This meeting was held on the Zoom virtual meeting software for remote access, due to the Governor’s order suspending public assemblies, during the declared novel corona virus (Covid 19) emergency. The meeting was taped by Falmouth Cable TV, in accordance with long-standing practices.

All votes of the Board were taken by roll call.

Public Comment - None

(Continuation) #072-20 Murphy, 40 Oyster Pond Road, Falmouth – requesting a special permit to raze and rebuild the pre-existing non-conforming detached garage adding living space above

Voting Members: Hurrie, Foreman, Dugan, Van Keuren, Zylinski

Kevin Klauer, attorney for Applicant – We have been before the Board 2 other times; we are seeking to raze and rebuild the non-conforming detached garage. Since our last meeting, we submitted the revised site plan to Conservation I believe that you received confirmation from Jennifer Lincoln that there were no issues relative to the garage of the changes that were made to the plans. Revised floor plans for the garage were submitted, which eliminated the shower in the bathroom to be a ½ bath in the garage. I believe we have responded to the Board’s questions and concerns.

Dugan – I’d asked to see the grade changes on a plan and don’t see them; how are you handling the grade on the steps?

Matt Costa, Project Engineer – I do believe we called out a couple of grades, we are talking about 6”; it’s the equivalent of a couple of bags of loam.

Dugan – How would you keep that in place?

Costa – You would spread some loam around and raise the grade.

Dugan – Did you submit that you would be doing a grade change for those steps?

Costa – I talked to Lincoln and she was going to reach out to Stockman (Zoning Administrator) and confirm that there is no issue.

Dugan – Did we received anything from Lincoln?

Stockman – The confirmation that I got from Jen Lincoln was that they were ok with the garage. If there is an issue with plans at the time of the building permit application, and the plans are not what Conservation approved, they won’t sign off on it.

Dugan – How did you handle the 2 means of egress for the garage? I notice that there is still a note for the Building Commissioner that it would not be used as a bedroom.
Klauer – The Building Commissioner confirmed to us that with that notation, because of the intent, it only requires one means of egress. We did remove the portion of the bathroom to address Mr. Foreman’s comments. We still have to apply for a building permit; and if we don’t meet code, then we don’t get a building permit.

Dugan – The Health Department looks at it as a bedroom, so that’s what we have to treat it as.

Klauer – Title 5 definition of a bedroom is different than what the Building Commissioner looks at and is concerned with in terms of sleeping accommodations. It is a bedroom under Title 5, which is why we are eliminating one of the bedrooms in the main house; it’s not intended to be used as a bedroom. You can have a room that meets the definition of a bedroom, but isn’t used for that purpose.

Dugan – My concern is which definition are you going with, Health or Building because they look at 2 different things. We had a general meeting with the Building Commissioner and he explained that if it wasn’t a bedroom, and used as an office, it would meet code. But if we looked at it as a bedroom it wouldn’t mean code.

Klauer – It meets the definition of a bedroom but that is not the intent. It has to meet the building code and we have to get a building permit. It meets the definition of a bedroom under Title 5 but that doesn’t mean it will be used as one. We are removing the bedroom from the main house. It is noted on the plans and that is our representation.

Dugan – Any thoughts about moving the drywell towards the front of the property?

Costa – They don’t need to be moved.

Zylinski – You’re putting the loam down so the seed will hold where the steps were, correct?

Costa – Correct.

Public Comment –

Wendy Buessler, Executive Director, Oyster Pond Environmental Trust, - We own the property behind 40 Oyster, including the majority of the vernal pool. I want to say how important and fragile vernal pools are, and how much they can be impacted. Any disturbance can impact the vernal pool and that’s why the Town regulations for wetlands require at least 100’ buffer and anything within that should be looked at very carefully. I noticed there are trees that are very close to the garage. Do those need to be trimmed back, because any change to the trees can change the light and change conditions in the pool? Do you know if the office upstairs would be air conditioned? My other concern are the drywells, even though Mr. Costa said it wouldn’t be a problem.

