

Town of Bourne
Zoning Board of Appeals
Meeting Minutes
August 3rd, 2022

PRESENT: James Beyer, Chris Pine, John O'Brien, Harold Kalick, Wade Keene, Karl Spilhaus (Associate).

STAFF: Ken Murphy

PUBLIC: Zach Brzezinski, Caroline MacPherson, Richard Goshgarian, Tanya Goshgarian, Kristin Weisker, Alexander Cuddeback, Ursula Garfield, Darlene Kittredge, Christopher Ellis, Kevin Klauer, Drew Hoyt, Brian Davin, Roger Forget

Chairman Beyer called the meeting to order via Zoom at 7:00pm.

Public Hearing for Supportive Finding No. 2022-SF05:

4 Kennebec Ave, Pocasset. Christina Winterfeldt. Request to raze and rebuild flood compliant dwelling in approximately the same area and decrease existing non-conforming GFA.

Chm. Beyer announces that Mr. O'Brien will write the decision for this item.

Zach Brzezinski identifies himself as an engineer with Bracken Engineering and representative of this project. Mr. Brzezinski shares his screen with the audience via Zoom. The property is approximately a 3,000 sqft lot, and the existing house was built in 1929. As for the current project, the applicants are looking to raze/demolish the existing structure. Initially, the applicants were looking to rehab the house, but found that bringing it into compliance with FEMA did not make this a viable option.

The 3,200 sqft lot sits within an AE-15 flood zone and is abutted by developed properties to the north and west. Currently, the project is a non-complying structure. The front porch sits on the front setback of the property and the existing shed to the rear is about 3ft off the lot line. The structure is also off on GFA and lot coverage. Mr. Brzezinski states that the applicants are pursuing a Supportive Finding under section 2530, since the pre-existing structure does not currently comply with the non-conforming bylaw.

The proposed project proposes to raze/demo the existing structure, construct the new structure in the general area of the existing structure and elevate it. The sheds on the property will also be removed. A new Title V compliant septic system will be sited on the east side of the property. These plans have been approved by the Department of Conservation and the Board of Health.

The new structure will be raised approximately 5-6ft from the current grade. This is compliant with flood zone requirements. The engineers have designed the structure with flood compliant flooring system that allowed them to reduce the overall height of the structure in order to keep it low as possible to the grade. The applicants employed the same architect as a neighbor, so they are keeping in harmony with the neighborhood, namely the same height and stone foundation.

Under the bylaw, the project is required not to be any more detrimental than what currently exists. To address this, the applicants have reduced the overall lot coverage from 35% to 29.7% and reduced the GFA by .6% (1250 sqft to 1242 sqft). The overall structure height is in compliance with the bylaw, maintaining a structure height of 30ft while still meeting flood zone requirements on the property. The applicants are also improving the overall setbacks by pulling them further in from the project. The project will maintain the pedestrian/vehicular flow of the current property by keeping the onsite parking. There will be no disruption to utilities or public services.

Overall, Mr. Brzezinski states, this project will have a positive impact on the natural environment. The new structure is flood compliant, includes a nitrogen reducing septic system which will help protect water quality in Hen's Cove, improves upon the non-conforming setbacks (4 currently to 5), and increases the shed setback to the westerly abutter.

One impact of this project is the applicants will maintain a year-round structure on the property. Mr. Brzezinski defers to the board for discussion.

Mr. Pine states that he does not believe that the board has a signed GFA sheet from the Town Planner, so they board would not be able to vote on the permit tonight.

Mr. Brzezinski states that they have been in contact with the Town Planner and because of staffing issues, the signed GFA sheet was not produced in time for the hearing. They will pursue a continuance if needed.

Chm. Beyer commends Mr. Brzezinski for a job well done on the design, but states that they will have to pursue a continuance because they do not have a certified area.

Mr. Kalick questions if the 200 sqft porch is part of the certified area. Mr. Brzezinski states that the porch areas are only 120 sqft so they did not include it. Mr. Kalick says that because it is a covered porch, it should be included in the GFA. Mr. Brzezinski states that the porch area falls under 200 sqft so it meets the exclusion under the bylaw. Mr. Kalick states that he believes that if the porch has a roof, that becomes part of the GFA. Mr. Brzezinski says that they will verify with the Town Planner regarding this matter.

