

Erin Stone
948 Province Road
Barnstead, New Hampshire 03218
Thefoxandcrowfarm@gmail.com

Date: February 4, 2026

Board of Selectmen
Town of Barnstead
Center Barnstead, NH 03225

Re: Formal Complaint and Request for Corrective Action – Multiple Violations of Town of Barnstead Personnel Policies

Dear Members of the Board of Selectmen,

I am submitting this letter as a formal complaint and request for corrective action regarding conduct by Town employee Fab Cusson that occurred in December 2024 and violated the Town of Barnstead Personnel Policies and Procedures Manual that was current and in effect at the time (most recently revised February 21, 2023).

This complaint concerns multiple public social media posts authored by Mr. Cusson, including two posts on the "Barnstead NH Community" Facebook page dated December 14 and December 22, 2024 (attached as Exhibits A and B), as well as any related postings on other social media or online platforms concerning these matters.

In at least one post, Mr. Cusson expressly stated, ***"I am writing to you today as your Building Inspector,"*** removing any ambiguity that these communications were personal rather than made in his official capacity.

In these posts, Mr. Cusson discussed, characterized, and publicly disparaged me, my husband (a private citizen and ZBA member), my farm and business (The Fox and Crow Farm), and the Planning Board, all in connection with disputed Town enforcement and permitting matters.

Scope and Impact of the Conduct

Mr. Cusson's posts went far beyond personal commentary. They:

- Publicly attacked a Town resident and elected official;
- Disparaged my husband, a private citizen and Zoning Board member;
- Targeted my farm and business, causing reputational and economic harm;
- Undermined the Planning Board as a governing body; and
- Presented disputed enforcement matters as established wrongdoing.

In his December 22, 2024 post, Mr. Cusson further asserted that he had a ***"duty to inform the public... of the facts about what has transpired,"*** and proceeded to disclose and characterize internal complaints, inspection findings, enforcement history, Town legal actions, and Select Board deliberations. These statements were made publicly, without authorization, and after Mr. Cusson had recused himself from involvement in

matters relating to my property. They served no legitimate Town purpose and instead functioned as a public campaign to discredit individuals and a Town board.

Basis for Delay in Reporting

I did not bring this matter to the Board immediately following the incident due to a reasonable fear of further retaliation, particularly given the power imbalance involved and the ongoing enforcement actions affecting my property and role in Town processes at the time. The Personnel Policies do not impose a statute of limitations on reporting misconduct, and delayed reporting under these circumstances is consistent with the policies' purpose and protections.

Policy Violations:

Based on the Town of Barnstead Personnel Policies and Procedures Manual, Mr. Cusson's conduct constitutes multiple violations, including but not limited to the following:

1. Standards of Conduct – Attitude (p. 47)

The handbook prohibits:

“Using abusive language to any person while at work, creating any type of disturbance... verbally abusing or neglecting other Town employees, visitors or residents of the Town of Barnstead.”

By publicly disparaging and attacking a resident, private citizens, a business, and a Town board in a widely accessible forum, Mr. Cusson violated this standard.

2. Harassment of a Resident, Citizen, and Visitor (pp. 8–9)

The harassment policy expressly applies to conduct directed toward citizens and residents, not only employees. Publicly singling out individuals and encouraging hostility in connection with Town matters constitutes prohibited harassment.

3. Retaliation (pp. 48–49)

The handbook prohibits:

“Retaliation against anyone who has complained of alleged harassment or discrimination or has participated in an investigation of a complaint.”

Mr. Cusson's posts followed my participation in Town governance and disputes involving enforcement actions and functioned to publicly punish and discredit me for protected participation.

4. Misuse of Position and Improper Assertion of Authority

By identifying himself publicly as the Town's Building Inspector and presenting a one-sided enforcement narrative after recusal, Mr. Cusson misused his position and improperly asserted authority in a public forum.

5. Confidentiality and Improper Disclosure of Town Matters (pp. 35–36, 39–41)

The Personnel Policies restrict public discussion of Town legal matters and information relating to residents. Mr. Cusson's posts disclosed and characterized internal complaints, inspection findings, enforcement history,

Select Board deliberations, and attorney involvement in a public forum, none of which he was authorized to disseminate.

6. Reputational Harm to the Town (pp. 41–42)

The handbook prohibits communications that:

“May cause embarrassment, damage to reputation, or other harm to the Town.”