Klauer – I know some of the trees will have to be limbed up, and the abutters are ok with it as they did submit a letter earlier on. I’m not sure about a/c; I know it will have heat.
Buessler – You’re concentrating on the water coming off of the roof; everything is uphill from the vernal pool, and it would be directed down towards the pool.

Costa – I think it will go down with the ground water, and not toward the vernal pool. We found sandy soil conditions; it will eventually hit sandy soils. It is 70’ away from the pool, as are the trees that will be limbed up.

Klauer – If I could make a request that the Board have a decision prior to closing.

Hurrie – Any mechanics proposed in the garage?

Klauer – There is a storage area which would hold the mechanics in the garage.

Hurrie – Any storage on the 2nd floor?

Klauer – Yes, closet space where the shower was taken out.

Hurrie – Is that space reflected on sheet A1.1?

Klauer – Yes, that will house the mechanicals.

Hurrie – On A1.2, that is just a closet?

Klauer – Correct.

Hurrie – Is the garage nonconforming to the overhang?

Klauer – It’s 3.8’ off of the side line, and that neighbor was the one who submitted the letter of support.

Dugan – No mechanics on the exterior?

Klauer – Not that I’m aware of. If there was, we would have to come back, and that could be a condition.

Dugan – I would make the same comments I made before, I don’t think you can go under 2 different definitions, and the Board would have to go with what the use is. They are going to be able to use this area as a sleeping area, and we look at it as a bedroom. There are fire walls that have to be put up because it is less than 5’. The engineer explained that there won’t be an issue with the drywells, but they are being pushed back towards the pool. I asked a question today if Conservation had looked at grade changes, and this is something that I normally wouldn’t have looked at, but this is a sensitive system and minor changes can effect it. As presented now, I wouldn’t be in favor. I think it’s more important to look at what the Health Department says. I would want something in writing from the engineer that the drywells won’t be a problem. The other matter is that the deck hasn’t been permitted. If we are looking at a project that didn’t have a permit, I would think that would have to be taken care of first before moving onto another project.

Zylinski – I think on some cases we get ourselves to the weeds. I am willing to go with what the Health Agent said, and if they don’t do what they are supposed to do, then it is on them.
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Foreman – I appreciate that they removed the shower to create a ½ bath. Someone might sleep up there, but it’s not an actual bedroom. I think there is an issue with the differing definitions between departments, but the applicant shouldn’t be penalized for it. The other issues here don’t concern this application; they will have to be resolved but it’s not part of this decision.

Barry – I have serious concerns about the difference between the soil that was sandy that was found down the road, so therefore this one would be also. But the statement from Wendy is that it is not sandy. To me a vernal pool is fragile, and this one is certified, and therefore puts it in a different category. If anything happens to it, it’s gone for good. The limbing of the trees is another concern.

Van Keuren - I would be in favor.

Hurrie – I agree with Ken that we can appropriately condition this permit, that the area not be for sleeping. Can the drainage be moved?

Costa – The drywells are where they are because we don’t want to put them near a full foundation. I personally reviewed this with Lincoln. Conservation has no issues but these drywells, and grading is not a zoning issue. The drywells will be an improvement because it will get that water down into the ground, and not run into the wetland.

Zylinski - Once water goes into a drywell it only goes down about 5’ deep. In the case of a vernal pool it doesn’t always have to be sandy, correct?

Costa – Either way the pool will be protected.

Zylinski – Conservation has OK’d it?

Costa – Correct.

Zylinski made a motion to close the hearing. Van Keuren seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

Roll Call Vote: Hurrie – Aye, Foreman – Aye, Dugan – Aye, Van Keuren – Aye, Zylinski – Aye

Zylinski made a motion to grant application #072-20. Foreman seconded the motion. Motion carried 4-1.

