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

June 14, 2019

RE: Minutes for Public Hearings and Open Meeting held on June 13, 2019 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:

New Hearing:

#022-19 Green Ocean Car Wash LLC, 187 Teaticket Highway, Teaticket
#025-19 Shea, 0 Nathan S. Ellis Highway, No.Falmouth
#026-19 Kachadoorian / Balas, 5 Canapitsit Drive, East Falmouth

Open Meeting:

1. Minutes of and May 30,2019 and June 6,2019
2. Discuss and vote decision- #115-18 Woods Hole Partners LLC, 533 Woods Hole Road, Woods Hole
3. Discuss draft decision and vote #006-19, Locustfield LLC, 0 Locustfield Road, Hatchville
4. Board Updates
5. Discuss Date for Future Workshop
6. Board Discussion RE: Zoning Recodification Committee
7. Future Agenda Items

Kenneth Foreman, Vice Chairman, Board of Appeals:

Date Minutes filed with Town Clerk: ____________ Town Clerk Stamp

Respectfully submitted
Ashley DeMello, Office Assistant
Noreen Stockman, Zoning Administrator
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document(s) Submitted</th>
<th>Date Submitted</th>
<th>Submitted By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application &amp; fee</td>
<td>4/29/19</td>
<td>B. Wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter of appeal w/ 5 exhibit</td>
<td>4/29/19</td>
<td>B. Wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request a white list</td>
<td>4/30/19</td>
<td>(X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request referrals</td>
<td>4/30/19</td>
<td>(X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email re: Confirmation date</td>
<td>4/30/19</td>
<td>(X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request - WC</td>
<td>5/1/19</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec'd - Cert a white list</td>
<td>5/1/19</td>
<td>Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request w/ comments</td>
<td>6/3/19</td>
<td>(X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter w/ six attachments</td>
<td>6/3/19</td>
<td>B. Wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue Letter</td>
<td>6/13/19</td>
<td>City Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter from ATTG, Inc.</td>
<td>6/13/19</td>
<td>City Hall</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: revised plans)</td>
<td>01/13/19</td>
<td>K. Klauer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 sets revised plans</td>
<td>01/12/19</td>
<td>K. Klauer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email to applicant</td>
<td>01/12/19</td>
<td>360 Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email to klauer</td>
<td>01/14/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application #: 022-19</td>
<td>Applicant Name: Green Ocean Car Wash LLC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address: 187 Eastcut LLC</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>4/22/19</td>
<td>K. Klau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aut. Letter</td>
<td>4/22/19</td>
<td>K. Klau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative</td>
<td>4/22/19</td>
<td>K. Klau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Sets Site plans (Exc. park)</td>
<td>4/22/19</td>
<td>K. Klau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Sets Elevations</td>
<td>4/22/19</td>
<td>K. Klau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Sets prop. fire plans</td>
<td>4/22/19</td>
<td>K. Klau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) A&amp;B. Aerial renderings</td>
<td>4/22/19</td>
<td>K. Klau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request abt hero list</td>
<td>4/24/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request refereal</td>
<td>4/24/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email re. elevations</td>
<td>4/24/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refer to comments</td>
<td>4/25/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email re. elevations</td>
<td>4/25/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refer to comments</td>
<td>4/26/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refer to K-C</td>
<td>4/29/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refer to comments</td>
<td>4/30/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW-PO Arebers list</td>
<td>5/1/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refer to K-C</td>
<td>5/1/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 copies elevations (K-179)</td>
<td>5/1/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refer to K-CA</td>
<td>5/3/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec'd referal to comments</td>
<td>5/10/17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec'd referal to comments</td>
<td>5/10/17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refer to CAA</td>
<td>5/15/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refer to Waterwtr</td>
<td>5/23/18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Sets review plans</td>
<td>5/30/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email to agent adding for</td>
<td>5/30/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter to concerns</td>
<td>6/4/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter to concerns</td>
<td>6/4/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter to concerns</td>
<td>6/4/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Zoning Board of Appeals  
Selectmen’s Meeting Room – Town Hall  
Minutes of June 13, 2019  

Members Present: Terrence Hurrie (Chairman), Kenneth Foreman (Vice Chairman), Robert Dugan (Clerk), Edward Van Keuren (member), Gerald Potamis (member), Mary Barry (associate) and James Morse (associate)  
Zoning Administrator: Noreen Stockman  

Executive Session – Bagley et al v. ZBA, discuss settlement of pending litigation – 284 Old Meetinghouse Road, East Falmouth  

K. Foreman moved to go into executive session by roll call, and then reconvene in open session.  


Frank Duffy, Town Counsel, discussed the potential settlement of the case with the Board.  