A Town employee publicly attacking residents, businesses, and a Town board over disputed matters undermines public trust in Town governance and exposes the Town to reputational and legal harm.

7. Conflict of Interest and Appearance of Impropriety (p. 45)

Employees are required to avoid conduct that creates even the appearance of a conflict of interest. Publicly taking sides in an active dispute involving a resident, particularly after recusal, violates this standard.

8. Conduct Inconsistent with Town Objectives

The handbook makes clear that no list of prohibited conduct can be exhaustive. Mr. Cusson’s repeated public postings, taken as a whole, are inconsistent with the Town’s objectives of professionalism, neutrality, and public trust.

Board Authority and Responsibility

The Personnel Policies make clear that the Board of Selectmen is the sole authority responsible for discipline of Town employees and that the Board may impose discipline, require corrective action, and bypass progressive discipline where circumstances warrant. Once on notice of these violations, the Board has an affirmative duty to investigate and act.

Requested Corrective Actions

I respectfully request the following reasonable and proportional corrective actions:

1. A formal written reprimand of Mr. Cusson, documented in accordance with the Personnel Policies.
2. Removal of all related social media posts, including the posts dated December 14 and December 22, 2024, and any substantially similar postings on other platforms.
3. A public corrective statement, posted in the same forum(s), acknowledging that it was inappropriate to discuss Town matters involving residents, private citizens, businesses, or Town boards on social media and expressing regret for the harm caused.
4. Confirmation that Mr. Cusson has been instructed not to discuss Town matters involving residents, businesses, or Town boards on social media going forward.

These actions are remedial, not punitive, and are intended to mitigate ongoing harm, restore public trust, and ensure compliance with Town policy.

Preservation of Records

I request that all records related to this matter, including social media communications, internal correspondence, and deliberations, be preserved.

Request for Response

Please confirm receipt of this complaint and advise, in writing, of the Board's intended course of action within fourteen (14) days of receipt. If the Board believes any portion of this complaint cannot be addressed, I request that the specific basis for that determination be provided in writing.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Stone

EXHIBIT A

Fab Cusson

Top contributor

• 1h •

Good morning, Barnstead. I am writing to you today as your Building Inspector. I have been doing this now in Barnstead for around 15 years. Thankfully, most of these years have been smooth and enjoyable! This past year, unfortunately, I cannot say the same. In recent weeks there have been some postings on here and on the World Wide Web and other Facebook pages, regarding issues between the town, that names me, Erin Stone, a member of our Planning Board and Jared Hanselman, a member of our Zoning Board, and their property here in Barnstead. Many of the accusations / statements I have read are simply erroneous, mis characterized, half-truths or just plain uninformed. Much of what I have read in recent days is what I would characterize as "rage baiting". I see this as someone posting inflammatory comments to work folks into a rage, and then skillfully directing their rage towards an individual or entity. For instance, it is being said that I attacked Erin Stone in a public meeting and threatened to sue her. Not true, the recording doesn't lie. In fact, it was me who was attacked. Further, insinuating all over social media that the Town of Barnstead is unfairly targeting farming is preposterous and couldn't be further from the truth. It's easy to see now this is merely an attempt at deflecting their property issues onto the farming community. We love our farmers and anyone who knows me knows I support them personally and professionally! Another, I am biased, unfair and picking fights with them for no reason. No, I have walked away, sucked it up, bit my tongue on more than one occasion with these folks. While it is true I am completely fed up with what feels like cyber bullying and a whole lot of gaslighting from certain individuals, I have done my best to remain unbiased and fair. That's only to name a couple. I've long been a believer that when controversy strikes, it's usually best to hit the pause button, instead of throwing more dung against the wall, with the hope things will settle down on their own. I have also learned over the years that indeed there are times when you're given no choice but to speak out. For me this is that time where I feel I must dispel the constant mis information published and spoken by Erin Stone. It's frankly exhausting dealing with this, but the alternative of allowing this mis information to go unanswered, is no longer an option for me. Unfortunately, In the past 6-9 months I have been publicly slandered, humiliated and outright mistreated by a few members of our community. Today it continues in a social media / blogging campaign by Erin Stone and Jared Hanselman. That for me is just a terrible place to be. I have no desire to go- tit for tat, with these very angry and unhappy people, but I may just have no choice. Keep in mind when this initially started in a public meeting, I made the decision to let it go, try and forgive, and hope things will smooth over with time. This unfortunately did not happen. Perhaps, silence, instead of pushing back, emboldened the bad behavior? With That being said, I've decided that this is one of those times I will work on setting the record straight. I also believe I have a duty to inform the public, who I work for, of the facts about what has transpired regarding The Fox and Crow Farm here in Barnstead. Rather than leaving you to the rumors, half-truths and mis characterizations (from both sides) I will just lay it all out on the table in full disclosure. This may be long.