Roll Call Vote: Hurrie – Aye, Foreman – Aye, Dugan – Nay, Van Keuren – Aye, Zylinski – Aye

**Findings**

1) Meets criteria of 240-3 C.  
2) Replacement of existing structure  
3) No increase in setbacks; will remain the same  
4) Improving drainage by installing a drywell  
5) Reducing bedroom count in the main house from 4-3 to provide for the room above the garage, which meets Health Departments definition of a bedroom under Title 5
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6) Discrepancy in use of room above garage between Board of Health and Building Commissioner; accept Building Commissioner’s determination regarding the fact that there is no need for 2 means of egress
7) Notation on plan – no sleeping in garage
8) Testimony given that there will be no sleeping in garage
9) Mechanicals would be downstairs in the lower level, no mechanicals will appear on the exterior
10) Approval by Conservation
11) Email from Jennifer Lincoln, Conservation Agent - removal of step and shower
12) Deck on property needs to go back to Conservation where there was nc permit
13) Single Family use
14) Ridge height - 18’ 11 ¾”
15) This structure is within 3’ of the main house

Conditions

1) Per revised plans (relabel closet)
2) No sleeping above garage; not to be used as a bedroom per notation or plans
3) Single family use
4) Cased opening in main house to remove one bedroom
5) Construction hours limited to 7A-7P Monday thru Friday; 8A-4P Saturdays
6) No cooking facilities above garage
7) Drywells to be inspected while open – Conservation
8) Per Sediment Erosion and Control Standards – conservation
9) 1” water service
10) As-built to be submitted to ZBA post construction

Roll Call Vote: Hurrie – Aye, Foreman – Aye, Dugan – Nay, Van Keuren – Aye, Zylinski – Aye

Motion carried 4-1 with Dugan in opposition.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application #</th>
<th>Applicant Name:</th>
<th>Address:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>072.20</td>
<td>MOPPY</td>
<td>40 Owen Rd.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document (s) Submitted</th>
<th>Date Submitted:</th>
<th>Submitted By:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application 12 sea</td>
<td>12/1/20</td>
<td>Kyle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner authorization</td>
<td>12/1/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 copies plot plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request air vents</td>
<td>12/2/20</td>
<td>Steen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request reference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belden - Assessors</td>
<td>12/2/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belden - H2O</td>
<td>12/3/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belden - Health</td>
<td>12/3/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belden - Planning</td>
<td>12/3/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abutters list area</td>
<td>12/9/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belden - Eng.</td>
<td>12/14/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Belden</td>
<td>12/18/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood - Five</td>
<td>12/29/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised plans</td>
<td>12/31/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Ballroom</td>
<td>1/17/21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised site/Arch plans</td>
<td>2/23/21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email - Ground lists</td>
<td>2/23/21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter - OPET</td>
<td>2/23/21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email - Concurn</td>
<td>2/23/21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email from Kyle</td>
<td>2/25/21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised site plans</td>
<td>2/25/21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(Continuation) #050-20 Village at Brick Kiln LLC, 511 Brick Kiln Road, West Falmouth – requesting a Comprehensive Permit to construct 32 single family units; 8 units to be affordable

Voting Members: Hurrie, Foreman, Dugan, Van Keuren, Zylinski

Dugan read a letter into the record submitted on 3/15/21 from Donnelan’s.

Dugan – It is my understanding that the peer review will not be here this evening, correct?

Stockman – That is correct.

Dugan – Because our peer review is not here tonight, we will be looking to continue, and will need you to sign an extension to May 6, 2021. If you are agreeable with this, the Administrator can send you the paperwork to sign.

Glynn – We were looking to see if we could continue to April 29th?

Stockman – We don’t currently have a meeting scheduled for April 29th; we were looking at May 6th for the next available date.

Hurrie – Are the Covid extensions still in place?

Stockman - You have some protection with the Governor’s orders. Its best practice to have written continuances as you approaching the 180 days.

Zylinski – What is the reason for a continuance tonight?

Glynn – The Applicant has not finished providing information to the Board and you haven’t heard from the Peer Engineer, because the peer review has not received the requested information. We were asked to get drainage calculations and storm calculations. They are being worked on, and should be in sometime next week. The peer engineer did not want to give his report until he saw those calculations.

Hurrie – Do we have an agreement to continue to May 6th?

Glynn –Yes.