Chm. Beyer asks if there is any comment from the public. Caroline MacPherson of 531 Circuit Ave introduces herself as a direct abutter. She says that she sent a letter to Mr. Murphy, but the board did not receive it. She states that to her understanding, the proposed structure will only be 5ft from the lot line, which does not meet the standard code. She believes that this is too close, it will directly impact the view, and there is no need to push this beyond the normal regulation. She asks if any plans have changed. Mr. Brzezinski states that the setback is the same as proposed. She states the shed is there now which is a small structure, but the new structure will be far too close to the property line which will impact their view and property value. Therefore she objects.

Chm. Beyer states that he thought that the applicants were reducing the footprint of the structure, but it appears they are not. Mr. Brzezinski states that they are reduced the GFA on the property. He admits that Caroline is correct, and shares his screen on Zoom once again. He references the shed which sits on the northerly side of the property and the new structure's footprint includes this area. He states that the new structure is roughly 8ft taller than the shed, however flood zone requirements entail the structure to be raised. Mr. Brzezinski states that they do not believe it will impact the abutter's view because of existing trees in the view corridor. Although, Mr. Brzezinski does concur that the massing of the house does come close to the abutters, they feel it is not a detriment because there is an existing structure there today, and the height of the new structure is because of FEMA flood requirements. Mr. Brzezinski states that in consideration of designing this new structure, they needed to get a new septic on the site as well as keep the parking, so they got rid of all the sheds on the property. Therefore, what they were left with was the current proposed footprint. In speaking with the architect, Mr. Brzezinski acknowledges that this has been a concern. As a proposed solution, Mr. Brzezinski suggest they could rotate the front stairs to point up Kennebec Ave, which would enable them to pull the structure up forwards from the property line. However, they would not be able to meet the full setback in the back of the property, which is why they are seeking a Supportive Finding under the bylaw—pre-existing and nonconforming.

Ms. MacPherson states that they trim the trees that are on her property every year and they are not 8ft taller than the shed structure. She estimates that they are probably the same height as the shed. Therefore, 8ft taller than what currently exists will significantly impact their view and property values. She restates that she objects and asks for reconsideration. She does not consider there to be a hardship, because the applicants just want a bigger house on a small lot, which the applicants knew when they bought it. She adds that this is not fair to them as a neighbor.

Mr. Kalick states that the ZBA cannot grant views, they are there to support the bylaws. He says that she has a legitimate complaint about the 5ft, and it may help if they are willing to pull the house forward. However the board will take it into consideration, a view is not a basis to deny a special permit. Chm. Beyer agrees that they cannot

guarantee views. Ms. MacPherson argues that there are other impacts other than views, and does not understand why the applicants can go outside the existing guidelines in order to build a bigger house. Mr. Brzezinski states that they are not trying to make a bigger house, they are actually reducing the GFA and lot coverage. By pulling the house forward they could gain an additional 3-4 ft, which would bring the setback to about 9ft.

Mr. Keene asks what the current distance is from the existing house to the lot line. Mr. Brzezinski states that it is 16ft, but they have an existing structure that is within 3-4 feet of the lot line. He states that because of the trees, there is no view that will be impacted because of the new massing, and that the architects tried to be respectful of the abutter's property. Ms. Macpherson states that they have a second floor that has water views, and that is part of the reason that they bought the property.

Mr. Pine adds that because of FEMA requirements for height, the applicants are being forced to build higher. Ms. Macpherson states that she does not have a problem with the height, her problem is with the proximity.

Chm. Beyer asks what the required setback is. Mr. Brzezinski states that it is 12ft. Mr. Kalick asks if the house could be redesigned to meet the setback. He states when you take down a house, it should have the same footprint, especially on a non-conforming property.

Chm. Beyer states that he would like to see two things: site plans that show the existing and the new structure in a way that the board can see the relationship between them, and a plan that conforms to the required setback. Mr. Brzezinski states that because they need to work around the property and the overall square footage, they would be putting the house right back on the front yard setback. Chm. Beyer states that they are asking to see what happens if the applicants pursue that.

Mr. O'Brien makes a Motion to Continue the Public Hearing for Supportive Finding No. 2022-SF05 on August 17th 2022, seconded by Mr. Keene.

Roll call vote as follows:

Vice Chairperson Pine – YES, Mr. Keene – YES, Mr. Kalick – YES,
Mr. O'Brien – YES, Chairman Beyer – YES.

The Motion Passes.

Public Hearing for Special Permit #2022-SP10:

16B Wild Rose Dr. HAV, Buzzards Bay. Richard Goshgarian. Request to replace curved roof with framed gable roof to the height of current dormers.

