

David G. Mulvey
Beryl M. Teague
May 8, 2012
7:00 PM

APPROVED
7-9-12

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Steve Barto at 7:00 PM. Roll call attendance was taken.

Present Pete Keefer
 Steve Barto
 Julie Thompson
 Mike Cleere

Absent Ford Knight

Julie Thompson motioned with a second from Pete Keefer to open the public hearing at 7:01 PM. Vote 4/0

Attorney Murray Heaton discussed the map and proposal to subdivide the property. After submitting the application to the Planning Board, they were advised that they needed an area variance first. The Mulvey family purchased the property in 1960, noting that, prior, there were 2 cottages, but one burned down. He passed around two pictures, from the past, showing both structures. He held up exhibit A, see attachment #1, showing all the parcels were 50' lots back in 1934. See Surveyor's Map, attachment #2. He explained that (if approved) Parcel B would be a 50' lot keeping the existing cottage. Parcel A would have a new single residence on a 100' lot. Beryl Teague added that it would be a small cottage, not a year-round big house. It will be compliant with all building requirements. The plan is to remove the pavilion and move the two storage sheds to the woods. The cottage will be built near where the pavilion is now.

Attorney Heaton continued noting that the existing cottage meets the setbacks and the variance is sought only for the width of the lot. There will be separate driveways and separate septic systems. He noted that the existing cottage is consistent with the neighbors. The lot was created in approximately 1934, consistent with the characteristics of the neighborhood.

Mike Cleere motioned with a second from Pete Keefer to close the public hearing at 7:10 PM. Vote 4/0

Mike Cleere motioned with a second from Julie Thompson to discuss and consider the application. Vote 4/0

There was no further discussion.

Criteria for Area Variance

1. Will there be any undesirable changes in the character of the neighborhood, or detriment to the nearby property? All Zoning Board of Appeals members in attendance agreed that there will be no undesirable change.
2. Can the applicant achieve this benefit from some other feasible means other than an area variance? All Zoning Board of Appeals members in attendance agreed that there is no other suitable remedy.
3. Is the area variance requested substantial? All Zoning Board of Appeals members in attendance agreed that the variance requested is substantial.
4. Will the variance have an adverse affect on the physical and environmental condition of the neighborhood? All Zoning Board of Appeals members in attendance agreed there will be no adverse affect.
5. Is this a self-created hardship? All Zoning Board of Appeals members in attendance said no.

Chairman Steve Barto motioned with a second from Mike Cleere to approve the variance requested with a roll call vote:

Steve Barto	Yes
Julie Thompson	Yes
Pete Keefer	Yes
Mike Cleere	Yes
Ford Knight	Absent

Mike Cleere motioned to approve the minutes from the last meeting, 4/28/12, as corrected, with a second from Pete Keefer. Vote 4/0

Pete Keefer motioned to adjourn at 7:17 PM with a second from Julie Thompson. Vote 4/0

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Hensel
ZBA Clerk