Zoning Board of Appeals
Attn: Board Members
59 Town Hall Square
Falmouth, MA 02540

February 24, 2020

RE: Minutes for Public Hearings and Open Meeting held on January 23, 2020 at 6:30 PM in the Selectmen’s Meeting Room – Town Hall Square

Dear Board Members:
The attached minutes as referenced above are respectfully submitted for the Board’s approval and to be filed with the Town Clerk:

039-19 797 Main LLC, 797 Main Street, Falmouth
063-19 & 087-19 18 Tashmoo Drive, East Falmouth
079-19 Buzzards Bay Development, LLC, Falmouth
084-19 Carderio, 29 Wood Haven Lane, East Falmouth
082-19 Milbury, 87 Penzance Road, Woods Hole
083-19 BMFB LLC, 876 East Falmouth Hwy., East Falmouth

Terrence Hurrie, Chairman of Board of Appeals

Date Minutes filed with Town Clerk: __________________________

Respectfully submitted
Ashley DeMello, Office Assistant
Noreen Stockman, Zoning Administrator

RECEIVED
FEB 24 2020

FALMOUTH TOWN CLERK

Town Clerk Stamp
Public comment - none

Dugan made a motion to take #039-19 out of order. Van Keuren seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

Continuation #039-19 797 Main Street, Falmouth – special permit to construct addition to building; convert to restaurant with 3 apartments above

Voting Members: T.Hurrie, R.Dugan, E.Van Keuren, Potamis, Barry,

Hal Choubah, Engineer, representative – We were here in November of 2018 and revised the parking plan. The Planning Board recommended to connect the 2 lots together and the easement was review by the PB and Town Counsel and the abutter recorded the plan at the registry of deed. We are looking for permission to expand the non-conforming structure. There were some concerns about parking. We developed a plan that would strictly use our property for parking, but we were 4 spaces short. The Board was willing to give a 10% parking reduction. Because we were revising the plans, we had to go back to the PB to have the plans approved. The owner of the abutting property feels as the though we are in breach of the easement agreement. We are fine with either one of the plans. We have been back and forth for almost 1 year between Boards. Without an approved plan we can’t get a building permit.

Board Discussion

Dugan – Last time you were here you said the easement agreement was no longer valid.

Choubah – It’s recorded and it was based on an approved site plan.

Dugan – I have been asking the same question since last August and there are no answers to the questions. If the easement agreement is valid, the 4 parking spaces are on a first come first served basis that isn’t shared parking, therefore you can’t use them. That would be a loss of 4 spaces. The 9 spaces on the back are also on a first come basis.

Choubah – I believe it was exclusive to 797 Main Street.

Dugan – If that’s the way is supposed to be, that’s a loss of 13 spaces. The other issue is the 8x12 dumpster on the plan, but in the agreement it’s 18”. The abutter can also move the dumpster as they please. The berm on the back of the property can’t take place because the space isn’t yours. The agreement keeps referring to lots 25 & 26. Cycle Ave., which is a separate deeded parcel, and we haven’t got an answer if you can use that for parking. The Engineering Department had several comments/concerns about parking. We need to make sure that a large vehicle can pull off Main Street without interfering with the other lots. We also checked with Town Council and he perused the agreement, but did not approve it. We have to go with what is legal with the property. I don’t know if the brick building on the other side has issues. I don’t see how we can give an approval with all the issues involved. I don’t know why you would have signed the easement without obtaining your permits first. There is an active agreement that runs with this property. We need to see the easements that are proposed so we know where the lines are. It doesn’t allow the 4 spaces in the back; they are only for
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document (s) Submitted</th>
<th>Date Submitted</th>
<th>Submitted By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application Fee</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>B. Wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting document</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>B. Wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request Adults</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>B. Wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipt/Ad Hoc</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter with attachments</td>
<td>1/22/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>filed extension</td>
<td>1/24/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
customers. I think it would be hard to approve a plan without you showing us that the agreement is invalid. Do you have anything to submit to the file that says the easement agreement is invalid? The way I look at it is that you’ve lost many spaces. I think you would be better off withdrawing and coming back. We have continued this matter so many times.

