



TOWN CLERK²
2021 SEP 10 AM 8:44
DUXBURY, MASS.

TOWN OF DUXBURY



BOARD OF APPEALS

DUXBURY BOARD OF APPEALS

MEETING MINUTES

May 27, 2021 @ 7:30 p.m.

ATTENDANCE: Wayne Dennison, Judith Barrett, Kathleen Muncey, Freeman Boynton Jr., Emmett Sheehan, Philip Thorn and Borys Gojnycz

Other persons present at the hearing: James Wasielewski, Building Commissioner, and Lauren Haché, Administrative Assistant

CALL TO ORDER: Wayne Dennison called the meeting to order and reads the Governor's Preamble: Pursuant to Governor Baker's March 12, 2020, Order Suspending Certain Provisions of the Open Meeting Law, G.L. c. 30A, §18, and the Governor's March 15, 2020, Order imposing strict limitation on the number of people that may gather in one place, the Town of Duxbury's Board and/or Committee meetings will be conducted via remote participation to the greatest extent possible with members. For this meeting, members of the public who wish to watch the meeting may do so by viewing the Duxbury Government Access Channels – Verizon 39 or Comcast 15. Viewers can visit www.pactv.org/duxbury for information about Duxbury programming. To watch a meeting live on PACTV's streaming channel, PACTV Prime, visit www.pactv.org/live. To watch replays of a meeting, visit www.pactv.org/duxbury or to watch online visit PACTV's Video on Demand at www.pactv.org/ondemand. NO IN-PERSON ATTENDANCE OF MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC WILL BE PERMITTED. Every effort will be made to ensure that the public can adequately access the proceedings to the best of our technical abilities; and despite our best efforts due to lack of technical infrastructure, this meeting will be available on PACTV to view a video recording and a transcript or other comprehensive record of proceedings as soon as possible after the meeting.

ZBA Case #2019-17, WB Builders, 1 & 25 Lincoln St. (CONT'D): *The Board voted to continue the public hearing to June 10, 2021 at 7:30pm*

ZBA Case #2021-13, Hammer, 1 Abrams Hill: *The Board voted to continue the public hearing to July 8, 2021 at 7:30pm*

ZBA Case #2021-15, McKeag, 39 Shipyard Lane: *The Board voted to continue the public hearing to July 8, 2021 at 7:30pm*

Wayne Dennison closes the public hearing.

BOARD OF APPEALS — MINUTES

Case No: 2019-17

Petitioner: WB Builders, Fieldstone Farm

Address: 1 & 25 Lincoln Street

Date: May 27, 2021 **Time:** 7:30 p.m.

(Continued from April 22, 2021, March 25, 2021 February 25, 2021, January 28, 2021, November 19, 2020, October 22, 2020, September 10, 2020, July 23, 2020, June 25, 2020, June 11, 2020, May 14, 2020, March 26, 2020, March 12, 2020 and January 23, 2020)

Members present: Wayne Dennison, Kathleen Muncey, Emmett Sheehan, Freeman Boynton Jr., Philip Thorn & Borys Gojnycz

Members Voting: Wayne Dennison, Kathleen Muncey, Emmett Sheehan, Freeman Boynton Jr. & Borys Gojnycz

Other persons present at the hearing: James Wasielewski, Director of Municipal Services & Lauren Haché, Administrative Assistant

- Wayne Dennison re-opens the public hearing and states we have received some additional material, including a draft decision from the applicant. Lauren, what else do we have
- Lauren Haché states we have an email from Mr. Kelly dated May 25, 2021 regarding public safety concerns. We also have a letter dated May 10, 2021 from Richard Prone from the Sidewalk and Bike path Committee listing concerns for safety. We also received the decision draft with comments from Town Counsel and another email from Richard Prone from today speaking to the violation of land clearing.
- Peter Freeman states Lauren, you also have my response email as well.
- Lauren Haché reads an email from Peter Freeman, the Agent for the Applicants explaining the land clearing for percolation testing
- Wayne Dennison states ok, so why don't we resume the public hearing and let's start with a questions, I take it from your email that given to the fact you have a pending 40B with the Town of Duxbury that you don't have to comply with any of the Town's Bylaws, is that your position?
- Peter Freeman states no, not at all. I respectfully disagree. I did not meant that, they jumped the gun apparently. I respect my clients, they did not do this intentionally and now they have egg on their face. You are absolutely right Mr. Chairman. I was not aware of that particular Bylaw, which is why we didn't apply for that special permit. I am hopeful we can find a practical solution and move forward.
- Wayne Dennison states I find the notion that this Applicant went and cleared more than 30,000 square feet of land without anyone's permission to do it staggering. I simply