Zylinski – I think we should just continue as they haven’t submitted the requested information.

Foreman – I don’t think we have discussed any of the waivers they’ve asked for. I think we should take this time to get some other issues addressed.

Dugan – I would request that we don’t discuss anything with the peer engineer review; we can touch on issues with waivers.

Glynn – We had a 32 home proposal, and reduced to 28, and created a bigger buffer on the abutter’s side. He is trying hard to accommodate Mr. Donnelan. We submitted a HOA budget. The new plans that will be submitted show open space, which will be deeded to the homeowners association, and the HOA
will maintain that. Both the affordable and market rate units will pay the same share. There will be other changes in the plan too. One of the changes will be to put the mailboxes and bus stop in the middle of the development. We will look at what we can do to accommodate Mr. Donnelan.

Michael Solimando, developer – I submitted a letter addressing some of the Board’s questions and concerns. The retaining wall will be removed in the back. I switched out the unit #29, which is now #25, and we shortened up that unit, and gave it a bigger back yard. There will be no need for the wall. Unit #22 was close to the corner of the lot; that was pushed off some more. I know that Mr. Donnelan is requesting a stockade fence, but it will not look good. I’m willing to work with them to put some evergreens in that will tighten up the view. I disagree with their attorney. I’d rather put in evergreens than a fence. A lot of the trees don’t have to be cut outside of the boundary line. I met with the Donnelan’s about 1 year before this and went over all of the plans. I wished they had called with their concerns but nothing was ever mentioned to me. As for their concern with the lights, they will be in the front of the house and only 6’ feet high. I don’t think they will see them. I could put one light at every 50’ station. 1 light on each house, I don’t think will harm them. We can make some type of restriction regarding lighting outside. I think it’s a state law that you have to have one light at a doorway outside.

Foreman – You said you relocated the mailbox?

Michael Borselli, project engineer – We will relocated the mailbox within the development, in the open space; it will essentially be in the middle. The bus stop will be relocated to the same location too.

Foreman – Is there plenty of radius for a bus to get around?

Borselli –Yes, it is more than adequate.

Foreman – Where do the Donnelans want the fence?

Solimando – In the back of unit #21 and all the way to the street.

Foreman – Is there any portion of that that you feel you could do?

Solimando – Not really; I’d like to plant some trees instead.

Foreman – I went out early on and didn’t see staking. Are there any locations that are staked now?

Solimando – No, we haven’t even cleared it yet.

Foreman – You don’t have to clear it to stake the building locations, I feel like it would be nice to see some staking.

Borselli – If you went out beyond a certain point it’s all briars, it’s challenging. I could stake some of the property line and the backs of the units.

Stockman – Do you know what the difference is between unit #23 and the Donnelans lot lines?
Borselli – 17’.

Stockman – Unit #28 is 10.1’ from the lot line?

Borselli – Yes.

Stockman – If you have a rear patio, will that leave you much room to plant before the shared property line? What type of plantings could be done before the lot line to provide the screening?

Solimando – There’s essentially a vegetated buffer already there. There are giant white pine trees when you come in.

Foreman – I would hope that you delineate the lot lines of the 4 major corners of those units.

Dugan – You are asking for waivers from 240-114, 115 & 117; could you explain why you are asking for those waivers?

Glynn – We didn’t do a landscaping plan.

Dugan – I haven’t seen those waivers, so I’m just wondering. I think 72 (C) is a typo; is that supposed to be 72 (3) (c) (8) which relates to a recharge area and water quality, is that the one you are requesting?

Glynn – Yes.

Dugan – Why are you seeking that waiver?

Glynn – We will be submitting drainage calculations, and perhaps we may not need it, but I would defer to Mike.

Borselli – I’m unaware of that specific bylaw.

Dugan read the section of the by-law into the record.

Glynn – We can’t comply with that because of the lot sizes.

Dugan – Do you have anything that shows this won’t degrade stormwater.