Chm. Beyer states that Mr. Kalick will write the decision for this item.

Richard Goshgarian introduces himself as the owner of the property. Mr. Goshgarian shares his screen via Zoom with the audience. He states that they are pursuing a permit for alteration of a pre-existing non-conforming structure to resolve safety and integrity issues. The metal roofing and framing will be replaced with traditional wood. The roof will be gabled with asphalt shingles. The ridge height would be raised 1.5' over the current ridge height, and the smaller horizontal windows will be replaced with larger ones that will provide a safer level of egress. The single entrance will be located to a more centralized location. They will not be changing the footprint of the living space. He states that the description of the project set out with the agenda is not accurate or consistent with what was stated in the application. He says the top plate of the walls are the height of the current dormers, and the ridge height would be 1.5' above the current.

Mr. Goshgarian states that the reason for all of these alterations is safety. He states that they have three small children and the current layout of the house is unsafe and cannot be altered without removing the metal framing. There are also numerous issues with water and moisture that are inherent to the design and condition of the roof.

Mr. Pine asks if the plans which are being presented to the board are the same that have been approved by Hideaway Village. Mr. Goshgarian confirms that they are.

Chm. Beyer asks how much higher the top of the roof peak will be. Mr. Goshgarian replies 1.5'.

Mr. Kalick makes a Motion to Close the Public Hearing for Special Permit No. 2022-SP10. Mr. Pine seconds the Motion.

Roll call vote as follows:

Vice Chairperson Pine – YES, Mr. Keene – YES, Mr. Kalick – YES,
Mr. O'Brien – YES, Chairman Beyer – YES.

The Motion Passes.

Mr. Keene makes a Motion to Approve Special Permit No. 2022-SP10. The Motion is seconded by Mr. Kalick.

Roll call vote as follows:

Vice Chairperson Pine – YES, Mr. Keene – YES, Mr. Kalick – YES,
Mr. O'Brien – YES, Chairman Beyer – YES.

The Motion Passes.

Public Hearing for Special Permit #2022-SP12:

19 Penobscot Ave. Kristin Weisker and Alexander Cuddeback. Request for Special Permit for a change of use from an existing barn to a two-story Accessory Dwelling for their son to help care for the parents.

Chm. Beyer announces that Mr. Keene will write the decision for this item.

Kristin Weisker introduces herself and her husband Alexander as owners of the property. She states that their son, Benjamin, is the person who will be living in the accessory dwelling. She states that the lot is 100ft x 100ft. The structure was constructed on the property many decades ago, but was converted into a barn in the last 12-14 years. The barn is in good physical standing. Mrs. Weisker states that she is 63 and her husband is 74, and Mr. Cuddeback is handicapped in multiple ways. They would like to see their son on the property to help them with their natural aging process.

They hope to convert the barn into a two-story home so their son can have privacy while he assists his parents. Mrs. Weisker states that the plans submitted are revisable if needed. The first floor would have a bedroom and bath, and the second floor would have a kitchen, living space, and potentially a deck.

Mrs. Weisker states that in regards to the impact on the area, they are on a very narrow street, but their driveway has at least four spaces. They performed a setback on their fence and also have about five additional guest parking spots, which they make available for their neighbors. Mrs. Weisker also states that the neighbors used their property for parking before their ownership.

Mrs. Weisker states that they would like to add a dormer for additional lighting, as well as possibly a 6x10ft deck. In regards to traffic, Mrs. Weisker says that they have four vehicles between the three of them.

Mr. O'Brien states that he received word from Town Hall today that to add these living spaces, the property would be far over the appropriate square footage.

Chm. Beyer explains that there are two constraints in regards to the size of what the applicants want to build. Mrs. Weisker states that they do not want to build, it is already existing. Chm. Beyer states that their plans have exceeded their maximum GFA by 342 sqft. If the board does not grant them a 10% variance, they will actually have exceeded their GFA by 580 sqft.

Mrs. Weisker asks for clarification. Chm. Beyer states that there is a maximum gross floor limitation for the applicant's property of 2,304 sqft, which is the amount of

occupied floor area in relation to the lot. Mrs. Weisker states that they own two lots, one adjacent, but the board informs her that the GFA was calculated using both lots. With a 10% variance, the board could grant the applicants a maximum of 2,535 sqft. The floor area of what the applicants are asking to create is 2,877 sqft. However, the applicants are within the acceptable amount of maximum lot coverage. Therefore, they must find a way to cut out some floor area from their plans. Chm. Beyer expresses some confusion about how the barn was already built.