Before we can get into the current issues, I'll give you a quick backstory. Earlier in the year the building department received a call from Bob Abbott of RM Builders regarding issues he felt he was having with the Planning Board while attempting to gain approval for a 7 lot subdivision on Will Smith Rd and Province Rd. He strongly felt he was being mistreated. I've known Bob for many years, also a Barnstead resident, who also helped us all, and generously donated towards building the Barnstead Police Department. I agreed to look over his file and saw what I thought were some questionable items, so I decided to at least attend the next meeting to see for myself. The first meeting I attended I was honestly appalled at the Chairpersons behavior and treatment of the applicant; it was not so much the issues being raised, but the way it was being conducted. Not only in the words used, but also the tone taken and body language displayed by the chair especially. I'm a firm believer that all people appearing before the board (whether you like them or not) should be treated with respect. This was not what I witnessed. It was so egregious at one point I had to raise my hand to speak. With a very calm tone and professionally (I have the recording) I basically rebuked the chairwomen on several of the board's positions. Well folks let me just state this did not sit well with Nancy or Erin. I attended a few meetings after that and spoke both in favor of the applicant's ideas and in many cases in the Towns favor. I explained to Bob when I felt the board was right (even if he didn't like it) and Bob was always respectful and amendable. I explained to the board my thoughts when I felt they were going too far, even when they didn't like it, however respectful by these two members was never the case. I should mention the other board members were fine, even though I didn't agree with all they said or did, my issues were mainly with Nancy and Erin. At one meeting after I offered some ideas, Nancy publicly accused me of being Bob's friend. My response was, of course we are friendly toward each other, and why wouldn't I be? I like to think I *am friendly with everyone in this room, or in this town for that matter. From there, the energy and demeanor of two members of the PB (Nancy and Erin) shifted in a very negative way towards me and the applicant. On one occasion, my jaw hit the floor as I listened to Erin Stone speak with much disdain, hollering disrespectfully at the applicants attorney. I have attended a good number of meetings in my life, this one took the cake for the worse mannerism and decorum I've ever witnessed by a board member. I am not the only person who witnessed this and was left shocked. The last meeting I attended was when Erin and Nancy presented a list of stipulations, that included the removal of the building inspector (me) for this subdivision, going so far as to refer to me as an investor / partner with RM Builders, which couldn't have been further from the truth. It was an outright lie designed to smear me and my name, including a more private campaign by Nancy to suggest I be replaced as Building Inspector all together. In a nutshell, they basically implied I was using my*

position as Building Inspector for financial gain, which of course is absolutely, unequivocally false, and outright slanderous. (Again, I have the tapes). I was so humiliated and honestly the implication deeply hurt. I sat there quietly for what seemed to be 30 minutes and just composed myself. To think after 15-years of maintaining honest and good working relations with the folks in this town, that I had just been so cheaply and publicly reduced to this, in front of everyone, as being a sellout. When public input came, I raised my hand and was allowed to stand up and speak. I very calmly stated that I didn't think what they did was legal (turned out it wasn't), that I would be consulting with my attorney in the morning and basically, I told them I was very hurt. I did also tell them that they publicly defamed me, then I got up and left the building. In reflection, though at my expense, I now see it made good theatre for them, and I took it as their way of signaling to me that there is a heavy price to pay when you dare to disagree with either of them. Ultimately, this has nothing to do with the issues that came up on their property, but Erin & Jared falsely claim this is where it all began for them.

