

Zoning Board of Appeals
Minutes of March 2, 2023 at 6:30PM
Zoning Administrator: Noreen Stockman - absent
Present: Morse, Peterson, Finneran, Murphy, Duffy, Potamis

RECORDED
APR 20, 2023 AM 9:16
TOWN CLERK

Public Comment – none

(Continuation) #110-22 Keller, 72 Pheasant Lane, East Falmouth – requesting a Special Permit to allow a spa/pool, encroaching into setback, and increasing lot coverage by structures.

Voting Members: Morse, Peterson, Murphy, Finneran, Duffy

Murphy read the ‘Notice of Public Hearing’ into the record, and read the following referrals into the record:

Water – no comment

Assessors- no comment

Planning – no comment

Health- By installing a pool you will create another setback that will need to be maintained if/when the septic system needs to be replaced. Will a replacement septic system no longer be able to be sited on the lot without setback variances once the pool is installed? The engineer should either show a reserve area or at least describe how this pool will not cause future variances or at least not cause more further variances.

Engineering - comments; defer to ConCom for stormwater management and erosion controls

Correspondence – 2 letters of support

Robert Ament, attorney for Applicant- A little over a year ago, Ms. Keller had a spa\pool installed on her property, which measures 7’x19’. It’s a wave pool, and goes about 2.5’ into the ground, and is about 2.5’ above the ground. It was installed in error, too close to the sideline. The spa, despite being a small structure, is considered a structure, and it was installed 8.2’ from the property line. The zoning compliance can be cured so it was no closer than 9.3’. There is no advantage to the fact that it was put too close to the lot line, and the out-of-Town installer didn’t know there was a permit needed; there is no excuse for it. Sometimes a small error can be ignored under the law, if we call it de minimus. I’ve discussed this case with the Building Commissioner, and his policy is that if it’s 1’ or less, it is considered that de minimus, and would not require it to be relocated. He told me that he hopes there is a way that it can be resolved without it being removed; he has also issued a letter stating that. The cost removing the pool is tremendous. You would have to excavate around it, and bring a crane to move it, and relocate. I believe that there is a way to solve this problem. The house and garage have been in existence for more than 10 years, and that garage is also too close to the same property line as the pool, at 9.3’ to the side line to the north. The pool is 8.2’ at one corner, and 9.3’ at another corner. There is decking at the north, which is part of the structure, and we propose to remove that. In a Special Permit decision for 109 Gansett Avenue that was recently granted, you allowed a shed in the front yard to be removed, and allowed it to be a little bit bigger. A second shed was granted, along with a swimming pool being located slightly closer to the lot line. There is no way the Board would find that allowing this spa\pool would have impacts that are more detrimental than the existing non-conformity. A mistake was made; ConCom has

Zoning Board of Appeals
Minutes of March 2, 2023 at 6:30PM
Zoning Administrator: Noreen Stockman - absent
Present: Morse, Peterson, Finneran, Murphy, Duffy, Potamis

approved what's there, because it's in their jurisdiction, being within 100' of a wetland. Moving it less than 2' would be disruptive. I hope you would avoid having this removed, and I'm not aware of any opposition to this. The Building Commissioner is in support of it; he just felt as though he couldn't do it. I have heard different costs to move it, and it's quite a range, but they are all 5-figure amounts.

Board discussion

Peterson – One difficulty I have with this is that this structure is supposed to have the 10' setback. I didn't see any reference to de minimis / quantities in our Bylaws. There should be a 10' setback for the spa/pool for me. I struggle with the homeowner not going back to the installer. Between the two of them, they didn't understand that there would be setback regulations? Why aren't they trying to cure the issue before coming to us? We need to know who the contractor is, so we can contact them, as a Board, to ensure that doesn't happen again. It's one failure after another. I would be leaning towards moving the pool.

Ament – I have talked to the installer, who is in Hyannis, and has not been helpful, or accepted the responsibility for curing this problem. They didn't think it was a structure that required a setback. The purpose of the board is not to punish the Applicant. The Building Commissioner has said that more than 1' wouldn't be considered de minimus, and that has been the practice. I think that you have the authority to accept the nonconformities with respect to accessory structures, if it's not more detrimental. You have done that in the past, and you can do that in this case. By moving the pool, it would be detrimental, and the homeowners have incurred a substantial cost. This Board can be a Board of relief.