Attorney Kirk, attorney for abutting property owner – I submitted a letter to the file because the plan conflicts with our property rights. We are in support of what our neighbor is trying to do. I think the suggestion to withdraw makes sense, as I view the Business Redevelopment section the parking issue is solely within the purview of the Planning Board. The only reason he has to come to the ZBA is to enlarge the building; he’s not changing the use. They (Planning Board) approved the easement plan that was on record.

Potamis – What was the previous use and what was the existing use?

Kirk – They are by-right uses.

Choubah made a request to withdraw application #039-19 without prejudice.

Dugan made a motion to allow the withdrawal. Van Keuren seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

All in favor.

Continuation #063-19 Kachadoorian / Balas 18 Tashmoo Drive, E.Falmouth – appeal of Building Commissioner regarding placement of 2 floats

Dugan made a motion to combine both hearings (#063-19 & #087-19). Van Keuren seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

All in favor.

#087-19 Balas / Kachadoorian, 18 Tashmoo Drive, East Falmouth – appeal of Building Commissioner’s November 20, 2019 decision

R. Dugan read the ‘Notice of Public Hearing into the record and read the following referrals:

Referrals – none


Brian Wall – This began as an enforcement request for 2 floats. There was no action taken by the Building Commissioner, so we filed the first appeal. Mr. Hoyt argued that there was nothing to appeal as there was no written determination. On November 20, 2019 the Building Commissioner made a written determination that he would take no action, which is why I asked for a continuation – to give time to submit a new application where we now had a letter from the Building Commissioner. The information is all the same; there is no difference other than we now have a letter. We both acknowledge that there is a special permit in existence but that is strictly for the bulkhead. It’s clear the permit was not for the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document(s) Submitted</th>
<th>Data Submitted</th>
<th>Submitted By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appeal &amp; see v/exhibits</td>
<td>9/2/19</td>
<td>Bruce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request a butters list</td>
<td>9/1/19</td>
<td>AO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request referrals</td>
<td>9/1/19</td>
<td>AO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral - B.C.</td>
<td>9/1/19</td>
<td>AO/Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recert. b/g (not list)</td>
<td>9/1/19</td>
<td>AO/Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decl. letter w/ Exhibits &amp; brief</td>
<td>10/1/19</td>
<td>AO/Burwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 91 Waterway</td>
<td>10/1/19</td>
<td>AO/Con Con</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filed copy, special permits</td>
<td>11/7/19</td>
<td>AO/STOEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memo from B. Wall</td>
<td>11/13/19</td>
<td>AO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email from Matty Hart</td>
<td>11/15/19</td>
<td>AO</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>Email re: complaint</td>
<td>1/30/20</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB Comments</td>
<td>2/4/20</td>
<td>OA</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>GSA Application</td>
<td></td>
<td>M. Galasso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter from M. Galasso</td>
<td>11/13/19</td>
<td>M. Galasso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quitclaim Deed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copies - Site Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copies Architectural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devel. Renderings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copies - Landscape Plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request cert. abutment list</td>
<td>11/13/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email to M. Galasso</td>
<td>11/13/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request referms</td>
<td>11/14/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>list of collaborators - M. Galasso</td>
<td>11/18/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cert. Abutment list</td>
<td>11/18/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email from C. Pacheco</td>
<td>11/18/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEC's Stormwater Cpts</td>
<td>11/22/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rekme - Engineering</td>
<td>11/22/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rekme - Water</td>
<td>12/3/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pet'd Extract Notice</td>
<td>12/3/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF. Housing Referral</td>
<td>12/6/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rezme - Historical</td>
<td>12/10/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter to Eng. Commt</td>
<td>1/14/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorization Letter</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review #2</td>
<td>1/17/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised site plans</td>
<td>1/23/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter off. housing</td>
<td>1/23/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
floats; you can grant less but can’t grant more than what is being asked for. None of the notices mentioned floats, therefore the Board of Selectmen couldn’t have granted a permit for floats. My clients would like to have a float to tie up a boat, they’ve obtained by constructive grant a special permit from the Board of Selectmen, and have a permit from Conservation. The abutters have made the argument that the Balas/Kachadoorian dock will interfere with their floats. We are asking this Board to order the boats be taken out of the water, and apply for a special permit from the Board of Selectmen.