Borselli – When we revise the plans it comes with a report that the standards for stormwater management are in accordance with MADEP for the protection of wetlands and surface water. This is the first project where we have had to provide such comprehensive drainage. What we will provide to you would far outweigh anything in the zoning bylaw for groundwater protection

Dugan – What are your plans for landscaping individual lots?

Glynn – We have submitted plans but they don’t comply with the bylaws. A shade tree will be planted on every lot and $5000 will be given towards other landscaping.
Dugan – Is it an allowance per homeowner? My issues is that 1 person my take a lot of plants and the other just gets an expensive tree which takes up all of the budget. What’s the consistency; is there a minimum amount of landscaping on each lot?

Glynn – You could condition that. Solimando wants to keep some control over it. He’ll make sure that there is some type of minimum, and a condition in the decision would make a lot of sense.

Hurrie – Is there any way to opt out of the $5,000. budget, or in the event that the property owner doesn’t have any preference, does Mr. Solimando come in and provide that $5000.00 worth?

Glynn – Yes, he would allow that to happen in a condition.

Hurrie – It’s an interesting proposal; I don’t think we see this too often.

Glynn – There will eventually be 28 shade trees.

Solimando – The Board can look up the Village at South River, another project that I did. It was nowhere near $5000 worth of landscaping, but I think the Board would be pleased. I’m here to sell units, and you have to make it look good.

Hurrie – Could you provide us a sample; the Board is not allowed to look up things on their own. It would need to be submitted to us.

Public Comment - None

Borselli explained different designations of the site with the Board.

Foreman – I’m looking at the peer review comments and I’m looking at the waivers and want to make sure we can discuss all of the waivers. I think we are looking for more details.

Glynn – We will be more prepared for the next meeting.

Zylinski – With the amount of waivers you will have to help me about why you are so adamant about not putting in a fence?

Solimando – I don’t think that it will look that good and I think trees will look better. They wanted it because they were afraid that people would trespass. I told him I could do a split rail fence, but they wanted the 8’ stockade.

Zylinski – Don’t you think their concerns should be considered?

Solimando – I did and we moved things back.

Zylinski – What if the fence was a condition?

Glynn – We have taken their concerns seriously. Give us a shot to see if we can come in with a proposal to keep them happy.
Van Keuren— I think we are going in the right direction.

Foreman – Which units will be affordable?

Borselli – They will be on the final plans units #1, 8, 10, 14,18,22,25. There will be a note on the plans that designates them.

Foreman – We should see some kind of a conceptual landscape plan. The one that was submitted shows the street trees but nothing else, it should show some other plantings.

Glynn – We will work on that.

Foreman – It could be a combo of fencing and plantings. We have also talked about flagging certain trees to be preserved. That may be a nice thing to do.

Solimando – If you read my letter that I submitted in February I think you would get a clearer picture of what I am trying to do, and what my concerns are.

Glynn – In the areas that aren’t going to be developed, I think we can look at that.

Zylinski – A lot of these boundary issues have to do with the density and that’s because you have maxed out the area.

Glynn – We went from 32-28 homes and gained some open space. We aren’t looking into losing more units.

Zylinski – Have you entertained purchasing an easement for buffers or a property swap with the abutters?

Solimando – I tried to buy some of the property from the church next door and then the YMCA bought it and we never got a reply. I’m willing to move some things around, and we did. We eliminated the retaining wall, and moved houses.

Zylinski - We have a responsibility to the abutters too.

Foreman – These are all preliminary, but the more we can get things pinned down, the better.

Hurrie – On May 6th we will be looking for the drainage calculations, revised plans, landscaping and how it relates to the waivers, bus stop / postal setup, review of the requested waivers and staking the property line along the Donnelan’s and all four corners of those houses.

Borselli – I will submit a PDF with specific numbers and stakes so it you will know exactly what you are looking at.

Dugan – Was there a referral submitted from the Affordable Housing Committee?