Murphy – Blaming the installer bothers me; when you live on the water, like the Applicant does, you know that you can't do anything without Conservation's permission. I still don't know how the garage got there; I haven't been able to find a decision.

Ament – It was installed in 1975.

Murphy – They still know, being that close to the water.

Ament – I don't know what the familiarity of the homeowner was with the wetlands; they haven't lived there for long. It's not your job to punish people. You do have the ability to solve this; I don't know why you would allow 2 new structures, and an expanded pool on Gansett Road, but not this, simply because the installer or homeowner did this wrong. I understand that the laws are necessary, and they need to be enforced, and we have to make decisions that discourage people from doing them. This is close to de minimus and I hope that you will have the empathy to allow this to stay the way it is.

Finneran – I realize it's just a swimming pool/spa. We could not see the stakes for the corner of the property. There was nowhere that I could go in, and determine the property lines, because it wasn't marked; but I was able to figure it out. The drawings that you have, and the aerial photos, do not show how the garage is placed; it vectors off at a greater angle. If one goes there and looks at the spa, you know exactly why they placed it where they did, and that's why it was placed in that location. The installer was from out of Town; for me to believe he was unfamiliar with setbacks is too much. If you look at the history of the property they failed to get a permit for the electrical and the plumbing.

Duffy – You've applied for a Special Permit for increase in lot coverage. So you are looking for several Special Permits.

Ament – We are looking for 2 Special Permits, the spa structure increased the lot coverage over 20%.

Zoning Board of Appeals
Minutes of March 2, 2023 at 6:30PM
Zoning Administrator: Noreen Stockman - absent
Present: Morse, Peterson, Finneran, Murphy, Duffy, Potamis

Duffy- Was the lot coverage already over the 20% with the house and garage?

Ament – Yes it would have been over the 20% but they are over 20 years old.

Duffy – This would be the first special permit to allow lot coverage over 20%.

Ament – Correct.

Duffy – Are you asking for our authority under 240-10.2A?

Ament – Not just that; the Board can grant an intensification of a nonconformity, and here we have the garage structure being too close to the line. An extension to that would bring the garage the same distance, and our Bylaw doesn't distinguish between accessory and principle structures; it's a residential use and we have a nonconformity.

Duffy – Correct, it doesn't distinguish between principle and accessory structures, but it qualifies the structures being pre-existing. I can accept that the house and the garage is, but I'm having difficulty convincing myself that the pool is, because that was just recently built.

Ament – The pool isn't, but neither were the structures that the Board allowed at Gansett Road. I maintain that you can approve; it would be a tremendous cost and disruption.

Potamis – I think that mistakes were made; ConCom has now approved it. How would you correct the Board of Health concerns about the reserve area?

Ament – I did request BSC prepare a new plan, but I have not gotten it yet. There seems to be plenty of room to me, in the southeast corner of the lot. Furthermore the referral was treating this as though it was a vacant lot.

Potamis- In the past we avoided the definition of de minimus.

Morse – The 2 letters of support that we received; where are those properties?

Ament – It's a corner property. I did write to the owner of the closest property, it's a rental property, and it was to ask about him selling a 2' piece of property, to adjust the lot lines, but he didn't want to do that. He is fully aware of this situation; he would have been noticed for this. I'm not aware of any opposition.

Public Comment – none

Stockman – Regarding 109 Gansett Road, the structures that were placed or replaced; none of the structures were closer to the lot line than what existed.

Ament – I don't disagree with that, but they were larger structures, and it included a new structure. There is no requirement that in applying this section of the Bylaw or the state law that you can't intensify the nonconformity, and case law explains that.

Zoning Board of Appeals
Minutes of March 2, 2023 at 6:30PM
Zoning Administrator: Noreen Stockman - absent
Present: Morse, Peterson, Finneran, Murphy, Duffy, Potamis

Peterson – I think the Board has been empathetic to all Applicants, and I wished that this never happened. The owner should be getting back with the installer, and it shouldn't be the Board taking corrective action. I am going to stay where I am.