Drew Hoyt, Attorney for appellants – I submitted a large file yesterday. Given the magnitude of what was being requested, I wanted to submit a complete record. The Dundulis’ don’t waive their arguments about application 063-19. My submittal is information pertaining to the new appeal. The floats have been there for about 25 years, have never been abandoned, and, at a time expanded the floats, which has been fixed, after a complaint was received. We don’t believe that this Board has the jurisdiction to issue an order. My clients are willing to pull their floats back away from Balas’s bulkhead (15’). The Dundulis’s are willing to give them 15’, which would be parallel to Mr. Balas’s bulkhead. It’s a simple layout because the Dundulis will only have to slide down the canal. The Dundulis floats don’t create a problem where Mr. Balas is building his float. I think the issue would be settled because of grandfathering rights. If you issue an order, it’s to pull back and give Balas room for his boat; not to have them start from the beginning. This Board has ordered that Mr. Pentakis acquire appropriate permits.

Brian Wall – On the grandfathering, we disagree, to claim grandfathering you have to have to same structure in place for 10 years. The Dundulis have only owned the property for 8 years, and have changed the float size several times. All of the permits that were issued to my client have all been appealed by the Dundulis’s. This agreement of giving my clients 15’ isn’t addressing the whole problem. The opposition is that my clients dock is overcrowding their floats. We are saying their floats aren’t legal. We are trying to get all parties to go to the Selectmen, so they can get the global picture.

Dugan – Is our deadline March?

Stockman – You have a new deadline with the new appeal. As long as Attorney Wall signs the hearing extensions you may continue the hearing; he was the party that filed the appeal.

Public Comment – none

Dugan made a motion to continue to March 5, 2020 @ 6:30 PM. Van Keuren seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

All in favor.

Continuation #079-19 Buzzards Bay Development, LLC, 40 Shore Street, Falmouth – Comprehensive Permit to renovate existing single family dwelling, construct 7 single family units; 2 units will be affordable

Voting Members: Hurrie, Foreman, Van Keuren, Dugan, Potamis
Kevin Klauer, attorney for application – 40 Shore Street is located on the easterly side of Shore Street, near Main Street. It comprises just below 1.12 acres in the General Residence district. The applicant is proposing to renovate the existing historic dwelling, and eliminate the existing garage and greenhouse. The plan involves construction of seven 2-story homes, of which 2 will be restricted as affordable. We have received approval from Mass Housing. We have made changes to the plans to address some of the Boards comments, and concerns and comments from the Engineering Department and Water Department. We’ve renumbered the houses (1-8) instead of A-H, revised the existing site plan to include dimensions, shifted the location of driveway to increase landscape buffer, reduced patios of #3 and #8, modified the parking court in 6, 7, and 8, adding green space. Klauer stated they submitted correspondence to the Engineering Department and Water Department addressing their comments. I believe we have addressed the Boards concerns. Mr. Klauer read a letter into the record on behalf of Pamela Harting - Barret and Renie Brunn. (Planning Board & Affordable House Committee members).

Board Discussion

Barry – Grading easement from the Town?

Klauer- We’ve proposed a retaining wall along the southern border; we would want to work with the Town for an easement, and that would negate the need for retaining wall. We aren’t sure if we would be able to get that, so this wall would suffice if we had to.

Barry – How close are the proposed buildings to other buildings and neighbors around the area?

Klauer – The building that comes close is about 20’ off King Street. We maintain a 10’ setback all around our property.

Barry – How close are the buildings that would abut the town property?

Klauer – It’s the vacant parcel; the houses are 10’ and 14’ from that lot line.

Barry – The size of the affordable units vs market rate units, could you go over that?

Klauer – The affordable units will be 1 and 3; building 1 is the smallest of all the units, buildings 2, 3 and 4 are about the same size, and buildings 5-8 are about the same size. The DHCD guidelines says the external appearance should be no different between a market rate unit and an affordable unit; there is no requirement for all the units to have the exact same square footage.

Barry – I have some guidelines for 40B; in there it talks about the distribution of the affordable units in location, size and type. It specifically says the affordable units should be distributed throughout the development in terms of unit size, type and location.

Klauer – The unit type is exactly the same; because 1 unit is smaller than the others doesn’t mean it wouldn’t qualify. I think we meet the guidelines for the size of the units.

Barry – In terms of location and unit size, how do you meet that requirement?

Klauer – There can be a reasonable difference.
Dugan – Do we have those plans in our file; the ones that show the comparisons?

Bogosian – All the plans for all the buildings were submitted.