- Wayne Dennison states I find the notion that this Applicant went and cleared more than 30,000 square feet of land without anyone's permission to do it staggering. I simply cannot understand given the fact that we have been at this for months, that they didn't know you can't just go in and bulldoze on the Town of Duxbury. It's flat out ridiculous
- Pater Freeman states I respectfully disagree, they made sure they were outside of the jurisdictional area, I can't say that they shouldn't have but I wasn't familiar with it as it wasn't part of the 40B application. I am not downgrading people being upset. There was nothing to gain for them, to undergo this process. We accept the responsibility and criticism and shame on us
- Wayne Dennison states ok, Jim would you like to talk about this at all
- James Wasielewski states sure, timing is everything; Joe Grady, the Conservation Agent alerted me to this situation. I ran this by Town Counsel and because there is no Comprehensive Permit issued at this time, the zoning Bylaw does apply here, so we had to issue the stop work order. I think that I understand what they were trying to do.
- Wayne Dennison states it seems clear to me that you don't have to clear 30,000 square feet to do the kind of work they were doing here, but Mr. Webb, why don't we hear from you
- Greg Webb states ok, the Engineers were asking us to do additional test pits. Last year we went in and conducted 40-50 without disturbing anything. This year they told us we needed to test on a ridge and drill 20 feet deep and I don't know who would go down to that hole to do a perc test. So in order to do these test holes, we needed to secure an area to stockpile the stumps and soil, to do a safe test. We needed an area to safely stockpile that material. Did I know that that rule was in place, no. Did we cross a line, yes. We shouldn't have cleared 30,000 sq. ft or 42,000 square feet is what we actually cleared. We only had to clear one acre and left the other 20 acres alone. I have building homes for decades and have never had a stop work order issued, this doesn't happen with us. I don't know of any other town that has that 30,000 sq. ft. rule, maybe they do, but I was not aware of it and the Board of health was on board with us digging these holes. I put the ridge in the middle of the site, to keep it safe. All of those trees that came down, would have come down once we get the permits. Again, I don't want to start off on the wrong foot. I want to put my best foot forward and we aren't trying to sidestep or rush this project. Again, I apologize
- Emmett Sheehan states it is what it is and you really did start off on the wrong foot. The neighbors are not happy with this. We'll have to move on, but this was a dumb thing to do-point blank, sorry
- Peter Freeman states we fully understand
- Wayne Dennison states this provision of the bylaw is now part of two lawsuits over the past 4 years, this has been a contentious issue in this town. For a 40B developer to just come in and do this is quite frankly incomprehensible. Whether or not it was a good faith mistake, I will accept it was a mistake. We're going to take some time to figure out how to address this. Can we hear from other members of the public
- Richard Prone states just from the outside looking in, I did read the Bylaw 611.2 and 611.3 and there is no ambiguity there.