Stockman – If we don’t have one I will follow-up.
Dugan made a motion to continue the hearing to May 6, 2021. Foreman seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

Roll Call Vote: Hurrie – Aye, Foreman – Aye, Dugan – Aye, Van Keuren – Aye, Zylinski – Aye

All in favor.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document (s) Submitted</th>
<th>Date Submitted</th>
<th>Submitted By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Copies of application</td>
<td>9.28.20</td>
<td>Glynn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title deeds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLC Filing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town area maps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS Map</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signed S &amp; P plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lottery info</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter from TFG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keller/Williams opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter from Abington Bank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request address list</td>
<td>8.28.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request current revenues</td>
<td>9.1.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit - Fire</td>
<td>9.20.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signed waiver @ LRC</td>
<td>9.2.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit - Eng.</td>
<td>9.10.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit - Cost @ LRC</td>
<td>9.10.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit - Health @ LRC</td>
<td>9.10.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document(s) Submitted</td>
<td>Date Submitted:</td>
<td>Submitted By:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference - Planning</td>
<td>9/16/20</td>
<td>L. Bottoni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference - Housing</td>
<td>9/16/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHC Comments</td>
<td>9/20/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waivers</td>
<td>10/1/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses to AHC Letter</td>
<td>10/1/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter from Atty. Kirk</td>
<td>10/1/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amended Application</td>
<td>11/10/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSC Group</td>
<td>11/12/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email reco'd hearing</td>
<td>11/24/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email from S. Bracy</td>
<td>12/2/20</td>
<td>Glynn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Application</td>
<td>1/28/21</td>
<td>Glynn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised plans sheets</td>
<td>1/28/21</td>
<td>Glynn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed lighting</td>
<td>1/28/21</td>
<td>Glynn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed mailbox</td>
<td>1/28/21</td>
<td>Glynn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter from Kirk (Donnell)</td>
<td>2/12/21</td>
<td>C. Bracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email from M. Burdell</td>
<td>4/11/21</td>
<td>Glynn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter - M. Solimando</td>
<td>4/14/21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Open Meeting:

1. Vote minutes: February 25, 2021 and March 4, 2021
   February 25, 2021 – Van Keuren made a motion to approve minutes of February 25, 2021. Zylinski seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0.
   Roll Call Vote: Hurrie – Aye, Foreman – Aye, Dugan – Aye, Van Keuren – Aye, Zylinski – Aye, Barry - Aye
   All in favor.
   March 4, 2021 - tabled

2. Discuss Draft Decision – vote anticipated - #008-21 Cellico Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless, 132 East Falmouth Highway a/k/a 13 Old Barnstable Road, East Falmouth (TH, KF, RD, EVK, SZ)

   Dugan read the Findings and Conditions of the decision into the record.

   Dugan made a motion to grant application #008-21 as amended. Zylinski seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

   Roll Call Vote: Hurrie – Aye, Foreman – Aye, Dugan – Aye, Van Keuren – Aye, Zylinski – Aye
   All in favor.