Mrs. Weisker claims that the barn was once a garage and then converted into a barn.

Chm. Beyer explains the options for the applicants, in which they will vote the special permit down and must wait a year to reapply, or choose to withdraw, and the plans may be modified at their leisure.

Mr. Kalick poses a question to Mr. Murphy, stating that they have a pre-existing non-conforming structure that has been grandfathered in as far as lot coverage, so the applicants should be able to convert the barn if it meets the Board of Health's requirements.

Chm. Beyer agrees and discusses with Mr. Kalick about whether the applicants need a special permit or supportive finding.

The board discusses that they received a letter stating that the current septic would be acceptable for a one-bedroom carriage house.

Chm. Beyer advises the applicants that they should withdraw their application as it stands, and reapply as a supportive finding, arguing that what they want to do isn't any worse than what's there now. He also states that another problem the applicants are facing is that four of their neighbors have objected to their application, on the basis that it would create too much traffic in the neighborhood. Chm. Beyer asks for comments from the public regarding this project.

Darlene Kittredge, of 265 Circuit Ave speaks. She states that they have lived there for six years, and they have no issue with what the applicants want to do with the barn. In terms of parking, the applicants have moved their fence back about 10ft for anyone who needs extra parking. Because it is a narrow street with small lots, there is often a shortage of parking spots. She thinks that it is a plus to have the son around to help the parents, and it will improve the value of the property. She hopes that their project will be approved.

Ursula Garfield of 273 Circuit Ave speaks. Mrs. Garfield expresses concern of the precedent that It would set in the neighborhood, because in the past the neighborhood suffered from too many permits that were handed out to oversized parcels. Mrs. Garfield states that she has no concern about the applicants trying to find a place for their son to

stay, and currently he is staying on a camper on the property, which is not ideal for anybody. Mrs. Garfield states that her concern is what happens to this property if it one day sells or the son leaves, and then becomes it an income producing property. She states that Airbnbs are not assets to small communities like theirs, and asks the board if it is possible to limit this accessory dwelling to just their son.

Chm. Beyer states that the board received several letters with that same question. The property in question is called accessory use, and in Bourne, accessory uses are limited to the terms stipulated which allow them. This means that the name of the person who is supposed to be living there is part of the condition of approval when given. There is a three-year limitation to the approval when given, and after those three years are up, the named person must be renamed. So if that same person isn't living there anymore, the building inspector would be involved, and the accessory dwelling would not be available for rent to anyone but the named person.

Mr. Kalick then asks Chm. Beyer if the best course of action for the applicants is to reapply as a special permit for an accessory dwelling and with a supportive finding. Chm Beyer agrees, but also expresses that the GFA problem still exists. He restates that the best recourse is for this application to be withdrawn.

Mrs. Weisker asks for some guidance from the board about what route they should take.

Mr. Pine states that he believes that the special permit should be for an accessory dwelling. He believes that an architect should look at their plans in order to comply. The main issue is that the square footage of the first and second floor exceeds the GFA for the property. However, if there is hardship, they could exceed the GFA by 10%. Mr. Pine is not sure if this would be a supportive finding either way.

The board members discuss the project further, and Chm. Beyer advises the applicants to engage an architect that can help them find a way to navigate this issue. Mr. Kalick suggests that the applicants only use the first floor in their plans in order to solve the GFA issue. Mr. Murphy brings up that they are in a flood zone, so that also complicates the issue as well.

Mr. O'Brien made a Motion to Accept the Withdrawal of the Special Permit No. 2022-SP12 without prejudice, seconded by Mr. Pine.

Roll call vote as follows:

Vice Chairperson Pine – YES, Mr. Keene – YES, Mr. Kalick – YES,

Mr. O'Brien – YES, Chairman Beyer – YES.

The Motion Passes.

Public Hearing for Special Permit #2022-SP11: 7 Alpine Circle, Sagamore Beach.
Christopher Ellis. Request for an attached Accessory Dwelling with storage above for the parents of the owners.

Christopher Ellis announces himself as representative of the project. He states that they are applying for an in-law apartment attached to the dwelling. Their plans stay under the required GFA. The first floor will be for the parents of the homeowners, the second story will be an unfinished area with a connecting deck for now, but the applicant hopes to finish that in the future.

