would result in an unnecessary  
236 hardship because:

237 (a) for purposes of this subparagraph, "unnecessary hardship" means that, owing  
238 to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the  
239 area,

240 (i) there is not a fair and substantial relationship between the general public  
241 purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to  
242 the property because it is a pre-existing use on a very small lot in a mixed-use  
243 area, so is unique.

244 (ii) the proposed use is a reasonable one, as it is a continuation of the same  
245 use for over 30 years.

246

247 **M. Feig moved in Case No. 12-17-2025-10 to grant the requested variance.**

248 **A. Hansen seconded the motion. The motion carried 4-0-0.**

249

250 Acting Chair Brunelle rejoined the Board.

251

252 **F. Case No. 01-21-2026-1 Request For Variance From LZO**  
253 **4.2.1.3.C.1 To Allow Replacement Of A Front Porch Within The**  
254 **40-Foot Front Setback. The Parcel Is Located At 40 Wilson**  
255 **Road In The Agricultural Residential (AR-1) Zoning District, Tax**  
256 **Map 18, Lot 28-15, Deborah A. Stewart (Owner/Applicant).**

257

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

259

260 Deborah Stewart appeared before the Board to present this request to replace a  
261 dilapidated porch with a covered farmers porch.

262

263 As the Board did not have plans for the proposed porch, the case was continued to  
264 February 18, 2026, in order for those to be provided.

265

266 **B. O'Brien moved to continue Case No. 01-21-2026-1 to the February 18,**  
267 **2026, ZBA meeting. M. Feig seconded the motion. The motion carried 5-0-**  
268 **0.**

269

270 **G. Case No. 01-21-2026-2 Request For Variance From LZO 5.14(B)**  
271 **To Allow A Fence Over Four Feet Tall. The Parcel Is Located At**  
272 **20 Alexander Road In The Agricultural Residential (AR-1)**  
273 **Zoning District. Tax Map 11, Lot 74-3, Linda M. Foote**  
274 **(Owner/Applicant).**

275

276 B. O'Brien recused himself from the Board and left the meeting.

277

278 M. Feig read the case into the record.

279

280 Attorney Eli Leino with Bernstein Shur and property resident Therese Foote  
281 appeared before the Board to present this variance request. Property owner Linda  
282 Foote and property resident Jeffrey Foote were also present. They agreed to move  
283 forward with only four Board members hearing the case.

284

285 E. Leino explained the property owners believed the 6-foot fence was compliant at  
286 the time it was installed, where 4 feet is the allowed height. The home is located in  
287 a residential neighborhood where fences are common. The fence provides  
288 reasonable accommodation for severe anxiety of J. Foote.

289  
290 E. Leino reviewed the variance criteria.

291  
292 The Board asked about the distance from the fence to the road, which was  
293 estimated at 10 to 15 feet. They asked why there was a fence on only one side of  
294 the property and were told the trees on the other side serve as a barrier. They  
295 questioned the safety of the fence in terms of drivers being able to see activity in  
296 the front yard. E. Leino suggested conditioning approval on J. Foote being a  
297 resident of the property.

298  
299 Acting Chair Brunelle asked for public comment.

300  
301 **Name:** Charlie Chrzan

302 **Address:** Castle Court

303 C. Chrzan asked if the fence would be extended to the other side of the driveway.  
304 The applicant clarified the fence will remain as it currently is.

305  
306 **Name:** Aurel Lika

307 **Address:** 18 Alexander Road

308 A. Lika said he had no problem with the height of the fence, but asked if the end of  
309 the fence near the street could be pitched to 4 feet. He asked if he could remove  
310 the survey stakes on his property. E. Leino said the stakes could be removed.

311  
312 **Name:** Fred Loonie

313 **Address:** 6 Castle Court

314 F. Loonie asked if there was a plan to continue the fence to the street. E. Leino said  
315 there was not a plan to do so.

316  
317 N. Codner questioned the application referring to a physical disability, not an  
318 emotional one. E. Leino explained the law generally interprets these as one and the  
319 same. The Board questioned the need for the entire fence to extend 6 feet. After  
320 meeting with the applicant, E. Leino said they would be willing to lower the first  
321 panel to 4 feet and increase the pitch up to 6 feet from that point.

322  
323 Acting Chair Brunelle closed public comment and the Board entered deliberation.  
324 The Board agreed they were comfortable with the first panel being 4 feet. They  
325 questioned whether the Traffic Safety Committee should be consulted.

326  
327 M. Feig reviewed the variance criteria:

328  
329 1) Granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest because it  
330 would not alter the character of the neighborhood in that it is slightly taller than  
331 what is permitted by ordinance and is in keeping with the aesthetics of the  
332 neighborhood.

- 333 2) The spirit of the ordinance would be observed because it does not violate the  
334 basic objectives of protection of health, safety, or general welfare of the public.  
335 3) Granting the variance would do substantial justice because not granting it would  
336 result in a greater loss to the applicant than any gain to the public.  
337 4) The values of surrounding properties would not be diminished because the fence  
338 looks nice and does not affect the surrounding properties. The abutters had no  
339 issue with the fence.  
340 5) Owing to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other  
341 properties in the area, denial of the variance would result in an unnecessary  
342 hardship because:  
343 (a) for purposes of this subparagraph, "unnecessary hardship" means that, owing  
344 to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the  
345 area,  
346 (i) there is not a fair and substantial relationship between the general public  
347 purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to  
348 the property – the Board cited 674:33, V, which allows for the ZBA to grant a  
349 variance from the terms of the zoning ordinance without a finding of hardship  
350 arising from conditions of the premises when a reasonable accommodation is  
351 necessary to allow a person or persons with a recognized physical disability to  
352 reside in or regularly use the premises, provided that the paragraph shall be in  
353 harmony with the general intent and purpose of the ordinance.  
354 (ii) the proposed use is a reasonable one given the parameters of 674:33, V.  
355

356 **M. Feig moved in Case No. 01-21-2026-2 to grant the variance from LZO**  
357 **5.14(B), with the conditions that the variance be granted only so long as**  
358 **the particular person in need continues to use the premises, and to reduce**  
359 **the first 10-foot panel closest to Alexander Road from 6 feet to 4 feet in**  
360 **height. A. Hansen seconded the motion. The motion carried 3-1-0.**

361 **VII. COMMUNICATION AND MISCELLANEOUS**

362 None

363

364 **VIII. OTHER BUSINESS**

365 None

366

367 **IX. ADJOURN**

368

369 **G. Carson moved to adjourn. A. Hansen seconded the motion. The motion**  
370 **carried unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 8:46 p.m.**

371

372 Respectfully submitted,

373 Beth Hanggeli

374 Recording Secretary  
375