Murphy – I agree with Mr. Peterson and Mr. Finneran.

Duffy – I look at this as an application being 2 parts, one under nonconforming, and the other under lot coverage. I think this would have been granted as a Special Permit had they come to us in the first place. I do not see any detriment to the neighborhood with this pool. I have a little more difficulty with the nonconforming part, but we do have a Bylaw that allows this. I don't see any particular harm.

Morse – I would agree with Mr. Duffy, but I don't like when these kind of mistakes are made. If this is removed or relocated, I think that it would cause more harm.

Ament – If the owner chooses to relocate the pool, that relocation would still require a Special Permit.

Duffy – We could grant the Special Permit to allow the increase in lot coverage.

Finneran – Is it proper for us to split the application?

Morse – I don't see why not.

Peterson made a motion to close the hearing. Finneran seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

Duffy made a motion to approve under 240-11.3A(4) to increase lot coverage affected by the installation of the spa/pool, to a total of 23.7%. Murphy seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

Findings:

- 1) Property is located within a Residential C zoning district, Green Pond Coastal Pond Overlay and located within an AE 13/15 flood zone
- 2) Lot size is 13,460 s/f
- 3) Public road
- 4) Lot coverage by structures 23.7%; total lot coverage 24.9%
- 5) 2 letters in support; no opposition in file, or at hearing
- 6) Meets criteria of 240-11.3A(4)
- 7) Garage has been in existence since 1978
- 8) Approval from the Conservation Commission
- 9) Testimony – the installer was unaware that permits were needed
- 10) Decking of pool is 5.9' from the northerly lot line, and the pool structure is 8.2' from the northerly lot line

Conditions

- 1) Deck at rear to be removed
- 2) Revised plan to show relocation of spa/pool; update garage location
- 3) Comply with Conservation requirements
- 4) Comply with Engineering Department's referral

Zoning Board of Appeals
Minutes of March 2, 2023 at 6:30PM
Zoning Administrator: Noreen Stockman - absent
Present: Morse, Peterson, Finneran, Murphy, Duffy, Potamis

All in favor.

Duffy made a motion to approve the location of the spa\pool under 240-10.2A(1). Morse seconded the motion. Motion did not carry with members Murphy, Finneran and Peterson in opposition.

Findings:

- 1) Greater than 1', not de minimus
- 2) Pool setbacks are 8.2' and 9.3'; exceeding/exasperating the existing encroachment into the northerly side-yard setback by the garage.

Application #	Applicant Name:	Address:
110.22	Keller	72 Pleasant Hill
Document (s) Submitted:	Date Submitted:	Submitted By:
Application / fee	12/27/22	Ament
Authorization	}	}
photo / disc. of pool		
(9) copies plot plan		
L/C calcs		
Request re fees	12/28/22	A
Request ADULTS	12/28/22	A
Email to B. Ament	12/28/22	A
Referral - Planning	1/4/23	A
Referral - Assessors	}	}
Referral - H2O		
Referral - Health	1/9/23	A
Referral - Eng.	1/11/23	A
Referral - Keller	1/25/23	A
letter - Ament w/ photos	2/21/23	A
letter - Support	2/24/23	A
letter Support Shua	2/24/23	A

Zoning Board of Appeals
Minutes of March 2, 2023 at 6:30PM
Zoning Administrator: Noreen Stockman - absent
Present: Morse, Peterson, Finneran, Murphy, Duffy, Potamis

#006-23 Mirisola, Trustees, 15 Moses Road, East Falmouth – requesting a Special Permit to raze and rebuild the existing nonconforming dwelling, exceeding 20% lot coverage by structures.

Voting members: Morse, Peterson, Murphy, Finneran, Potamis
Duffy recused

Murphy read the ‘Notice of Public Hearing’ into the record, and read the following referrals:

Planning – no comment

Assessors – no comment as presented

Water - Current water service is ¾ copper. Service should be upgraded to 1”; plan currently shows a water line with a meter pit. The meter pit must be removed, and the meter moved inside the home or utility closet on the first floor.