3. Amend Board’s ‘Rules and Procedures’ – vote anticipated
   Hurrie – It was my understanding that we were voting on Barry’s changes tonight, with input from Town Counsel.
   Stockman – My request to have this vote postponed was to save you the trouble of filing the rules twice; not to delay Mary’s request. There were some issues as to whether some of the material in the rules was properly worded so Town Counsel did request an opportunity to weigh in.
   Dugan – My concern is how long will it take for Town Counsel to get back to us. I’d rather vote on Barry’s changes tonight, and vote again when we get their input.
   Hurrie – How hard does everyone want to look at our “Rules and Procedures?”
   Stockman – The problem is the current rules don’t align well with 40A. My concern was to have Town Counsel look at that. For example, you have something in your rules that allows for “reconsideration”. If you continue a hearing, you have to continue to a future date and time certain, and your rules don’t indicate that.
Dugan – I’d prefer to vote Mary’s tonight.
Barry – My preference is to go ahead and vote it. I don’t see any problem with having to file more than once.
Foreman – I think we should wait and do it all at once.
Van Keuren – I think we should vote tonight because it could drag out for another 6 months.
Zylinski – I can go either way, whatever the Board wants. I do have a question about what we are voting on. This new rule would mean that there is no wiggle room within the 7 business days?
Dugan – Yes, they must submit within 7 business days.
Zylinski – So when it happens that they don’t, and they push that issue, what is the response from us?
Dugan – It would be a continuance to the next meeting.
Zylinski – Right at that point?
Dugan – Yes.
Stockman – We do have circumstances that, following referrals such as Engineering, who may request for drywells, the applicants will then rush to have them put on the plans. I would suggest that a drywell is not a material change for which you should continue. If an applicant produces a 50 page report, that is a different case. I would advocate that the Board maintain some flexibility.
Barry – We are required under state law to have reviewed all of the information before we vote on it. If we get a large document the day of, or the day before, how can you discuss and vote on it. If its 7 business days ahead, you will have a chance to read and absorb the information. We continuously have applicant’s provide information at the last minute.
Zylinski – I can agree with your argument but what is the difference between that and allowing the continuation tonight? I think we have to have more specificity in what we are asking for.
Barry – I think it’s pretty clear what we are asking for. This happens all of the time: an application comes to us for a special permit, or a 40B, and it’s incomplete, or we don’t have all of the information. I’ve heard Foreman say many times that he doesn’t have something, or can’t locate it, and it gets crazy shuffling so much around. If you feel comfortable operating this way, then vote no on it. What you are talking about is an entirely different thing.
Stockman – There are also different sets of rules for a 40B versus those of a special permit.
Dugan – The Applicants get the information way in advance and every time in the last year we have gotten stuff the day before a hearing.
Foreman – My only concern would be timelines and constructive grants.
Stockman – I think that as long as we are watching, the timelines won’t be an issue. We do keep an eye on the timelines in the office, but if you continue a case multiple times, that is something you have to watch out for.
Foreman – I also wonder if we denied a case because the information wasn’t submitted more than 7 business days, but we did have it, and they appealed, would the courts sustain our denial because we technically had the information.
Barry – You would just tell people you have to get the information in on time, because the deadline is approaching, or it will be denied, and then people will do what you ask.
Zylinski – I would be curious if there was any case law on this. My questions was simply are we prepared to enforce this when it happens.
Dugan made a motion to amend the “Rules and Procedures”. Van Keuren seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0.

Roll Call Vote: Hurrie – Aye, Foreman – Aye, Dugan – Aye, Van Keuren – Aye, Zylinski – Aye, Barry – Aye

All in favor.

4. Board Discussion
Hurrie – I was on Facebook over the weekend and came across a post where a member of the public had posted a recent transmission to the Planning Board. This was in regards to the solar bylaw revisions. I continued to read the thread and saw that a current member of the Planning Board started to say, “It seems like you all had made up your minds before the debate had started, you, the ZBA, the 300 Committee and the Energy Committee. Why bother having a Town meeting? And the conversation continued. It bothered me that a member of the Planning Board considered making those remarks to a member of the public, but also other Boards. I wonder if it was ethical for the Board member to make those representations, online, outside of a public hearing, when his Board was considering this proposal.
Zylinski – Would you reach out to their Chair for something like this?
Hurrie – I haven’t had communication with their Chair in a while. We haven’t talked about these bylaws specifically.
Stockman – It might be optimal for something like this to go through the Town Managers office or Town Counsel if there is a question about State Ethics Requirements.
Zoning Board of Appeals
Virtual Meeting – Town Hall
DRAFT -Minutes of March 18, 2021 at 6:30PM
Zoning Administrator: Noreen Stockman
Present: Hurrie, Dugan, Van Keuren, Barry, Foreman, Zylinski
Absent: Morse

Foreman – It was a public hearing, and they invited input, so we made input. The petitioners have made some significant revisions to their proposals, so that input had positive consequences.
Dugan – They picked and chose what to read into the record to then summarize.
Hurrie – This Board Member specifically objected to acknowledging that they received those letters and from who, let alone reading them into the record.

5. Board Updates - None
6. Future Agenda Items – Next meeting March 25, 2021

Meeting Adjourned 9:30PM

Respectfully submitted,

Ashley DeMello, Office Assistant
Board of Appeal