Chm. Beyer states that he did not see a GFA analysis with the application. Mr. Ellis states that he submitted a plot plan which contains the GFA analysis. He states that they are at 20% after construction for GFA and 15.2% for lot coverage. Chm. Beyer explains that a plot plan isn't enough and that there is a table in the zoning bylaws that must be filled out that shows the calculation for both GFA and lot coverage. Chm. Beyer says that he must submit that and get it approved by the Town Planner before they can vote, and suggests a continuance for August 17th. Mr. Ellis asks the board if they have the plot plan in front of them, because it has the calculations with a stamp from an engineer.

Mr. O'Brien explains that this does not replace the certification from the Town Planner. Chm. Beyer adds that the calculations must be done in a certain way for GFA and lot coverage. All of this is part of the application packet and it is the applicants responsibility to see that it gets filled out. Mr. Ellis states that he filled out the whole application package but the Town Planner did not complete her job in a timely manner. Chm. Beyer states that it is the applicant's responsibility to see that the application is complete, and right now it is not. He asks the applicant to accept a continuance or withdraw his application. The applicant chooses a continuance.

Chm. Beyer states that he will write the decision for this item.

Vice Chairperson Pine makes a Motion to Continue the Public Hearing for Special Permit No. 2022-SP11 until August 17th, 2022. Mr. O'Brien seconds the motion.

Roll call vote as follows:

Vice Chairperson Pine – YES, Mr. Keene – YES, Mr. Kalick – YES,
Mr. O'Brien – YES, Chairman Beyer – YES.

The Motion Passes.

Public Hearing for Special Permit #2022-SP05:

Cont'd from 7.6.22. 70 Gilder Rd. Brian and Gail Kennedy. To construct an addition 6.3' from the property line to a non-conforming structure.

Chm. Beyer states that he has a letter from Mr. Murphy asking for this item to be withdrawn without prejudice.

Attorney Kevin Klauer introduces himself as representative of the project. He states that he did submit a letter to Mr. Murphy requesting the withdrawal without prejudice, and that he is here to answer any questions, should there be any. There are none.

Mr. Keene made a Motion to Accept the Withdrawal of the Special Permit No. 2022-SP05 without prejudice, seconded by Mr. Kalick.

Roll call vote as follows:

Vice Chairperson Pine – YES, Mr. Keene – YES, Mr. Kalick – YES,
Mr. O'Brien – YES, Chairman Beyer – YES.
The Motion Passes.

Public Hearing for Amendment to Comprehensive Permit No. 08-18:

Cont'd from 7.6.22. 230 Sandwich Rd. Chase Estates.

Attorney Drew Hoyt introduces himself as representative of the project. Chm. Beyer asks if Atty. Hoyt received the letter he forwarded stating that the traffic report peer review has not been completed. Atty. Hoyt confirms he did see the letter and because of that there isn't much they can discuss, but he wanted to appear in front of the board in case there were any questions.

Atty. Hoyt also states that he did receive the draft of the Comprehensive Permit, and thanks the board for their work. He wonders what he could do on his end to help the process. Chm. Beyer states that he sent the Comprehensive Permit to the Town Counsel and he is expecting comments from him and those comments will go directly to Atty. Hoyt. Although they will need a full meeting for the Comprehensive Permit, during the next meeting they will go over the traffic study peer review. Chm. Beyer asks if Mr. Murphy can follow up with the peer reviewer to make sure that he will be done by the 17th.

Mr. Keene inquires about the summer traffic study, and Atty. Hoyt states that it should be done before August 17th.

Brian Davin, a member of the public, speaks. He identifies himself as a prospective buyer for 12 Bosuns Lane, which is adjacent to the developer's personal property. Mr. Davin

states that he withdrew his offer from 12 Bosuns Lane because of concerns that Chase Estates would connect into Bosuns Lane. The board states that there is a condition in the approval that the development would not connect into Bosuns Lane. Mr. Davin also expresses concern that there is an active dirt road between the developer's residence and the development. He wonders if there are any restrictions on commercial traffic on Bosuns Lane. Mr. Murphy states that there should be no travel between the sites at all, and if the project is approved, that should be a condition of the approval as well. Mr. Davin then states that there is a wooden fence structure being built at the developer's residence, and asks if this is an approved project or in relation to the new development. Mr. Murphy states that this is not an approved project, but the owner is working with the building inspector to get the appropriate permits.