- Philip Thorn states I agree this is an infraction, but the Bylaw states the land clearing is up to the Planning Board. I don't think this is necessary to pontificate and shame them, let's kick it to the Planning Board and move to the next item on the Agenda. What punitive measure can we take against the Developer
- Wayne Dennison states I respect your comments, but adamantly disagree. Quite frankly the way these process work is to the extent the 40B Developer needs approval from other Boards. I see this as an exercise in public responsibility. I am willing to say they made a good faith mistake but I am not willing to sit here and say here is how we fix it tomorrow. We need to hear from Town Counsel. I have been doing this a long time and this is the first stop work order I have seen on a project.
- Peter Freeman states Mr. Chair id I may, I appreciate what Mr. Thorn said, I do agree, shame on us. We are not trying to get around or out of anything. We didn't apply for the special permit waiver, so if they hadn't jumped the gun and the plans were approved, we wouldn't need the permit. I just wanted to clarify that
- Emmett Sheehan states you used the word if three times. This has occurred in town a lot, which is why there is a bylaw in place
- James Wasielewski states so in my experience, how we resolve stop work orders, they do happen and we try to work with people to get them compliant. The mistake has happened and we have to find a way to resolve it
- Wayne Dennison states Jim, how do you think we resolve it
- Jim Wasielewski states well there are a couple of ways, one, if we could compartmentalize the violation and ask the Board where they stand. I kind of look at it like, if we can compartmentalize this would they have a favorable vote. It is in the Boards hands on how you want to handle it.
- Wayne Dennison states so the point is if they had the Comprehensive permit in hand, they could have done what they had done, I get that. They don't, so let's talk about the comprehensive permit. We have the draft decision from the applicant, we have the comments from town counsel, although we just received them yesterday, right Lauren
- Lauren Haché states that is correct Mr. Chairman
- Peter Freeman states no disrespect to you, but your Counsel did have the draft for over a month and only just got the comments to us yesterday. Which, she really didn't revise all that much, so I am confident we can come to an agreement.
- Wayne Dennison states okay, I would like to make this work as efficiently as possible. Should we start with the waivers
- Peter Freeman states sure, that is totally appropriate and they go through the waivers
- Kathleen Muncey points out item number 44 which asks for relief from article 611 of the bylaw
- Wayne Dennison states so you clearly knew about the Bylaw section 611
- Peter Freeman explains it's looking for special permit relief
- Wayne Dennison states it's clear that the applicant had to know the existence of article 611 or this wouldn't have been in the draft
- Peter Freeman agrees
- Kyle Devinish, Outback Engineering explains the 75 foot buffer along the streetline

- Wayne Dennison states can you share your screen
- Kyle Devinish explains he doesn't have the pdf
- Wayne Dennison states Lauren you do
- Lauren Haché shares her screen
- Kyle Devinish states site layout and materials and begins to explain the buffer and the plan
- Wayne Dennison states does the Board have any questions about the buffer waivers
- Peter Freeman continues going through the waiver requests with Kyle Devinish
- Wayne Dennison state the waiver that caught my eye has to do with emergency vehicles turning radius
- Kyle Devinish states yes
- Wayne Dennison states one of things we're asked to look at has to do with safety and this is asking for a waiver of something like this
- Kyle Devinish states it has allow for emergency vehicles can turn around and exit the site safely
- Therese DiMuzio states can I ask a question, on the new plans it doesn't show the septic system but on the original it shows the septic system and leaching field border the wetlands
- Kyle Devinish states the leaching field is in the central area and anything to do with the septic system is outside of the 100 foot vegetation buffer.
- Teresa DiMuzio states so it's not marked
- Kyle Devinish states this is the landscape plan. The grading and utility sheet plan is where the septic plan is located. We do have to comply with the State Title V regulations
- Rich Prone states I would like to as a questions, given the Baker Polito bill passed about the 3 feet from a curbed sidewalk and speaks about how this is the worst section of Lincoln Street
- Wayne Dennison states my recollection is that the Applicant is willing to put in a sidewalk along the frontage of their development. Has the Applicant looked at the Baker Polito proposal
- Peter Freeman states I don't know, we can put in the sidewalk but we don't have the authority to widen roads
- Rich Prone states the distance between the two entrances is short, can the ZBA request the Applicants to build a nice sidewalk the length of your frontage
- Teresa DiMuzio states I want a point of reference, we had an older woman walking on Lincoln Street and it ended up that a policeman went by and he ended up pulling over and called another officer and an ambulance. As I went out to see what was happening, the first responders stated this is a very treacherous road to navigate and more importantly walk. Also, while I was in town hall, there were notations of 9.8 acres of property of endangered species and could you point that out on these blueprints.
- Peter Freeman states that the Engineers have been in touch with the State regarding this matter. The indication is that there is enough open space required by the state