R. Dugan made a motion to reconvene in open session. The Board then voted to reconvene in open session:  


#026-19 Kachadoorian/Balas, 5 Canapitsit Drive, East Falmouth – Appealing the inaction of the Building Commissioner, and requesting zoning enforcement, regarding placement of two floats.  


R. Dugan made a motion to take #020-16 out of order seconded by E. Van Keuren  


T. Hurrie – The applicant is requesting a continuation to August 1, 2019  

R. Dugan made a motion to continue the hearing to August 1, 2019. E. Van Keuren seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0; all in favor.  

#022-19 Green Ocean Car Wash LLC, 187 Teaticket Highway, Teaticket  


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

Wastewater-letter submitted by Wastewater Superintendent, Amy Lowell; the proposed development is with the Little Pond Sewer Service Area; existing building is not connected to sewer; it will require a variance from the Selectmen under the Flow Neutral Bylaw. Additional information to address comments will be required.
Zoning Board of Appeals
Selectmen’s Meeting Room – Town Hall
-Minutes of June 13, 2019

Members Present: Terrence Hurrie (Chairman), Kenneth Foreman (Vice Chairman), Robert Dugan (Clerk), Edward Van Keuren (member), Gerald Potamis (member), Mary Barry (associate) and James Morse (associate)
Zoning Administrator: Noreen Stockman

Health – The BOH gave a positive referral that a Title V compliant system could be located on the property; discharge will be entering the Towns sewer system; applicant not proposing ground discharge of wash water which is considered industrial wastewater, under DEP.

Engineering – provided 2 pages of comments

Fire – They will need a driveway on West side and rear of property to be at least 14’ ft wide for apparatus access

Water – Service needs to be upgraded to either 1” or 2” service

Planning – Site plan review application had been filed with the Planning Department

Correspondence – 2 letters with comments/concerns

Kevin Klauer appeared with the Applicant, engineer and designer. Mr. Klauer explained the property is located on Rt 28, with a lot containing 24,200 s/f in B2 zoning. There is an existing one-story building on site. The building is non-conforming to the side and rear setbacks, with a shed 9.1 feet from the lot line. The lot coverage by structures, paving and parking is non-conforming. The applicant is proposing to raze the non-conforming structure, and build a conforming commercial car wash with a footprint of 2,675 sq ft. Lot coverage by structures will be 11%. Lot coverage by structures/parking/paving is reduced from 81% to 70%. We withdrew an application last year and have made changes, we are expecting a decision from the Planning Board on June 18, 2019. Some concerns expressed by the Zoning Board last time were cars entering and exiting from the site, and bailout lanes from the cars in que. We believe we have addressed these concerns with the changes to the plans. We altered the curb cut further south, and will allow for better traffic flow. There is plenty of space for queuing and there are 2 bailout lanes added in the queuing line. The ITE manual is 26 trips per hour or 13 cars for a business without a drive-thru; a car wash is 12 cars per hour. Summer and fall are the slowest times for a car wash. The water reclamation tanks are located underground and fed by drains in the building to catch runoff. Oil or solids will be disposed of properly. We are aware that we need a variance from the BOS, and have responded to Amy Lowell’s concerns. We have also worked with the 300 Committee, to address some of their concerns, and have agreed to some changes. The width was increased to 14’, the curb cut was reduced from 3 to 2, we have 1 lane in and out instead of 2, and added additional signage within the lot for traffic flow. This is a significant change and there will be no non-conformities.

K.Foreman – How does the pay station work?
Zoning Board of Appeals
Selectmen’s Meeting Room – Town Hall
Minutes of June 13, 2019

Members Present: Terrence Hurrie (Chairman), Kenneth Foreman (Vice Chairman), Robert Dugan (Clerk), Edward Van Keuren (member), Gerald Potamis (member), Mary Barry (associate) and James Morse (associate)
Zoning Administrator: Noreen Stockman

K.Klauer- There will be 2 employees, the pay stations are automated and will likely be at the entrance of the tunnel.

K.Foreman – What if you need to bail?

K.Klauer – The gate can be lifted manually. An employee will be at the entrance, and at the pay station, so there would be someone available.