Health - Property on Town sewer (New Silver system) differ comments to the Wastewater Division.

Engineering – standard comments

Conservation - The above referenced property is subject to a hearing under a Notice of Intent with the Falmouth Conservation Commission, which has been continued to 3/1/2023.

Correspondence – 3 letters of support

Robert Ament, attorney for Applicants – The Mirisola’s wish to raze and rebuild the existing dwelling. There are much taller houses in the area that the proposed. These properties are in the velocity flood zone, and it is necessary to elevate the homes, to comply with the flood plain regulations. The existing house is at elevation 8’ and the flood elevation is at level 18’; because it’s a velocity zone, the requirements is that the lower part of the floor joist be 2’ above the flood zone. The first-floor elevation of this house has to be minimally at elevation 21’, which would put the first floor at 13’. The new structure would be up to the 35’ maximum height limit. There are a bunch of nonconformities, and the Bylaw has provisions regarding the flood plain. We are noncompliant with the flood zone, which will be eliminated with the proposed, the side line to the north is 8.5’, and will be improved to 9’; the setback from the to 4’ NGVD line is 35’; and will be improved slightly to 36’; the existing total lot coverage is nonconforming at 42.8%, but will be reduced to 36.5%, and lot coverage by structures will increase from 18.7% – 21.9%. We are eliminating some nonconformances, and reducing others. When you grant lot coverage to exceed the 20%, you take into account views and vistas, and the average size of structures in the neighborhood. The property is sewerded; there are currently 4-bedrooms, but that will be reduced to 3- bedrooms. We did submit the lot coverage worksheet as required. The average footprint of the 23 homes that we looked at is 1,698 s/f, our footprint will increase from 1,182 s/f – 1,285 s/f. The average percentage for lot coverage is 26.04%, and ours will be below that at 21.4%. This is not an excessively large footprint, and it does compare to the others on the street. The ConCom closed its hearing last night; we don’t have their decision, but the staff report had no new comments; all concerns had been addressed at their prior meeting. The letter that was submitted in support (Kenney) is a direct abutter to the project. The Applicants have said that they will take 2 weeks off in July and 2 weeks off in August from construction.

Zoning Board of Appeals
Minutes of March 2, 2023 at 6:30PM
Zoning Administrator: Noreen Stockman - absent
Present: Morse, Peterson, Finneran, Murphy, Duffy, Potamis

Board Discussion

Potamis – Is the cupola included in the height?

Ament – No, it's not, it's not considered habitable space.

Potamis – Are there breakaway walls proposed?

Ament – There are none; it's all open.

Finneran – I don't have any problems with the cupola. You may want to take a ride out there, and see how it's staked out; that's the way we like it. It makes it easy for us to do our job.

Murphy – Did you get a decision from ConCom?

Ament – No, they took it under advisement, which they normally do, and they have 21 days to issue a decision. We anticipate a decision in about 2 weeks. The only issue that seemed to be open is that the area that is labeled "parking" is open, so the flood waters can run under the house without causing any damage. The only enclosed areas are the storage area and the entry vestibule. The policy of the ConCom is to allow up to 200 s/f to be enclosed. We may have to make a change, and come back administratively.

Finneran – Are the walls concrete walls block or stick built?

Morse – It would be wood.

Peterson – Nice design. We are right at the building height; the cupola does look nice, but we are trying to keep things as low as possible. It's a nice job.

Public Comment

Charles McCafferty – Silver Beach – I was also Chair of the Coastal Action Resiliency Committee; one of the recommendations we made was that when placing houses on the water, that you considered the variance to the street setback, instead of the highwater setback. We would want the setback from the water be maintained. It is a velocity zone, and I would mention that this is a dynamic area for flooding and storms; much of Silver Beach will be below sea level.

Ament – As you know, the house is substantially in the footprint of the existing house; it's 25.1' from Moses Road. The Board doesn't have the authority to grant a variance; if you did, you would be creating a new nonconformance, rather than having an existing nonconformity to the waters, this is being slightly improved.

Morse – Coming into FEMA compliance is compelling.