- Kyle Devinish states you are spot on, Peter. The natural heritage boundary is on the south portion of the site. This will come up with the Conservation Commission and the Natural Heritage Commission and State
- Wayne Dennison explains that this process, we are not being asked to waive anything that pertains to endangered species correct
- Peter Freeman states correct
- Wayne Dennison states let's get back to the waivers
- Peter Freeman continues with reading the waivers
- Kyle Devinish states so title v is 4 and 5 feet and Duxbury is 5 to 6 feet, so it would be a 1 foot deviant
- Freeman Boynton Jr states and you're expecting to be that close to the groundwater
- Kyle Devinish states yes, based on the preliminary test pits
- Freeman Boynton Jr states one of the most important rules and regs. the Board of Health has is the separation of groundwater, in my opinion
- Kyle Devinish states we are proposing an advanced denitrification program which would limit the nitrogen into the ground
- Peter Freeman states that is why Pat Brennan was ok with this
- Wayne Dennison states ok, so there was some concerns with Residents about not initial testing done relative to nitrogen loads
- Peter Freeman states I remember the discussion, you can guess what's out there, you can do the perc tests and soils and other existing environmental testing
- Kyle Devinish states regarding the nitrogen loading, the town has to consider the other complexed here
- Wayne Dennison states it does seem to me that the folks that follow you is that you have to deal with existing conditions on the ground
- Kyle Devinish states that is true, as Peter said we do have to deal with what is on the ground and accounted for this in our nitrogen calculations.
- Wayne Dennison states Freeman, you probably understand this better than anyone else on the Board, are you comfortable with this
- Freeman Boynton Jr states maybe a test well ought to be drilled to see how much nitrogen is in it
- Peter Freeman states we are following your Appendix G and Title V and we're not trying to get around that, Jim Pavlik and Pat Brennan worked together on this.
- Kyle Devinish states the waiver is from how the calculation is performed rather than the nitrogen level
- Peter Freeman states numbers 52 and 53 get into the specifics and Kyle can explain that now
- Kyle Devinish states so the Duxbury Wetland regulations are more stringent than the Wetlands Protection Act, so anything within the 100 foot buffer would need an NOI. So we are asking for a waiver to 25 feet from wetlands for driveways, decks etc. All of the foundations are over 50 feet, but there is work within the 100 foot, so we will be filing with the State

- Wayne Dennison states ok, so there are state requirements with DEP you will have to comply with and get permits regardless correct
- Peter Freeman states yes, through your Conservation Commission
- Wayne Dennison states so on top of what the State had for regulations, the Town has even more strict requirements on top of what the State says, right
- Peter Freeman states right
- Freeman Boynton Jr states I don't see anything that doesn't meet the regulations, it looks to me that you meet them
- Peter Freeman states that Outback tried really hard to meet them
- Wayne Dennison states my problem with this is that it is a Plan waiver and I am not sure this is something; there is a real hesitance with this
- Peter Freeman states I don't have any problem with that
- Wayne Dennison states I would personally like to know what plans would be problematic under the Duxbury wetland rules
- Kyle Devinish states I think I misspoke, the part in item 53, the project does comply, the waiver is for specifically to not account the 100foot buffer to account
- Peter Freeman states the last two 54 and 55 are tied together that relates to tree cutting as it relates to a scenic way, rather than needing to go to the Planning Board
- Kyle Devinish states yes at the entrance ways there will be tree cutting and also where the slopes are on either side of the entrance at the slopes.
- Freeman Boynton Jr states the widening of the front by 15 feet will need you to cut a million trees but that is pretty important for the safety along that road
- Wayne Dennison states alright, so I know that you will need to confer with Town Counsel, I don't know what to do with her comments. I think we need her for that
- Peter Freeman states I understand.
- Wayne Dennison states does the Board have questions about anything we discussed tonight
- Freeman Boynton Jr states I have a couple miscellaneous questions
- Wayne Dennison states perfect
- Freeman Boynton Jr states the access to Modoc St is that going to go through the Clubhouse driveway
- Kyle Devinish states yes, as access way with parking to the side
- Freeman Boynton Jr states also, while looking at the GIS map, on Mayflower street there is a tight turn at the southerly side of the project and there is a slope there
- Kyle Devinish states I will have to examine that
- Freeman Boynton Jr states it looks like you're doing some grading when you demo the existing house. Could we kick that up a notch at the southerly entrance
- Kyle Devinish states we can look at that along the property line, but this is a possibility
- Freeman Boynton Jr states I think within reason of the Abutter. Also, where the grade drops off, further north on the property, maybe some thinning of the trees north of the north entrance
- Kyle Devinish states that is active grading proposed, so those trees will get thinned
- Freeman Boynton Jr states how about another 100 feet for the site distance at the curve