E.Van Keuren – Has the Fire Department looked at the drawings that were recently submitted.

K.Klauer – we did take their concerns into consideration.

E.Van Keuren – So the Fire trucks can get out?

K.Klauer – They didn’t say they couldn’t.

R.Dugan – When you widen the aisle to 14’, did that narrow the exit from the car wash?

K.Klauer – No, the entrance has been narrowed by the elimination of the lanes.

Matt Costa (project engineer) – When we made the adjustment there was a stone strip that we took out between the 2 lanes.

R.Dugan – My concern is that that turn is too tight, I drove it on my site visit and had a hard time not going into the opposite lane. Because there is nothing to partition the two lanes except for striping, someone will go into the other lane.

M.Costa – That’s why we have the striping so people could make a wider turn.

R.Dugan – How wide is that striping between the 2 lanes?

M.Costa- 1 foot.

R.Dugan - That one foot isn’t going to be sufficient.

M.Costa -Turning radius in CAD shows that larger vehicles can get out. I don’t know if we marked all the lanes. 14’ is an adequate radius.

R.Dugan – I couldn’t make that turn, unless something at the site is mismarked, you may want to check that. You have the handicap space and a walkway, is that because the office is located on the opposite side of the building?

M.Costa- Because there is a handicap spot away from the building, they need a 5’ pathway to access the building.
R. Dugan – Is the handicap space for parking or vacuum?

M. Costa – Just for parking.

R. Dugan – If someone is coming out of the car wash, why would they just park there?

K. Klauer – We are required to have one.

R. Dugan – Maybe one of the vacuums could be moved towards the handicap space.

M. Costa – We could move one closer.

R. Dugan – You said there is only 1 employee parking space because there are only 2 employees?

K. Klauer – Yes and they also asked that a bike rack be installed.

R. Dugan – On the entrance you have something that looks like just stone, what is that?

M. Costa – It’s a stone area.

R. Dugan – Could it be landscaped?

M. Costa – Yes.

R. Dugan – Will the pole be removed, and utilities put underground?

K. Klauer – Yes it will be removed.

R. Dugan – Will you be able to fit arborvitaes toward the sideline because it looks like it’s only 2-5’ wide.

M. Costa – Yes, we will be able to plant and maintain them, through pruning.

R. Dugan – On the 12 cars per hour, is that just for the car wash or does it include vacuums?

K. Klauer – I’m not aware of a number just for vacuums.

R. Dugan – Hours of operation?

K. Klauer – 8:00 AM – 7:00 PM.

R. Dugan – You are close to the traffic light at the housing complex, it seems easier to turn right. Could you do a right turn only?
K.Klauer – When we went through this last year, the thought was that if you force a right hand turn, people are just going to take the next left, even if it’s a person’s driveway. That would generate traffic somewhere else. I would have to talk it over with my client, but as of right now it’s not proposed.

M.Costa – Winter is heavy use time for the car wash, but with low area traffic. Summer is low but heavy traffic so it would be opposite to out traffic.

R.Dugan - There has been a bailout lane added, but at 12 cars per hour, it seems like you’ve gone overboard. Could it be reduced?

M.Costa – The flow and the queuing are tied together, the flow on the site creates the queuing. If they do get busy, we will have that space for queuing. The flow works well on this site, I’d rather not touch it.

R.Dugan – What is the height on the awnings at the pay station?

K.Klauer – 20’ approx.

R.Dugan- Do you have information on decibels for vacuums?

K.Klauer – I can submit information to the file.

M.Barry – If you’re using the vacuums and people are waiting, will that cause issues coming out of the car wash?

K.Klauer – You wouldn’t be able to que in line for the vacuums, you could drive around.

M.Costa – There is a spot without a vacuum that someone could stage in.

M.Barry – When you’re going in or exiting its confusing to see where the curb is. Could that area be different?

K.Klauer – It’s the same curb size as it exists; we are just shifting it down. If the curb cut was larger; you would have some sort of a slope.

M.Costa – DOT has specific measurements, and that area is in DOT’s jurisdiction. We have to file with them.

T.Hurrie – Does this fit into the Davis Straits reset study?

K.Klauer – I’m familiar, but not sure is has been adopted. This does comply with the B2 district.
T.Hurrie – The actual car wash was purchased from a distributor, is that still the same?

K.Klauer – Yes, I think the size works well for the lot.

R.Dugan – Will that actually be raised curbing?