Finneran – I would like the height of the cupola to be included on future plans.

Murphy made a motion to close the hearing. Finneran seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

Murphy made a motion to approve application #006-23. Finneran seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

Findings

Zoning Board of Appeals
Minutes of March 2, 2023 at 6:30PM
Zoning Administrator: Noreen Stockman - absent
Present: Morse, Peterson, Finneran, Murphy, Duffy, Potamis

- 1) Property is within Residential C zoning district, Wild Harbor Coastal Pond Overlay, AE 18 flood zone
- 2) Previous 1988 decision
- 3) 6,000 sq lot
- 4) Public way
- 5) Existing lot coverage 18.7% / 42.8%; proposed 21.9% / 35.8%
- 6) 35' proposed height, without cupola
- 7) 3 letters of support
- 8) 3-bedrooms
- 9) Meets criteria of 240-10.2A, 240-11.3A(4) and 240-12.1E
- 10) Property is sewerred
- 11) Property will be brought into FEMA compliance
- 12) Testimony; concern regarding setback to the 4' contour line

Conditions

- 1) Per plans
- 2) 2 weeks in August and 2-week July with no construction (per Applicant)
- 3) Work with Police Department if detail for construction is needed
- 4) Comply with the Engineering Department's referral
- 5) Comply with the Water Department's referral
- 6) Height certification at framing
- 7) No additional structures without permission from the Zoning Board
- 8) Construction Hours: Monday – Friday 7A-7P, Saturday's 8A-4P; no Sunday's or Holiday's absent an emergency
- 9) If change is made with the Conservation Commission regarding the wall, Zoning Administrator can approve the change administratively

All in favor.

Application #	Applicant Name:	Address:
006'23	Minsola, Instees	15 MUSK ROAD
Document (s) Submitted:	Date Submitted:	Submitted By:
Application / fee	1/13/23	KLUGER
OWNER AUTHORIZATION	}	}
PHOTOS OF EXISTING		
L/C WORKSHEET		
(9) COPIES SITE PLAN		
(9) SETS ARCH. PLANS		
EXISTING FLOOR PLANS	1/17/23	}
Request Abutters	}	}
Request referrals	}	}
Letter of support - Kinney	1/17/23	}
Letter of support - Pasella	1/17/23	}
Referral - Planning	1/18/23	}
Referral - Assessors	1/18/23	}
SP decision - 88-91	1/25/23	}
Health referral	1/25/23	}
Referral - Eng.	2/2/23	}
Referral - ConCom	2/14/23	}

Zoning Board of Appeals
Minutes of March 2, 2023 at 6:30PM
Zoning Administrator: Noreen Stockman - absent
Present: Morse, Peterson, Finneran, Murphy, Duffy, Potamis

#008-23 Rosengren / Mangelsdorf, Trustees, 182 Sippewissett Road, Falmouth – requesting a Special Permit to expand the third level, and convert into habitable space

Voting Members: Morse, Peterson, Murphy, Finneran, Duffy

Murphy read the 'Notice of Public Hearing' into the record, and read the following referrals:

Planning – no comment

Water - current water service is ¾ copper. Service should be upgraded to 1"; the meter pit must be removed, and the meter moved inside the home, or utility closet on the first floor.

Health - Applicant proposes a septic system upgrade to 5-bedrooms. This larger septic system appears to accommodate the third-floor proposed project.

Engineering – standard comments

Conservation Commission – no comment

Correspondence – 1 letter of support

Robert Ament, attorney for Applicant – The letter that Ms. Murphy just read is from the abutting property, and that is significant, because they are the people that are right next to the house in question. The house was built in about 1910; they are proposing to add 410 s/f of habitable space to the third floor, by adding 2 dormers. It's not a large house for the area; it only has 1,862 s/f of finished area according to the Assessor's records. The house is nonconforming because it's 8.7' from the northeasterly property line; the steps on the side of the house are only 1.7' from the property line, and the house itself is only 2.3'. The proposal doesn't change the footprint of the house; we are looking to add dormers to the front and rear. We are keeping a historic house, although it isn't registered as such, and improve it with more living space. A family room with a roof terrace is proposed for the third floor space. If you're increasing habitable space, you need a Special Permit if the lot is less than 20,000 s/f, our lot is just over 19,000 s/f. A tiny bit of the proposed addition is just slightly within 10' of the line. It doesn't increase the nonconforming nature, and it's not more detrimental. I did submit case law for these issues, and I believe that the Applicants are entitled to a special permit.