Dugan – I see the elevations, but I’d like to see the plans with the comparisons. Can we get a copy of that?

Klauer – We can submit those.

Barry – On one of the plans there is a note that says... “contractor shall remove unsuitable soil and buried debris encountered...” Could someone explain that?

Matt Costa, Project Engineer – We found some unsuitable material while we were doing a perc test, so we wanted to make a note so the contractor was aware.

Barry – What material did you find that was unsuitable?

Costa – Fill; it looked like it had old landscape debris mixed. It’s not uncommon to find something like that.

Barry – In the letter that the municipality wrote to Mass Housing, what did they ask for specifically?

Galasso – They would prefer smaller units looking at the Housing Production Plan.

Barry – What was the thinking about addressing those?

Galasso – It doesn’t say we should only build those types of units. The Housing Production Plan says there is a need for smaller units. It says smaller units are a preference because it’s a bigger need, but it doesn’t exclude us.

Barry – It did say they were asking for smaller units because that’s where the needs are.

Klauer – This project has a 10.97% profit margin; we are 5% below an acceptable profit margin. Doing anything different to the bedroom count would render the project unbuildable as designed. In order to build all 2 bedroom units, the density would be greater. We tried to keep the density minimal.

Dugan – When the Town sends a response, do you ever submit something in writing saying why you can’t do what the Town is asking you to do?

Bogosian – We’ve had meetings with the Town departments and have made some changes to encompass their concerns. We discussed with the State on-site why we couldn’t do everything that the Town is looking to do.

Dugan – When the Town sends a response, is that the only thing the Town sends?

Barry – Sighted for orientation for solar panels; more responsive to local needs by providing 1 and 2 bedrooms.

Klauer – Mass Housing didn’t identify that as an area of concern.
Bogosian – Mass Housing didn’t show any problems with 3 bedrooms. It’s in a convenient location. We are also preserving the Historic home, even though it’s smaller.

Barry – It may be a place of negotiation.

Klauer – We couldn’t do it in a way the neighbors would support.

Bogosian – The only way to accommodate 1 and 2 bedrooms would be to put in 1 big building in where you could get about 40 units. We have had community support based on these plans.

Dugan – It seems when a project comes before the Town, the State specifically states items they would like to be addressed. I have yet to hear from a developer that they have addressed the letter from Mass Housing; there seems to be a disconnect.

Bogosian – We were upfront with the Town from the beginning on what our plans were.

Dugan – On the retaining wall, is that on the lot line? Can you build the retaining wall without an easement from the Town?

Bogosian – It wouldn’t be a problem.

Van Keuren – There are some patios that look very close to the lot lines – can you pull those in?

Bogo – The problem is the septic system; we can’t move the building closer to it.

Kevin Kyle, 26 Shore Street – What’s the height of the houses?

Bogosian – About 26’.

Barbara Nardy, 26 Shore Street – What will the hours of operation be during construction.

Bogosian – About 7:30 – 3 - 5, Saturdays 1/2 days, not in the summer though, and no Sundays. We would request 7 a.m. -7 p.m.

Stockman – The Town does not have any set hours for construction.

Nardy – I’d also like an 8’ fence instead of the 6’ fence.

Bogosian – I don’t have a problem going from a 6’ fence to 8’.

Hurrie – When are your proposing to have your work started, and will it be phased?

Bogo – It will all be done at once, no phasing; we would like to start as soon as possible.

Dugan – I know Ken had some questions about tree sizes, were there changes made to that?

Bogo – No, but we did change the large parking area to put in some more green space; we also downsized some of the patio areas.

Costa – Reviewed changes addressing Engineering’s comments.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application #</th>
<th>Applicant Name:</th>
<th>Address:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>084-19</td>
<td>Carolein</td>
<td>24 woodturn lane</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 fee</td>
<td>12/5/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) copies - plot plan</td>
<td>12/5/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) sets - proposed plans</td>
<td>12/5/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request Abutters list</td>
<td>12/5/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request retired</td>
<td>12/6/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embrath authority</td>
<td>12/6/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pereml Fire</td>
<td>12/9/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cert. Abutters</td>
<td>12/11/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pereml Abutters</td>
<td>12/11/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pereml-Planning</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pereml-Conservation</td>
<td>12/27/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pereml-Engineering</td>
<td>1/9/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dugan made a motion to continue past 9:30 p.m. Van Keuren seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

All in favor.