M.Costa – There will be Cape Cod berms, no raised curbing. The rendering elevated the curbing and that’s not what is proposed.

R.Dugan – So everything that shows raised curbing is actually not?

M.Costa – There is no raised curbing.

R.Dugan – It seems like that would keep people in lanes with the curbs.

M.Costa – It will be Cape Cod Berms where we need to keep water on site for 75% recycled waste water. The rest will be asphalt and crushed stone.

R.Dugan – Could you ask them to re-do the rendering and submit it with the changes?

K.Foreman – What happens if you go to the vacuum area and you’re queued, it seems like you want the 1st space to be available.

M.Costa – We would be happy to move the space.

K.Foreman – Crushed stone, I’m assuming you did that so you could get under the total lot coverage.

K.Klauer – That’s part of it.

G.Potamis – Solar panels?

K.Klauer – There is intent for solar panels.

Public Comment:

Annmarie Ronfolo, 69 Hillcrest Drive - I am president of the 300 Committee; we own the 11 acre park next door. Our concerns were noise, visibility, lighting and wastewater. We have been able to review the plans from this year’s application, and appreciate the work that the applicant has done to address our comments and concerns: sound proofing to reduce noise, fence at the property line, planting, and dark sky compliant lighting.

R.Dugan – I think Attorney Klauer has a good idea of what we need.
<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>4/25/19</td>
<td>K. Klaun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Letters Narrative</td>
<td>4/25/19</td>
<td>K. Klaun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance #08-09</td>
<td>4/25/19</td>
<td>K. Klaun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Copies Site Plan</td>
<td>4/25/19</td>
<td>K. Klaun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Sets Proposed Elevations/First Plan</td>
<td>4/25/19</td>
<td>K. Klaun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request Abutter List</td>
<td>4/30/19</td>
<td>K. Klaun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request Reference</td>
<td>4/30/19</td>
<td>K. Klaun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec'd Reference - w/c</td>
<td>5/7/19</td>
<td>A. PB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec'd Reference - w/c</td>
<td>5/31/19</td>
<td>A. RR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec'd Reference - w/Comment</td>
<td>5/8/19</td>
<td>A. SEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec'd Reference - w/c</td>
<td>5/8/19</td>
<td>A. Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec'd Reference - w/Comment</td>
<td>5/8/19</td>
<td>A. Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec'd Reference - w/Comment</td>
<td>5/28/19</td>
<td>A. Esy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec'd Reference - w/c</td>
<td>5/30/19</td>
<td>A. McLean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Plans - Plot Plan</td>
<td>6/11/19</td>
<td>A. MXK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Information</td>
<td>6/30/19</td>
<td>A. MXK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Zoning Board of Appeals
Selectmen’s Meeting Room – Town Hall
Minutes of June 13, 2019

Members Present: Terrence Hurrie (Chairman), Kenneth Foreman (Vice Chairman), Robert Dugan (Clerk), Edward Van Keuren (member), Gerald Potamis (member), Mary Barry (associate) and James Morse (associate)
Zoning Administrator: Noreen Stockman

R. Dugan made a motion to continue to July 11th at 6:30 PM. E.Van Keuren seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0. All in favor.

R.Dugan made a motion to take agenda item #2, #006-19 Locustfield LLC out of order. G. Potamis seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

#006-19 Locustfield LLC, 0 Locustfield Road, Hatchville

N.Stockman – My intent was to provide you with conditions to review. While you’re looking at the conditions, you can vote them individually.

K.Foreman – I reviewed the tapes from 5/23/19 and submitted a certification of that to the Board for your acceptance.

K.Foreman – I think we should just go through the findings and conditions, and mark up as appropriate.

G.Potamis – Was anything submitted that would alter the language? I don’t know if we are missing anything.

N.Stockman – We could elaborate on the language if need be.

The Board discussed language of the findings and conditions of the proposed draft decision, including extending the sideline fencing to the easement.

R.Dugan made a motion to continue deliberations to June 27, 2019 at 6:30 PM. E.Van Keuren seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0. All in favor.

