

Zoning Board of Appeals

Minutes of the Public Hearing (218v) John & Monica Boyle

Via Zoom

December 29, 2020

Present: Richard "Bill" Tracy, Peter Ignatovich, Laurie Sanders, Dave Loven, John Kelsey

Attending: John & Monica Boyle, Linda & Ron Rancourt, Shirl Morrigan, and planning board members-- Susan Bronstein, Pat Coffey

Bill Tracy called the continuation of the public hearing to order at 7:07pm, noting that it was begun on 12/19 and is an application for a special permit for a two family house and a variance (250' vs 300') for John and Monica Boyle, 156 North Road.

John and Monica Boyle presented that they wanted to add a garage (32 x 40') and an attached single family home (32 x 36'), with its own garage. The Boyles want her parents to live in the new home. The proposed driveway would be 11' feet from the property line.

Board members asked various questions. John Kelsey listed the criteria to meet a variance and asked them to present how the project met the criteria.

Peter Ignatovich noted that if an addition were built without a kitchen, the Boyles would not need a special permit or variance. Essentially a private wing, but with a shared kitchen.

Monica Boyle said the intent was to have her parents close, but maintain their autonomy.

John Boyle said the current design was developed to meet the setbacks, but that the size of the building could be adjusted to provide better turnaround for second proposed garage.

Dave Loven recused himself because he has an outside business relationship with John Boyle's relatives.

Susan Bronstein said that the project was discussed in the planning board meeting, and read a letter, stating that the planning board does not support the variance or the special permit at this time because it conflicts with the 300' frontage requirement.

Bill Tracy stated that he was in favor of what the Boyles were trying to accomplish, but did not like the design. Ron Rancourt said he and his wife also supported the idea.

Discussion continued about alternative layouts and designs, septic system locations, etc. The board also talked about the difference between an inlaw apartment and two-family. Pat Coffey stated that the bylaw revision committee is developing new language for in-law apartments (900 s.f., limited # of bedrooms, # of people, always owner occupied, recorded at registry).

Since the Boyle's were willing to redesign, Bill Tracy recommended keeping the hearing open.

John Kelsy stated that he couldn't see how the project met criteria 6.11 (1) b and c, and that he couldn't see a justification. He also stated if a vote on this design (or something like it) were done and it failed, the Boyles would have to wait two years. He stated he supported the need, but couldn't support the design.

John and Monica agree to redesign and consider an inlaw apartment (i.e. shared kitchen, with building inspector review). They will speak to the building commissioner.

Motion: To continue the public hearing until January 19th at 7 pm.

Peter Ignatovich made the motion, John Kelsey seconded. All were in favor. None opposed. Motion carried.

Motion to adjourn the meeting was made by John Kelsey. Peter Ignatovich seconded. No more discussion. Meeting adjourned at 8:49 pm.