Dugan made a motion to continue the hearing to March 5, 2020 @ 6:30 PM. Van Keuren seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

All in favor.

Dugan made a motion to take the new hearings out of order. Van Keuren seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

All in favor.

**#084-19 Cardeiro, 29 Wood Haven Lane, East Falmouth** – requesting a special permit to allow an attached 3 car garage

Voting members: Hurrie, Foreman, Dugan, Van Keuren, Barry

R.Dugan read the ‘Notice of Public Hearing into the record and read the following referrals:

Fire – no comment

Assessors – no comment

Planning – no comment

Conservation – no comment

Engineering – Standard comments; with recommendations to condition drywells / storm water infiltration measure; comply with section 99-1

**Correspondence** – none

Brian Bourque, representative for the applicants – Wood Haven Lane is a small subdivision in East Falmouth. They have a need for an extra garage bay. The house is a ranch style. The lot is over 2 acres and has plenty of room to accommodate this request. This same size house would be able to get a building permit, if we weren’t asking for an extra garage bay, and the Engineering wouldn’t have the right to review this project. It’s a 2 acre lot with percable sand, and the posting of the house number is a requirement, and will be taken care of before they move into the house.

**Board Discussion –**

Dugan – Will there be any gutters proposed?

Bourque – There will be gutters on the house but the soil is so sandy that there won’t be a need for drywells to be installed.

Dugan – Do you have any issue with us conditioning stormwater management?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document(s) Submitted</th>
<th>Date Submitted</th>
<th>Submitted By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application/pec</td>
<td>11/25/19</td>
<td>G. Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pictures of garage</td>
<td>11/25/19</td>
<td>G. Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Copies site plan</td>
<td>11/25/19</td>
<td>G. Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Sets &amp; opp. &amp; arch. plans</td>
<td>11/25/19</td>
<td>G. Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request a site list</td>
<td>11/25/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-approval - Planning</td>
<td>11/27/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-approval - Assess.</td>
<td>12/3/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-approval - Acc.</td>
<td>12/3/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-approval - Fire</td>
<td>12/3/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-approval - Eng.</td>
<td>12/16/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-approval - Continuation</td>
<td>12/27/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bourque – No issues.

Dugan – Can you add the limit of work to the plans?

Bourque – I can, but I’ve never seen that, unless it’s something that is going through Con Com.

Potamis – This had been approved by the Board of Health for 4 bedrooms, but you asking for 3?

Bouque – Correct.

Public Comment – none

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

Dugan made a motion to grant application #084-19. Potamis seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

Findings:

1) Adding additional car bay for extra storage
2) Large agricultural zoned property; just under 2 acres
3) Amenable to add to the plans
4) Stormwater measures
5) Comply with section 99-1; affixing house numbers
6) Meets 240-38 G 1b and 240-216

Conditions

1) Per plans
2) Plans to be revised to show limited work / contours
3) Stormwater measure for roof runoff
4) Comply with section 99-1

All in favor.

#082-19 Milbury, 87 Penzance Road, Woods Hole – requesting a special permit to allow habitable space above detached garage

Voting members: Hurrie, Dugan, Van Keuren, Potamis, Barry

R. Dugan read the ‘Notice of Public Hearing into the record and read the following referrals:

Planning – no comment

Fire – no comment

Health – A 4 bedroom septic system was installed for this accessory structure / garage

Assessors – Includes lots 10, 15 & 16B; Assessor’s request inspection prior to final sign off

Engineering – Standard comments; recommendations to condition applicant ccomply with section 99-1
Correspondence – none

Greg Jones, architect/representative for applicant – I was here 2 years ago seeking a special permit to build a 4 car garage. The property is about 10.5 acres, located on Penzance Point, and contains the 4 car garage and a dwelling known as the “long house”. The client felt no need to use the upper level of the detached garage, other than storage. The 1st floor is being used to store their cars. The client has reconsidered the use of the upper space of the garage; the main house doesn’t have enough space to accommodate guests. There will be 1 bedroom, 1 bathroom, a large living area and a wet bar. This will be about 780 square feet even though there is more space than that. We are looking to amend the previous special permit to allow extra living space. We have no issues with the comments from the Engineering Department. There will be no changes to the exterior plan or footprint.