#025-19 Shea, “O” Nathan S. Ellis Hwy. (lot 2), North Falmouth

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

Engineering – standard comments; note that drywells, rain garden or other storm water measure for roof area

Health – suitable 4 bedroom septic system depicted on plan

Water – applicant must apply for new water service
Zoning Board of Appeals  
Selectmen's Meeting Room – Town Hall  
Minutes of June 13, 2019  

Members Present: Terrence Hurrie (Chairman), Kenneth Foreman (Vice Chairman), Robert Dugan (Clerk), Edward Van Keuren (member), Gerald Potamis (member), Mary Barry (associate) and James Morse (associate)  
Zoning Administrator: Noreen Stockman  

Kevin Klauer is representing the applicant, the prospective purchaser. We are requesting a Variance to allow a deviation under 240-68 a 1. We are requesting relief from the 75’ street setback. The 25,593 sq ft lot is bisected by an easement. The lot to the left was built with from a variance, and this property is affected most from the easement. The setback was changed from 35’ to 75’. Without the variance, the lot is unbuildable. We are requesting a 43’ setback. There was a variance issued from the Board in 2009 at 42’ from the street. The owners did not choose to move forward at that time. The easement affects the use of the lot, and the 75’ setback would cause a hardship. This would provide relief to the owner, and there is no detriment to the public good. The unique shape and topography would cause a hardship, and relief can be granted.

M. Barry – There was a variance and wasn’t used?

K. Klauer – The neighbor appealed in 2009, and the court said he had no standing. I don’t know why they didn’t move forward.

R. Dugan – Same owner?

K. Klauer – The property is under agreement and the current owners did sign off on the application.

R. Dugan – What was the zoning?

K. Klauer – RB

R. Dugan – Difference?

K. Klauer – 1’ further back.

K. Foreman – What did the court say in the appeal?

K. Klauer – The neighbor alleged there was a diminution in value by the grant of the variance.

J. Morse – Is this property east or the west of parking lot on 151?

K. Klauer – East side.

Public Comment:

Miniasian - 28 Nathan S. Ellis Hwy. – 8 times the Planning Board denied me and gave a variance that the court said was detrimental. The court took 2.5 years and cost me $28,000. This
property does not conform to the rules and regulations in the Town of Falmouth. I have been shown prejudice.

R.Dugan – I don’t think it changes the topography as much as the use. We’ve been told to look hard at variances.

K.Klauer – Read the findings from the 2009 Variance that was issued by the ZBA.

R.Dugan – There is a pole on the easement?

K.Klauer – Yes.

R.Dugan – Does the easement meet anything for changing the topography? Can we make a decision that it changes the shape of the lot?

K.Klauer – The shape of the lot is affected by the easement, because of the location.

M.Barry – How does the easement fit into the definition?

E.Van Keuren – You can’t build on it.

M.Barry – It’s not soil conditions, or shape.

K.Klauer – Current statute allows that unique structures can be unique to the shape of the lot (pole). The pole and the easement are the same.

G.Potamis – I think it might be important to see the statute.

R.Dugan – I want to make sure we have a definition.

K.Klauer – The structure is set back as far as possible due to the easement.

E.Van Keuren – I think it would be prudent to get more information.

M.Barry – Is this an easement of use or gross?

K.Klauer – It runs with the property.

M.Barry – I would say gross.

T.Hurrie – This is set further back?

K.Klauer – Yes.

R.Dugan – I’d like an opinion from Frank Duffy, and for you to submit more information.
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R. Dugan made a motion to continue the hearing to June 27, 2019 @6:30 PM. E.Van Keuren seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0. All in favor.

Open Meeting:

1) Minutes 5/30 – R. Dugan made a motion to approve May 30th minutes. E. Van Keuren seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.  
Minutes of June 6, 2019 – tabled

2) #115-18 Woods Hole Partners LLC, 533 Woods Hole Road, Woods Hole-  
K. Klauer - I have reviewed the decision and have no comments, I think the decision is reflective of what we agreed upon.

R. Dugan – All the changes are in place.

G. Potamis – Most of them were grammatical.

K. Foreman – My changes were made.

R. Dugan made a motion to approve special permit #115-18 with conditions. G. Potamis seconded the Motion. Motion carried 5-0. All in favor.

3) Board updates – none

4) Discuss date for future workshop -  
G. Potamis – Can we discuss lack of enforcement and possibly ask the Building Commissioner to come for our workshop?

N. Stockman – I think we are starting to address some of the concerns within the decisions

5) Recodification- Upcoming meeting next week

6) Future Agenda Items – Bagley et al v. ZBA will be put on the 6/27/19 Agenda for executive session

Meeting adjourned 9:30 PM

Respectfully submitted,  
Ashley E. DeMello, Office Assistant