Board Discussion

Peterson – It's a nice project. I'm glad that the septic system will be upgraded, still 5-bedrooms, is that correct?

Ament – There are not 5-bedrooms now, and it's not clear if the upstairs room will actually constitute a bedroom, it may but the new septic system would accommodate that.

Finneran – I did have a problem with the single stake, but that was indicated for the dormer above; no problems.

Duffy – When you build the dormers and convert, you are adding 410s/f of habitable space, so it will be a 1½ story addition?

Ament – Yes.

Zoning Board of Appeals
Minutes of March 2, 2023 at 6:30PM
Zoning Administrator: Noreen Stockman - absent
Present: Morse, Peterson, Finneran, Murphy, Duffy, Potamis

Duffy – What is the square footage of the existing 2nd floor?

Morse – It's under the 50%; I did the math.

Ament – The second floor is 920.5 ft, and ½ of that would be 460.25.

Potamis – You are asking for 5 bedrooms or 4?

Ament- We don't want a restriction for how the inside of the house is used; we are installing a 5-bedroom system, which under Title 5 would allow for an 11-room house.

Public Comment – none

Peterson made a motion to close the hearing. Murphy seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

Murphy made a motion to grant application #008-23. Peterson seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

Findings

- 1) Property is located within a Residential B zoning district
- 2) Lot is 19,329 s/f
- 3) Public road
- 4) Existing lot coverage by structures 10.82%, total lot coverage 16.35%; no change
- 5) Height is 32'.4"
- 6) 5-bedroom septic system being installed
- 7) 1 letter of support, no opposition
- 8) Meets criteria of 240-12.1E and 240-10.1A
- 9) Nonconforming to the side yard setback, being 1.7' at the closest point
- 10) No new nonconformities being created

Conditions

- 1) Per plans
- 2) Construction Hours: Monday – Friday 7A-7P, Saturday's 8A-4P; no Sunday's or Holidays absent an emergency
- 3) Comply with the Engineering Department's referral
- 4) Comply with the Water Department's referral
- 5) No other structures without prior approval from the Zoning Board

All in favor.

Zoning Board of Appeals
Minutes of March 2, 2023 at 6:30PM
Zoning Administrator: Noreen Stockman - absent
Present: Morse, Peterson, Finneran, Murphy, Duffy, Potamis

#014-23 Robinson, 594 Palmer Avenue, Falmouth – requesting a Special Permit to convert the existing gift shop into an accommodation

Voting Members: Morse, Peterson, Murphy, Finneran, Duffy

Murphy read the 'Notice of Public Hearing' into the record, and read the following referrals:

Planning – no comment

Health - The septic system serving this property has a daily capacity of 984 gallons per day. This [sic] suitable for 8 bedrooms at 880gpd and nearly enough for 9 bedrooms at 990gpd.

Conservation – no comment

Engineering – standard comments

Correspondence – several letters in opposition

Finneran – The project wasn't staked (corners of the lot) out, and there is no building permit for the work that is currently being done.

Duffy – I saw that there were some letters asking for a continuation, and I did see that it wasn't staked, even though there is nothing structurally being proposed

Murphy – I would like to see the parking area staked.

Duffy – There were also comments in the file that the Special Permit is not in compliance.

Morse – The Board has struggled with this staking issue. It has been the Board's policy that if a property is not staked out, we would continue the application. The corners of the lot need to be staked for any ZBA project, so that the Board can see what the dimensions of the lot are.

Patrick Cook, attorney for Applicant – That was my understanding if there was site work being done, but the structure is already there. We are aware of the content of the different complaints, and I believe that most of that has to do with boundary lines. The abutter to the north has retained counsel, and I have had some discussions with him. There has been some survey work that has been done and additional survey work that is being scheduled and that should occur within the next week.