- Kyle Devinish states in general we have to maintain a buffer from the wetlands there
- Freeman Boynton Jr states and what do you guys think about putting in a sidewalk, we haven't nailed that down yet.
- Peter Freeman states we haven't had this discussion about doing a sidewalk beyond the two entrances, but we can be agreeable
- Greg Webb states I think we decided to let the Board decide this
- Kathleen Muncey states but it's not in the draft decision right now, right
- Peter Freeman states I am pretty sure it is, let me find it
- Wayne Dennison states but we don't have a plan with it yet
- Kathleen Muncey states we need to know how much frontage
- Freeman Boynton Jr states how about a sidewalk from the southerly end up to basin 1
- Peter Freeman states we can discuss it, unless Greg wants to speak to it
- Greg Webb states I believe we can make a condition for this
- Wayne Dennison states if you can do that, this would great due to the enormous amount of residents concerned
- Freeman Boynton Jr states between basin 1 and the southerly property line, you could just lay some asphalt
- Greg Webb agrees, we have the space to put in a grass sidewalk or paved, whatever you want
- Freeman Boynton Jr states going north of infiltration basin 1 puts you in to the old cranberry bogs
- Wayne Dennison states I think a paved sidewalk would be better
- Emmett Sheehan agrees
- Wayne Dennison states how do we move forward, relative to the fact there is a stop work order, what has to happen right now
- Peter Freeman states, based on Valerie Massard's suggestion with Planning, we should meet with Pat Brennan and do a site visit and perhaps proceed with the perc tests
- Wayne Dennison states ok, so the notion that we will have a further hearing, work on a sidewalk plan and the decision and waiver changes with Town Counsel, what if we leave the land clearing issue in the hands of Mr. Wasielewski and Ms. Massard and they can handle that in the interim
- Peter Freeman states I appreciate that and I agree
- Wayne Dennison states Jim are you ok with that
- Jim Wasielewski states yes
- Wayne Dennison states how quickly do you think we can get back here to finalize things
- Peter Freeman states I would say two weeks
- Freeman Boynton Jr states I would love to see you guys meet the 6 foot water separation and a sidewalk
- Wayne Dennison states Lauren when can we take this up
- Lauren Haché states June 10th or June 24th
- Wayne Dennison moves to continue the public hearing to June 10, 2021 at 7:30pm

Motion: It was moved, seconded and unanimously voted continue the public hearing to June 10, 2021.

Moved by: WD

Seconded by: ES

Number in favor: 5

Number Opposed: 0

BOARD OF APPEALS — MINUTES

Case No: 2021-13

Petitioner: Camilla Hammer

C/O Jessica Williams

Address: 1 Abrams Hill

Date: May 27, 2021 Time: 7:30 p.m.

Members present: Wayne Dennison, Judith Barrett, Kathleen Muncey, Philip Thorn & Borys Gojnycz

Members Voting: Wayne Dennison, Judith Barrett, Kathleen Muncey, Philip Thorn & Borys Gojnycz

Other persons present at the hearing: James Wasielewski, Director of Municipal Services & Lauren Haché, Administrative Assistant

- Wayne Dennison opens the public hearing and reads the public hearing notice. Mr. Dennison continues to read the case response memos from the various town board including the Planning Board, the Conservation Commission, the Board of Health and the Design Review Board that states there has been a new designed retained for the project, so they have nothing meaningful to review at this time. Lauren did we receive anything else
- Lauren Haché states we received the new plans today, a plot plan and architectural drawings
- Wayne Dennison states lets have the Applicant, it appears to me that Jessica Williams will be representing the Applicant
- Jessica Williams explains the project, two dwellings on one lot. The Builder requested I come out and put together some quick drawings, at that time I let the builder know that there are in fact two dwellings on one lot and then I put together the application package. That is why there are some pretty simple drawings on my part. It is an old Sears's cottage that is practically in the marsh. The plan is to move the entire structure back and being that it is old the building needs to be rebuilt, it would not survive the move. During all of this time, the Home Owner whom I have never met, retained a new designer and they have provided some sketches. What I have decided to do, is go ahead and provide the information because I feel the design we have received today is not significantly different. There is no non-conforming issue, it's just the simple two dwellings on one lot. This has been previously approved by ConComm.
- Wayne Dennison states so, Joe Grady said that this is moving from where it was originally approved and thus needs more permitting
- Jessica Williams states my apologies, that is correct, a condition would be Conservation approval. Jessica Williams shares her screen and shows the plans and sketches. The

proposed cottage is smaller in square footage with a 100 foot deck. It is still going to be in a FEMA zone, so it will still need to be built on piles or concrete blocks.