Board Discussion –

Dugan – Due to 240-70 D., an apt. will never be allow on this site, and no cooking facilities. It couldn’t be rented out, do you understand that?

Jones – Yes, they understand.

Public Comment – none

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

Potamis made a motion to grant application #082-19. Van Keuren seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

Findings:

1) Meets 240-23 G.1(b)2, 240-70 and 240-68 A(8)
2) Previous special permit on property
3) Added septic system for accessory structure
4) Under 240-70, an accessory apartment would not be allowed
5) Applicant stated no cooking facilities; will not be rented out
6) 4 bedroom septic will cover the bedroom addition
7) Finishing off 2nd level to create habitable space without cooking facilities
8) Property consists of 10.25 acres

Conditions

1) per plans
2) 240-70 D.- cannot be modified to be an apartment; no cooking facilities; not to be rented
3) Comply with section 99-1
4) Garage structure will be 87A and the main house 87; provide addresses and arrows to specific properties
5) Assessing department to view before final sign off
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document (s) Submitted</th>
<th>Date Submitted:</th>
<th>Submitted By:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application/See</td>
<td>12/2/19</td>
<td>K. Klaas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auntie Authorizx</td>
<td>12/2/19</td>
<td>K. Klaas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Copies - Site plan</td>
<td>12/2/19</td>
<td>K. Klaas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Sets proposed plans</td>
<td>12/2/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request Written</td>
<td>12/3/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Emails re. additional info</td>
<td>12/3/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request referrals</td>
<td>12/3/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan - Fire</td>
<td>12/6/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Emails re. application</td>
<td>12/10/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan - Planning</td>
<td>12/10/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed. Article list</td>
<td>12/10/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan - Assessor</td>
<td>12/11/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan - CapCom</td>
<td>12/27/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan - Eng</td>
<td>1/6/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail letter written</td>
<td>1/9/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copy of P13 revenue</td>
<td>1/17/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter of concerns</td>
<td>1/17/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter re. Anderson</td>
<td>1/23/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter re. Main and Main</td>
<td>2/12/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawal letter</td>
<td>2/19/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All in favor.

**#083-19 BMFB Falmouth, LLC, 876 East Falmouth Highway, East Falmouth** – requesting a special permit to allow an accessory structure (raw bar shed) in the front yard

Voting members: Hurrie, Dugan, Van Keuren, Potamis, Barry

R.Dugan read the 'Notice of Public Hearing into the record and read the following referrals:

Fire – no comment

Planning – Applicant applied to the Planning Board for site plan review modification and will be on the 1/14/20 agenda; * still under review*

Assessors – no comment

Conservation – no comment

Engineering – Standard comments; 2 pages of comments; recommendation to add drywells of storm water infiltration measures

**Correspondence – 2 letters with comments / concern**

Kevin Klauer, attorney for applicant – Bad Martha is a retail brewery on 2.3 acres in the B2 zoning district. In 2018 they received a site plan review from the Planning Board and work was completed this past summer. We have applied to the Planning Board for a modification to site plan review. The addition to the building is by-right, with a modification to the special permit. There will be a raw bar with a tap for the summer house. It will provide better service. Because it’s in the front yard, it requires a special permit. We are proposed at over 100’ from the street. The building is currently conforming, and will remain. The capacity will not increase. We were presented with complaints at the Planning Board from abutters to the south. We have submitted a letter to address those comments and concerns. The applicants have agreed to thicken the berm to help with noise control. They have improved this site. The addition of the shed doesn’t cause any detriments.

**Board Discussion** –

Potamis – Do you have Board of Health approval?

Klauer – It will be tied into the sewer.

Morse – Any objections from Mahoneys?

Klauer – No, we work closely with them, there has been no issues raised from them.

Morse – Any exterior lighting on the “shuck” shed?

Klauer – Not that I’m aware of.

Morse – You mention there will be a tap, so that will be expanding the alcohol?
Klauer – It’s not expanding the use for the liquor license; the outside area is already included in the permit. The capacity will not change either. The music will stop at 6:00 PM moving forward.

Potamis – You said you are putting in more landscaping?

Klauer – There’s a 3’ high planted berm and they will enhance that, especially on the eastern edge of the berm.

Hurrie – Does the newly proposed berm address the concerns of the neighbors?