Now fast forward to later in the summer of 2024. Complaints began to come in regarding the then, Fox and Crow Farm, which had a heavy online presence. In their ads on Facebook, Website, Air BnB etc. they advertised (amongst many other things) two different vacation cabin rentals on their property. As some of you may recall, in 2024 voters voted in favor of a Short Term rental ordinance, which in part required owners to apply for a site review to the Planning Board for all Short-Term Rentals. In 2023, voters voted in the definition of Short-Term Rentals to specifically state "a business" so these rentals would be subject to section 8:1 of our ordinance, which again required PB, Health and Selectboard approval. In fact, Erin Stone co-authored both the short-term rental ordinance and the previous year's definition. It is important to note that they operated two separate rentals on their property, but never applied to either of their own boards for approval. Folks in town grew concerned, some infuriated that they were ignoring the very ordinance they wrote, to enforce on others, but not themselves. This did not leave a good taste in people's mouths, especially when considering the great demands she herself placed on RM Abott builders for traffic studies, road engineering, etc., claiming the extra traffic (on the same road, less than a ½ mile away from her property that she conducted the rental and various other businesses on) would be detrimental to the Town. Many in our town feel it boldly displays the appearance of do as I say, not as I do. How could I disagree with these sentiments?

This is only one of many layers. It turned out that one of the cabins was never permitted. I had this happen on two other occasions and had to straighten them both out. Each time they were caught building with no permit, I was very friendly with them, but I required them to do what everyone else was required to do. The first occasion was around the time they first moved into town. They began erecting a large barn with no permit, Erin displayed it on FB and it was reported to the town. Once I contacted them, Jared was pleasant and responsive, came in and took care of it. The second time was when Erin was displaying one of the log cabins he was building and it was discovered he started building again with no permit. Again, Jared was pleasant and responded quickly, dropped off an application, and left a check with my office, on the check memo he wrote "Hunting cabin". He was given a permit for a hunting cabin. He and Erin both explained how they wanted to try their hand at log cabins and always wanted to build a cool hunting cabin where they could stay warm and dry while hunting. As an accessory building to the main structure, I felt this was certainly an allowed use.

I should also state that I feel I got along well with Jared, I considered him a friend. I purchased a pig from him at one point, made many online purchases during Covid with them and even visited their store on several occasions. This is what also made it extra awkward for me every time I had to jump on his case to get a permit. There was no question, they both understood they needed permits after the second issue. Despite going through that entire process of building with no permit - twice, it turns out there was a third building which they never disclosed. They had erected a second unpermitted cabin on the property. Which leads me to wonder if the strategy is to only pull permits if caught? Here is where the plot thickens. Not only were there permitting issues, but the "cabins" it turns out were being used as vacation rentals to the public. This changed everything. It meant people would have assumed and trusted they were safe and fit for habitation, inspected by the town of Barnstead. When in fact one of them was not supposed to even exist, and the other was granted under the condition that it was for their personal use as an accessory structure. Once they used these buildings for rentals, they went from being accessory structures to being accessory dwelling units (ADU). A dwelling unit requires ZBA approval, but this was never done. Jared himself has voted on multiple cases for ADU's, presented by our law-abiding citizens, who have come before the board for their approval. Yet they never applied for this themselves. We now know that not only were these illegal ADU's not approved by the ZBA (for the various required variances), but they were being rented to the public with no septic systems (all the details have been copied from their website before it was taken down). Instead, they dug holes in the ground, and as of today we see no NHDES approvals for either of these latrines that were put into use as public rentals. Aside from the multiple International Building Code violations present, The Barnstead Building Code, ZO, IPC also requires a septic system for an ADU, a minimum of 500 SF for per dwelling. Neither of these cabins were presented to the ZBA for the proper approval, yet the owner sits on the very board deciding if you can have one. Lastly, when they received approval for the ADU on the barn, a new question arises, did they inform the ZBA they had two others on the property? Doubtful, because if they had they would have needed another variance -as Barnstead only allows one ADU per property. They had two already in play, and now are building a third. One could now also argue that the ZBA approval they have for the one ADU attached to the barn is invalid if the ZBA was not provided with the full details of the other two already on their property.

Back to the STR's (Short Term Rentals). These STR's both required PB approval, selectmen and Health approval. Neither of these "cabins" were ever presented to the PB, yet the owner sits on the very board deciding if you can have one.

