

Land Use Administrator

From: H Sullivan <hksullivan@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 25, 2025 10:40 PM
To: Land Use Administrator; Jim Wieck; Beth Blair
Subject: Zoning case no. 2025-1

Hello -

My name is Hannah Sullivan and I reside at 41 Hackleboro Rd. in Canterbury, which abuts the property subject to the above-referenced matter (49 Hackleboro Rd.).

Regrettably, I am unable to attend the Zoning Board meeting on March 26 due to prior commitments (I am in NYC for business, flying home that evening). Because I cannot attend, I wanted to submit my comments via email. I appreciate the Zoning Board's consideration of my comments, and I also appreciate my neighbors' efforts to inform abutters of a potential change in property usage. Canterbury has a well-considered Zoning Ordinance and an exception/adjustment process in place that will lead to the right result.

I am supportive of the use of residences in Canterbury for home office purposes, per the provision in the Canterbury Zoning Ordinance for home offices (Section 2.5). While the abutters' notice mentioned home office usage, Section 2.5 was not referenced in the application. Accordingly, it is unclear why any exception or adjustment to the current Zoning Ordinance is necessary. If an exception to Section 2.5 is necessary (for example, if commercial usage is intended that would require multiple commercial vehicles to utilize the property, or commercial lighting or commercial signage, or other deviations from customary residential use), that section of the Zoning Ordinance should be referenced with an explanation of why intended home office use does not comply with current home office use as already contemplated by the Zoning Ordinance.

Because the abutter notice references an entirely different section of the Zoning Ordinance ("Article 5, Section 5.3"), it is unclear why - or even whether - an exception or adjustment by the Zoning Board is necessary.

In closing, I am hopeful that Section 2.5 covers the petitioners' home office use and allows them the flexibility they desire. If it does not, my request is that the application be re-submitted to reference Canterbury's existing home office provision along with a statement about why an exception or adjustment is necessary. Finally, I would like to re-emphasize my support for any home office that fits within Canterbury's current framework as set forth in Section 2.5 of the Zoning Ordinance, as well as my willingness to consider any reasonable exception.

Regards,
Hannah Sullivan