- Wayne Dennison states so has the cottage been actively used
- Jessica Williams states I believe so, yes
- Wayne Dennison states how do we know that, if it hasn't been used for two years, then the use is discontinued and we can't approve this
- Jessica Williams states I will have to speak with the property owner to confirm this. The cottage gets flooded and then cleaned back up on an annual basis. When I went to the cottage to take dimensions, there were beds, stove and kitchen, so it was used recently. I believe every summer it gets put back into use.
- Wayne Dennison states what is the site coverage now
- Jessica Williams states the existing is 745 square feet and proposed is 738 square feet, so it's very similar
- Wayne Dennison states what about the other dwelling on the property
- Jessica Williams states 2,145 square feet, outside of the coastal bank area and a total property is 74, 900 square feet total
- Wayne Dennison states does the Board have questions
- Kathleen Muncey states I don't think we have enough information
- Borys Gojnycz states I agree, sounds like the application isn't complete, is there a miss-referenced rule
- Wayne Dennison state well, the public hearing notice is correct, so that problem is remedied. I have an issue that the Design Review Board hasn't weighed in
- Jessica Williams states I let the DRB know at the time, that the drawings were going to change. All parties involved that the shift in these changes, would most likely result in a continuation
- Wayne Dennison states I am troubled with the line changes and the lack of comment from the Design Review Board
- Philip Thorn states I have concerns over this entire application with Jessica Williams representing and not the designer. I feel like the home owner and new designer should start from scratch
- Wayne Dennison states well, we can condition around Con Comm. and Board of health, but I can't see acting on this until we have someone explain how the cottage was previously used and quite frankly have them propose to the DRB what they are proposing to do.
- Jessica Williams states it would be preferable to continue the case rather than start from scratch, I would be in agreement to work with the Home Owner in order to keep this project moving forward. It does take time, so we would like to continue in order to get our designs and things in order. Apologies for this, I just want to help the Builders out with keeping things moving forward.
- Wayne Dennison states does anyone feel like the Applicant needs to start over? I am sympathetic to Phil, but I think they just need some time and can regroup.
- Kathleen Muncey states I am fine to continue this
- Judith Barrett agrees with a continence

- Wayne Dennison states lets continue this to July, right
- Philip Thorn states if Jessica is in agreement, then I agree with a continuance
- Jessica Williams states for the sake of my colleagues involved, continuing and staying aboard is fine with me
- Wayne Dennison makes a motion to continue the public hearing to July 8, 2021
- Judith Barrett Seconds
- All in favor WD, JB, KM, BG, PT

Motion: It was moved, seconded and unanimously voted continue the public hearing to July 8, 2021.

Moved by: WD

Seconded by: JB

Number in favor: 5

Number Opposed: 0

BOARD OF APPEALS — MINUTES

Case No: 2021-15

Petitioner: Jennifer and Charles McKeag

C/O Jessica Williams

Address: 39 Shipyard Lane

Date: May 27, 2021 Time: 7:30 p.m.

Members present: Wayne Dennison, Judith Barrett, Kathleen Muncey, Philip Thorn & Borys Gojnycz

Members Voting: Wayne Dennison, Judith Barrett, Kathleen Muncey, Philip Thorn & Borys Gojnycz

Other persons present at the hearing: James Wasielewski, Director of Municipal Services & Lauren Haché, Administrative Assistant

- Wayne Dennison opens the public hearing and reads the Public Hearing notice and states we have an application, a memo from the Conservation Administrator, the Planning Board, the Board of Health and the Design Review Board. We have a site plan and architectural plans. Lauren did I miss anything else
- Lauren Haché states we did receive a few letters from Abutters in support
- Wayne Dennison states ok, Jessica please proceed
- Jessica Williams shares her screen and explains the project to the Board. Ms. Williams shows the expansion to the front of the house and addition of an entryway space, connecting the garage to the house and creates a reasonable bedroom with an added dormer to add some head space. We would like to clean up the trim and make the home appear more cohesive. We would like to take the cute little garage and slightly increasing the roof pitch by two feet to make the garage flow with the house
- Wayne Dennison states so Jessica do we have the plan you are showing us
- Jessica Williams states yes
- Wayne Dennison states the plan with the photo shop
- Jessica Williams states no, I can submit that to Lauren right now
- Wayne Dennison states so this is not getting any closer to the property line, you are putting in more volume in the setback.
- Jessica Williams states that is correct
- Wayne Dennison states ok, does the Board have questions
- Kathleen Muncey states is the bump out on the first floor where the pantry is, is that already a two floor
- Jessica Williams states no, that was a single story and shares her screen to show a photo of the existing house and talks about adding a bathroom on the second floor