During the spring / summer, not long after the incident at the town meeting where I stated I would seek my attorney's advice, I spoke with Nancy, the PB Chair, and explained the complaints coming in from folks in town regarding all these violations of their property. I also explained to her that a prominent businessperson (that most of us know) in this town has said she heard Nancy say something to the effect that the PB will never give RM Abbot the subdivision approval, and that the PB will bury him in engineering until he gives up. She didn't deny it or admit to this statement, she responded with I guess I'll have to be very careful what I say. She then told me she was already aware of the cabins, STR's at Erin's, and she as the Chair would address them directly with Erin. You would have to ask Nancy directly if she ever did, I have nothing to indicate that it ever happened. By this point it was clearly an embarrassment to the PB Board, yet it was still mostly kept out of the public eye. Within days of having this conversation with Nancy, the town received a letter from Erin and Jared's attorney stating in part that I'm not allowed on their property, and they want to call in to their own inspector. They felt I was biased against them. I met with the Selectmen and voluntarily recused myself from inspecting their property, but not from any other building inspector duties outside their property. I assumed someone (possibly Nancy) spoke to Erin and Jared and told them of the complaints I was following up on, and that was when they decided they needed to have me removed as an inspector. Honestly, after the treatment I received at the PB meeting, I wasn't comfortable ever stepping foot on that property again anyway. It was for the better I felt. I even sent a kind text message to Jared explaining I understood and still wished him the very best. Now they are at odds with the new MRI inspector, but they still blame the town for being biased. Can't seem to win.

Phew, now to the last couple layers. Last year (before all the troubles) they applied for a barn permit. WOW! I was pleased. I thought they finally understood they must apply first for a permit. The barn was easily seen from the front of the house, there is no way this one could hide from the public view. He was quickly given a permit for the barn. A year goes by and his permit expired. Our office reached out to them to renew, and they came in with a renewal request, but this time they added an ADU. This one had ZBA approval, and a septic design, which was great. The permit was renewed with the ADU added. I had not been to the property for any inspections by that time, so I cannot clearly state what stage the construction was in, but likely early stages (unless he failed to call in for inspections when required). Now by the time they were all framed, I was already recused as the onsite inspector. So, the town, again at the taxpayers expense, sent out an MRI inspector. He goes out to the property to inspect the barn and confirms the two cabins that were being advertised as rentals. You can find his report under selectmen's supplemental minutes.

When the MRI report came back, he found inconsistencies in the plans. Additionally, during that period they dropped off a plumbing permit for the barn /ADU but on it also said, "light commercial kitchen". This is when we pulled the septic design and saw that it is not only called for an ADU, but also a processing facility of some sort. By this time Erin and Jared had a history of either not pulling permits, or pulling permits for one use, then using them in an entirely different way. This is when we (The MRI inspector, Selectmen and me) realized this was potentially about to get out of control if a commercial kitchen for a new facility of some type was approved without PB site review. Considering all the inconsistencies, it could no longer be ignored. Jared and Erin put us all in the most difficult kind of position. Here we had members of our own boards, who coauthored the very ordinances they themselves didn't adhere to, yet sitting in the place of authority themselves deciding whether others can or cannot. I witnessed the Selectboard struggle with the idea of *how to carefully right this wrong, and if they didn't how it would violate the trust and faith that the public had placed in them to be transparent and open.* They had to act, and they knew it, but how? By this time the town was forced to hire an attorney, though at a great expense to the taxpayers, they had no choice. Barnstead needed careful representation as Erin and Jared had an attorney, and the narrative seemed to be changing daily and even being skillfully twisted. It was decided not to approve the plumbing permit as long as it had a "commercial kitchen", until such time they could provide a site plan review to the PB with a commercial kitchen or processing facility. A cease and desist was issued by the town council for the cabins and other structures. The Selectmen took a strong stand against the violations, and then made the minutes available to the public to maintain full transparency with the members of our community.

At some point after the MRI inspectors visited their property, they removed the rental cabins from their website, closed their farm stand, and claimed they have discontinued the unapproved uses on their property. Ultimately, because of their written letters to the town of shutting down the illegal uses on the property the Selectmen felt they achieved their goal of getting the property to come into compliance presently, and decided it made no sense to continue expending taxpayer money on legal fees with the new assurances they had in place. This is all provided they don't start up again without the proper approvals. The Selectboard really navigated this tangled web of violations and accusations like professionals with the interest of the town always in mind. If you happen to see any of them on the street, take the time to thank them. The town has also lifted the cease and desist and requirement for site plan review, again, as long as they don't go back to operating without the proper permits and approvals. Hopefully it ends here, we will see.