Morse – We ask that the property be staked at least 7 days in advance of the next meeting.

Murphy made a motion to continue to the April 13, 2023 meeting. Peterson seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

All in favor.

Application #	Applicant Name:	Address:
014.23	Robinson	594 Palmer Ave.
Document (s) Submitted:	Date Submitted:	Submitted By:
Application / 2e	1/24/23	J. Robinson
(9) copies site plan	/	/
(9) copies Ex. prop. Plans		
Septic information		
Request reterms	1/27/23	(initials)
Request Abutter	1/27/23	(initials)
Cert. Abutters list	2/2/23	(initials)
Referral sheet	2/14/23	(initials)
Referral - Eng.	2/21/23	(initials)
Referral - Con/Com	2/24/23	(initials)
Email - J. Strunack	2/27/23	(initials)
Email - J. Robinson	2/27/23	(initials)
Email - M. Hickey	2/27/23	(initials)
Email - J. Robinson	2/28/23	(initials)
letter w/ attachments	2/29/23	(initials)
Complaint - Boissonneault	3/2/23	(initials)
Plan of land - Boissonneault	3/2/23	(initials)
Complaints - Hickey	3/2/23	(initials)
letter w/photos	4/10/23	(initials)
letter w/photos	4/10/23	(initials)

Zoning Board of Appeals
Minutes of March 2, 2023 at 6:30PM
Zoning Administrator: Noreen Stockman - absent
Present: Morse, Peterson, Finneran, Murphy, Duffy, Potamis

Open Meeting:

- 1) Vote Minutes: February 2, 2023 and February 16, 2023
Peterson made a motion to approve the minutes of February 2, 2023. Murphy seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0.
All in favor.
February 16, 2023 - tabled
- 2) Request for Insubstantial Change(s), modification(s) to Comprehensive Permit #063-20 et al Roger Heerman, 24 Kendall Lane, Falmouth – vote anticipated
Voting Members: Morse, Peterson, Murphy, Finneran, Duffy
Stockman – The Applicant is requesting permission to finish off the space above the garage as an office area. Where this is a Comprehensive Permit, he has to request that through this Board.
Heerman – We are looking to add a couple of knee walls.
Morse – What’s the total square footage of space you will be adding?
Heerman – 110 s/f
Stockman – The Board will require a 4’-cased opening, so it couldn’t be considered a bedroom.
Morse – Under the State guidelines, does this request constitute an insubstantial change?
Noreen - Yes
Duffy – You will be doing this work by a building permit?
Heerman – Yes.
Morse – Are you going to have enough room to have a 4’ cased opening?
Heerman – I’m not sure; I will have to check.
Murphy – Do you know if you have a carbon monoxide detector?
Finneran – Is there a fire separation from the garage to this room?
Heerman – I’m not sure; I didn’t get that far with the Building Department.
Morse – You may want to withdraw, and come back when you have new plans showing that opening, and after you’ve spoken to the Building Department.
Heerman asked to withdraw the application without prejudice.
Murphy made a motion to allow the application to be withdrawn without prejudice. Finneran seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.
All in favor.
- 3) Board Discussion -
- 4) Board Updates –
Morse - Just a reminder, please make sure you do your State Ethics course by the end of this month, so that we are all in compliance.
Finneran – I am going to craft an affordable housing article this fall, and I would ask this Board if we could put it on a future agenda, to discuss it, I would like any help or suggestions.
- 5) Future Agenda Items – Vote for staking policy, affordable housing article (Finneran)
Morse – I’m good with giving suggestions, I’d just like to make sure that Town Counsel would be okay with that, so we don’t cross a line.
Stockman –It would be in your best interest to have the Planning Board’s support.
Duffy – We can look at it, but we can’t vote on it.

Meeting adjourned 8:40 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

**Zoning Board of Appeals
Minutes of March 2, 2023 at 6:30PM
Zoning Administrator: Noreen Stockman - absent
Present: Morse, Peterson, Finneran, Murphy, Duffy, Potamis**

Ashley E. DeMello, Office Assistant

Zoning Board of Appeals