- Philip Thorn states Jessica, I think I heard you, but would like to confirm, there are no changes in height in any of the roof lines, in particular the garage
- Jessica Williams states to clarify there is no change in height for the main structure, the garage roof, should we decide to move forward, will go up about a foot just to give that ridgeline to match the house
- Jennifer McKeag states we're just trying to match the house, not go steeper, to make it match the house, right now it is very disproportioned
- James Wasielewski states Jessica can you put the plot plan back up on the screen, I can't read the numbers on the plan in front of me
- Wayne Dennison states this is Jessica's favorite part where we do the math
- Jessica Williams states sure and shares her screen and explains the coverage calculation stating the lot area is 8,885 and subtract that number from 20,000 and we end up with 11,115 and 3% of that is 333 square feet which we then add to the 15% so we end up with 1665 sq. feet and we are right in that neighborhood
- Jim Wasielewski state you are right on, thank you
- Wayne Dennison states we have at least one neighbor that is on
- Antonia Shoham, 35 Shipyard Lane, states thank you, I would like to welcome the McKeags to the neighborhood and I am very happy with what they are doing, with one exception, the height will block the sun coming into my kitchen in which I am sitting now and I really don't want to lose any more light in here. If it does go up any more, even a few inches it will directly affect my sunlight. That is my concern, how high is the garage roof going to go
- Jennifer McKeag states that is a fair question, we enjoy living next door to you. From what I understand the four corners will stay the same and the roof would pitch slightly, I am not sure about the centerline will go and Jessica can maybe answer that
- Antonia Shoham states will that garage be used as a garage after this
- Jennifer McKeag states yes
- Charles McKeag states yes, this will be a garage. We're just trying to change the peak slightly
- Antonia Shoham states that is my concern
- Jennifer McKeag states I understand completely
- Antonia Shoham states maybe we could get another drawing from the Architect
- Jessica Williams states ok, we can compromise and draw the new pitch is at a foot or a foot and half. We are trying to make the garage a little more attractive without changing the wall height. Two feet is what it is drawn to now, but I could draw the pitch at 1 ½ feet should Jenny and Charles agree to it, Toni would that be agreeable
- Antonia Shoham states no, as it is now, I would like it to be no more than a foot
- Suzanna Sheehan, Antonia Shohams daughter states I think from the picture of the outside, does not really reflect how it is sitting inside. You are looking directly at that garage. It will make an impact, but lowering it would be wonderful
- Antonia Shoham states I would be happy with no more than a foot

- Jessica Williams states my suggestion to Jenny and Charles, I believe I can make the design more attractive without increasing more than a foot. I do think I need the foot, would you be willing to let me take a look at this
- Jennifer McKeag states that yes, and I know that this is more about consistency from a design standpoint. I just want to make sure that whatever we do, it looks nice.
- Charles McKeag states looking at the garage now, it looks like a home depot shed. I would like to improve the character. Jessica, I have full faith in your ability Jessica.
- Wayne Dennison states we don't typically do this this way, but it is important to have neighbors talk through this. My suggestion is to approve this at no greater than one foot on the ridgeline. In the event the Applicants come back, we could do that with another permit.
- Jessica Williams states may I ask Jenny and Charles, if this is acceptable or should we come back to have a higher ridgeline and have someone create a mock up and continue our hearing.
- Wayne Dennison states that is fine
- Jessica Williams states Jenny and Charles states what is your thought
- Jennifer McKeag states I would need to see the new proposal. We are only asking for a small section, we tried to steer our whole project to keep this area as unaffected as possible. At the end of the day, if we spend all this money, I would like to see what we can get
- Wayne Dennison states well, let's continue this to another date. Why don't we continue this and see what you folks and your neighbor can work out that doesn't have to happen on tv.
- Jenny and Charles McKeag laugh and state that is fair
- Wayne Dennison states July 8th
- Jessica Williams states that is great
- Wayne Dennison moves to continue to July 8
- Judith Barrett seconds
- WD, JB, KM, BG, PT
- Wayne Dennison states thanks folks, this is very heartening to see folks and neighbors that want to work together
- Jessica Williams states that she will be putting this entire project into a 3D mode

Motion: It was moved, seconded and unanimously voted continue the public hearing to July 8, 2021.

Moved by: WD

Seconded by: JB

Number in favor: 5

Number Opposed: 0