Klauer-We think it will, they are thickening the berm, and moving it easterly too.

Barry – What is the existing landscape on the berm?

Klauer – There are bushes now, mostly lower lying bushes; a couple of trees. They will probably be matching the existing vegetation.

Dugan – When do you expect to be finished with the Planning Board?

Klauer – Tuesday and hopefully have a decision issued at the next meeting – mid February.

Public Comment –

Jody Whitehead 897 E. Falmouth Hwy – We are concerned about the additional parking on Autobahn Circle, our house is directly across the street.

Klauer – Everything to the east is Mahoney’s property, and they have allowed for some overflow parking for Bad Martha’s in that area. The addition of plantings would reduce any headlight glare.

Dugan – On the Planning Board permit, did they allow parking where it says Autobahn Circle?

Klauer – We have the required parking for our site on our lot, and there is some additional parking on Autobahn Circle, which is owned by Mahoney’s.

Potamis – Would you consider adding additional landscaping?

Klauer – I can ask.

Barry – Could you make the berm larger?

Klauer – I’m not sure that would do anything, because it gets tight at the corner of the parking lot.

Barry – Anything that you could do would be helpful for the sound, probably not for your headlights.

Klauer – I think the landscaping would have an impact with both of those issues.

Van Keuren made a motion to continue to February 20, 2020 @ 6:30. Dugan seconded the motion.
Motion carried 5-0

All in favor.
Open Meeting

1) Vote minutes of 12/12/19

Van Keuren made a motion approve 12/12/19 minutes, Dugan seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0.

2) Board updates –

Stockman – There is a Board Training next Thursday, January 30, 2020 at 6:30 PM at the Hermann Meeting Room, sponsored by Citizen Planner Training Collaborative, on the Roles and Responsibilities of the Planning and Zoning Boards.

Dugan – I have an issue with application material submittals coming in so late. I don’t know how the Board feels but when we get information so late; I’ll always ask for a continuation to review the material.

Stockman – There are communities that ask you to prepare their decision as part of a filing.

Hurrie – Can we update our procedures, so that if material gets submitted too late, they will automatically get a continuation?

Dugan – According to our procedures, once we close the hearing we can’t reopen. The only way we can re-open is if the Board brings it up. Once we close the hearing, no one should get up to the podium.

Hurrie – At some point can we review the Boards Policies and Procedures at an upcoming meeting so we can adjust some language?

Barry – If we are going to work on the procedures, it doesn’t seem like there is fairness given to the abutters in comparison to the applicants page (5 item H)

3) Board Discussion RE: Approval of excused absences

Potamis – I will be out for 2 months, part vacation part rehab; I think I will miss 6 meetings

Dugan – The only problem is the consecutive meetings, you can start having issues with quorums and votes. When I applied for the Zoning Board of Appeals, this was an issue that the Board was having. I change my schedule to accommodate these meetings. Missing more than 4 consecutive meetings puts the Board at a disadvantage.

Barry – How many meetings are you missing?

Potamis – All of February and March; I think 6 meetings. I’ll be back April 1st.

Barry – It could be potentially 7 or more.

Morse – As a reminder I will be out March 5th.

Hurrie – I have a conflict on the 20th, just with 1 case.
Morse – If it gets bad you can vote the Doctrine of Necessity.

Van Keuren – I think we need someone here, that’s a lot of meeting to miss consecutively.

Dugan – I think the issue of absences was put in the Town Code for a reason.

Barry – You have to think in terms of precedent whichever way you decide.

Morse – I think we need a definition of “excused” “unexcused” absence.

Dugan – Due to the amount of consecutive hearings, I would say no.

Hurrie – I’m with Morse – I would be uncomfortable removing someone without a definition of ‘excused absence’.

Dugan

4) Board Discussion –

Dugan – I have a question for Town Council - when releasing their opinion, whether you need a unanimous vote or not. If you don’t have a unanimous vote, I’m not sure you can release Town counsel’s opinion.

5) Future Agenda Items – Board Member Training next Thursday 1/30 at the Hermann Room; next meeting February 6, 2020

Potamis – Can we add to a future Agenda regarding what the Selectmen have said about what they are looking for, i.e. 1 and 2 bedroom units?

Respectfully submitted,

Ashley DeMello, Office Assistant
Zoning Board of Appeals

Meeting adjourned 10:30 PM