Whether you are for less regulation or more, whether you like these ordinances or are against them, it is not the point of the issues laid out above. The point is simple. If the people who are authoring these ordinances, putting them out to the public to vote on them, and then sitting in the position of authority to enforce them over you, they themselves must prepare to comply. So, there you have it. Obviously, this is only a synopsis of what all transpired. There is more I left off, merely to save space. In the end, my hope is to set the record straight. Let's hope the mis- information campaign and the rage baiting ends now. There are much better ways we can be expending our resources and energy.

EXHIBIT B

Fab Cusson
12/22/2024

Good morning, me again. When I posted last week, I had hoped it would be the only time on this subject. As I stated in my last post, I've decided to answer the many erroneous statements being made about the Town and myself on their various social media platforms and the web. They are accusing me of public defamation. I don't see it that way at all. I'm merely giving an answer to the very public campaign they started and continue with on their many public platforms. They should know defamation is a two-way street.

It's important that the public can hear the other side of the story. I receive phone calls about what is being written now. I'm not going to lie, it's unsettling. I honestly don't feel like spending my day writing and responding to all the garbage being said, but in the spirit of full disclosure I will publicly answer a few of the recent claims being made about me and the town from our perspective.

1. The most important thing I want to stress. This is NOT a farm fight as it is being made out to be. Perhaps by making it a farm fight it infuriates farmers who haven't heard both sides? I'll say it again: Barnstead fully supports their farms and follows the laws on farming! This is simply an issue between folks in town, who hold board positions, who also author and / or enforce new and existing ordinances for our residents, who now are in a dispute over permitting and approvals for themselves.

2. Regarding the false claim, we never needed a site review: The STR definition in our ordinance (Erin co-wrote it) clearly states short term rental is a business. It was written for the sole purpose of ensuring STR's had site review under 8:1. Look up the post on this community page dated March 5 2022. The content of the definition is clear.

3. She now claims: The STR conditional use permit was not available to the public yet. If that is the case (IMO) it's not a good look for PB, and the first I've heard this. They passed an ordinance onto the people and never published their own application? Interesting. At this past week's PB meeting they had the application; we discussed it for the first time. BTW: I found it interesting that their cabin rentals would never have been approved if they followed the guidelines of the applications requirements. So, you can decide for yourself why the application was never finalized / implemented?

4. Another claim, the cabins are not dwelling units is misleading: It seems they are now carefully narrating the usage of the cabins to make their case. As I understand the rules, once they started renting the cabins for overnight stays and advertising them to the public online, they became dwelling units. The ads have since been removed, but we have them saved should they be needed.

5. Nobody else got an STR permit: Conditional use permits, and site plans are submitted to PB, not Building Department. I only follow up on complaints. It is not in my job description, nor do I have time to track STR's in town. They are elected officials in town and are expected to lead the way for others. This seems more like a deflection of the blame than a defense.

6. As to the claim the cabins are not Dwelling units... IRC: Barnstead & NH State adopted code definition: Dwelling unit: A single unit providing complete independent living facilities for sleeping, eating, cooking and sanitation. When they publicized and rented these cabins for overnight stays, they became dwelling units. If the town wants to pass an ordinance that people

can rent out their sheds, dig outhouses and Air B&B them out to the public then that's fine. Until then it's considered a dwelling unit in Barnstead.

7. Latrines are not governed by NHDES or Barnstead: Barnstead follows NHDES rules for septic systems. Perhaps they should start by reading ENV-WQ 1022. Test pits for soil and water table requirements. As stated in my previous post I am still awaiting some NHDES clarifications, but it's clearly stated in the septic designers' rules. I am being told that if it's in the design rules, it's *for the purpose of design and approval*. I plan to follow up with NHDES this week.

Lastly, the rabbit shed permit issued this week does have a condition they are clearly not happy about. Yes, the permit basically states in part that they cannot convert the shed into a dwelling unit, without proper approvals in place. Why did I add that to their permit? The simple answer is because I got burnt by them on the "Hunting Cabin" that they told me was merely a neat little hunting blind for their use, yet it turned into a rental cabin to the public that never received CO or STR approvals. The misuse or change of the original hunting cabin permit put me in hot water and the town in a potentially bad position. I just wanted to make sure it doesn't happen again. They are upset it took two months for the "rabbit shed" permit to get signed off on. First off, the shed was already built without a permit so it's not like it held them up. I simply couldn't sign it until the attorneys cleared some things up which just happened recently.