Mr. Pine made a Motion to Continue the Public Hearing for Amendment to Comprehensive Permit No. 08-18, seconded by Mr. O'Brien.

Roll call vote as follows:

Vice Chairperson Pine – YES, Mr. Keene – YES, Mr. Kalick – YES,
Mr. O'Brien – YES, Chairman Beyer – YES.

The Motion Passes.

New Business

Chm. Beyer discusses the future venue for ZBA meetings on an ongoing basis. He states that the board has been meeting via Zoom under an emergency provision from Governor Baker due to the Covid-19 Pandemic. This permission has recently been extended until April 2023. However, there has been some discussion about whether the board should hold live meetings at the Community Center in Bourne. Chm. Beyer asks for the views of the board.

Mr. Pine states that because of travelling for work, having remote access as option is a big advantage. Also for professionals that must take part in their meetings and would otherwise need to travel long distances, remote access is a benefit. Although he does understand the push for an in-person meeting, the remote option also makes it easier for the public to participate. He states that he would be in favor of continuing the remote format.

Mr. O'Brien states that he does not disagree with anything that Mr. Pine has already stated, and adds that avoiding bridge traffic is an advantage for him personally. Also, he notes that he read in the paper that the air conditioning in the Community Center has recently failed, which would make it very difficult to hold meetings. Mr. O'Brien states that he would be in favor of continuing in the remote format.

Mr. Kalick states that an in-person meeting is completely different from what the board is currently doing. He states that the board misses a lot, although the current format is convenient. He believes that the board is doing an injustice to the applicants through the remote format.

Therefore, if they board was to vote on it, he would vote to have it go back to way it used to be, which is the in-person format.

Mr. Keene states that he enjoys the Zoom meetings, but there are instances where the in-person formats work better, like when there is a big audience. The smaller meetings, however, are well suited for the remote format. He hopes they could negotiate a schedule where both remote and in-person meetings occur based on the agenda.

Mr. Spilhaus states he believes the remote format is enormously convenient, but notes that he hasn't been on the board in a time when in-person meetings were the norm. He suggests that perhaps the board could have an in-person meeting every few months, because he recognizes the value of sitting down together.

Mr. Murphy states that because of distance, the remote format is extremely convenient. He states that he will have to check on the requirements, and is not sure if they can switch between remote and in-person meetings.

Chm. Beyer states that he believes that it must be one way or the other, and it can't be hybrid because that would be too difficult to manage.

Mr. Murphy also poses the question if they would still record if the meetings went to in-person, or they would have the meetings in a closed room with meeting minutes.

Mr. Kalick asks what other towns are doing. Mr. Murphy states that majority of other towns have already given up Zoom. The Planning Board in Bourne has also given up Zoom.

Chm. Beyer states that he would not be able to go to in-person meetings for about a month following knee-surgery in September. Another concern of his involves the attendance of meetings. He states that all members of the board must be present for big meetings such as Chase Estates.

After some discussion regarding travel plans, Mr. O'Brien suggests that the board continue remote meetings until April. Mr. Kalick expresses concern that for in-person meetings, they will need five members present, so he suggests that they get another member. Chm. Beyer states that members are allowed to miss two meetings and must study the minutes. Ultimately, the board agrees that it is more likely to have full attendance for board members when the meetings are remote.

Roger Forget, Superintendent of Upper Cape Technical School, states that they have the technology and ability to house in-person but also remote meetings. The board thanks Mr. Forget for his offer. Mr. Murphy states that after April, they will not be able to have hybrid.

Chm. Beyer states that since attendance would be an issue for in-person meetings over the next few months, he suggests that they stay remote for now and re-visit the issue before the end of the year. The board agrees.

Mr. O'Brien asks a procedural question regarding continuances, and the board discusses. Mr. Kalick then asks how applicants can come before the board when their applications are incomplete. Chm. Beyer states that for the application being referenced by Mr. Kalick, this is an endemic problem with the staffing at the Planning Board. He says that it is better to keep items on the agenda so there is pressure to get these items complete. Mr. Kalick states that in order for there to be a hearing, all items needed for an application package should be complete before the hearing comes before the board.

Old Business

None.

Adjournment

Mr. Kalick makes a Motion to Adjourn, seconded by Mr. O'Brien.

Roll call vote as follows:

Vice Chairperson Pine—YES, Mr. Keene—YES, Mr. O'Brien—YES, Mr. Kalick—YES, Chairman Beyer—YES.

With no further business before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 8:44pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Ina Sullivan