

**TOWN OF NEW BOSTON
NEW BOSTON ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
Minutes of 2022**

February 15, 2021

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Zoning Board of Adjustment Chairman David Craig. Present were regular members David Craig, Michael Dahlberg, Kenneth Clinton and Anthony Olivier. Also present was alternate member, Lorraine McKim and Planning Coordinator Shannon Silver. Absent was Wayne Charest.

Approval of the minutes of November 16, 2021 and January 18, 2022, unanimous.

ADAM DONOVAN & BRITTANY LOVELESS (PROPERTY OWNERS)

Application for a variance to the terms of Article II, Section 204.4, of the New Boston Zoning Ordinance.

Property located at 24 Lorden Road, Tax Map/Lot # 12/19-20
Residential-Agricultural "R-A" District

Chairman David Craig stated that the Board has an application for a variance from Article II, Section 204.4, the applicants are Adam Donovan and Brittany Loveless, owners of the property at 24 Lorden Road in the "R-A" Zone, and this is a request for a variance to waive the 20' side setback line to allow the construction of a garage. Chairman Craig then asked the applicant, Adam Donovan to make his presentation on what he is doing, and what the problem is, and why he needs the variance. He asked the applicant to give the Board the facts first, and then when the Board knows what is happening here, he (the applicant) could speak to the criteria of the Ordinance.

Applicant Adam Donovan then addressed the Board, thanking the Board for giving him the time to address them, he advised his wife is at home with his daughter, so he was representing both of them. Mr. Donovan stated that they have lived at 24 Lorden Road for about two years now, having moved there in March, 2020, and the application they are submitting is to construct a 24' x 24' detached garage. He stated that it would be within the 20' setback of the neighboring property, Lot # 19-21. Mr. Donovan said there is a survey that he had done, and asked if the Board had access to see that, and that he does have another copy of that if needed. Chairman Craig asked if this was the site survey by Jeffrey Land Survey, LLC, Mr. Donovan stated that it was the same, and that the Board could see at the front point it would be roughly 11.2' from the side setback, and at the rear point it would be roughly 12.2', and as far as the criteria he asked the Board if they wanted him to move the criteria as to the facts supporting it. Chairman Craig advised that before the applicant talked about the criteria, he asked the applicant why that particular spot. Mr. Donovan advised that based around where the existing driveway is now, it's the only spot that seems to conform to the existing property layout, with where the driveway is currently located. Chairman Craig then asked the applicant to continue. Mr. Donovan went on to say the construction itself, in support of item no. 1, it would not be contrary to public interest

TOWN OF NEW BOSTON
NEW BOSTON ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
Minutes of 2022

1 because it would increase the taxable value of the property, and the structure would conform to
2 the existing construction quality and aesthetic of the existing home and other homes in the area,
3 if this variance were granted the spirit of the Ordinance would be observed because the
4 construction will not have an undue adverse effect on adjacent property, and the character of the
5 neighborhood, traffic conditions, utilities, and other areas related to public health (that is a quote
6 from Article 401.3(F)). Mr. Donovan stated that no. 3 speaks to the justice of granting the
7 variance, the items in this section he does not necessarily feel are required to be shared, but he
8 mentions it because he feels it provides some context, that the need for the variance stems from
9 the existing placement of the home, which was altered from the original plans by the property
10 developer, the lot was developed, he assumes, to minimize alteration of the natural site features
11 as written in Article 401.3(C), and that did move the existing location of the driveway from a
12 different place than it was originally proposed to be, and he has pictures of the original plot
13 design, showing that originally the developer had intended to place the center of the driveway 40'
14 from the property line, and those plans were deterred from, based on what he believes were the
15 existing layout of the lot itself, the shape and content. Chairman Craig stated that it would be
16 helpful if the applicant could show the Board what he is referring to. Mr. Donovan then
17 approached the table and passed out copies of what he was referring to, to the Board. Chairman
18 Craig asked the applicant to show the Board what they are looking at. Mr. Donovan stated the
19 documents were from the Town records of the original proposed usage of the lot, as far as the
20 layout, and advised the Board that the original design would have had the driveway center about
21 40' from the edge of the neighboring lot, and at some point during the construction of the home
22 they did alter that plan and built the existing driveway within the 20' setback. Applicant went on
23 to state that he had a picture of the original design, which was also altered from, and he doesn't
24 believe that at any point there were updated designs of the actual home submitted or approved,
25 and he is not referencing that because he has an issue with it, but he does believe it provides
26 some context as to why this variance is needed, and stated that in the original design the septic
27 was supposed to be in the back half of the house, and it actually ended up in the front half of the
28 house closer to the road, and the original design would have had a two-car garage within where
29 the driveway is going, where he wants the new garage to go, but he believes because of the
30 movement of that driveway into the setback they altered the actual original design, he is not
31 critiquing anything on the Town's part or the developer's part, but he thinks it is contextual for
32 the conversation about this variance. Chairman Craig asked if Mr. Donovan stated that the septic
33 system is in the front of the house, not the back of the house, Mr. Donovan stated that was
34 correct. Chairman Craig asked what year the house was built, the applicant stated 2018, and that
35 the design the Board was looking at was the only design he could find on file in the office.
36 Chairman Craig asked Shannon if you could put a driveway in a side setback, Shannon stated
37 yes, and she stated that this plan that they are referencing was actually done by Coco Cormier,
38 and then the developer changed engineers, and that had a lot to do with the plan design change,
39 lot configuration change, this is an Open Space Subdivision, and she feels that it something
40 important to note too, the lot configuration is much smaller, and that he is covered on a couple of
41 sides by some drainage easements, Chairman Craig asked about the change in engineers,
42 Shannon stated yes, and the plan designs were changed pretty extensively midway through, and a
43 new surveyor took over the project, she stated that she doesn't know that the driveway location
44 ended up being changed she thinks because of the plan design, not necessarily anything to do
45 with house location, but that you can put a driveway there as it's a non-structure. Chairman

TOWN OF NEW BOSTON
NEW BOSTON ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
Minutes of 2022

1 Craig stated that by sticking the house that far to the side...Mr. Donovan stated it limits what you
2 can do with the lot, because you can't really use that portion to the eastern side or the right side
3 of the lot, because the house is so far up against Lot # 19-21, that would be the one to the west.
4 Chairman Craig asked if it was correct that he could not move the driveway or put the garage on
5 the other side of the house because he would be over the septic system, if that is part of the issue.
6 Mr. Donovan stated that would be part of the issue, and also just the natural slope of the land
7 there is very sharp, which he believes is why the original plans were altered in the beginning,
8 because the slope there is very steep on that portion of the property, and so the buildable section
9 of the lot was moved further than normal or similar in other lots in the same area. Chairman
10 Craig asked him to continue. The applicant stated item no. 4, if the variance were granted the
11 values of surrounding properties would not be diminished, the construction quality would meet
12 the quality and aesthetic of existing homes within the neighborhood, article 5 for the first item,
13 he said this speaks to what they were talking about previously, no fair and substantial
14 relationship exists between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the
15 specific application of that provision to the property because the sharp slope on the eastern most
16 side of the property limits the buildable portion of the lot and prevents this lot space from being
17 utilized to the same extent as neighboring lots, this forces the buildable portion of land with the
18 side setback and he cites 401.3 (G) which promotes diversity and originality in the lot layout, and
19 form item no. ii, the proposed use is reasonable because it best conforms with the existing
20 driveway placement and causes no harm to public interests. Chairman Craig thanked Mr.
21 Donovan, and asked the Board if they had questions. Mr. Olivier asked the applicant what the
22 distance was between the house and the proposed garage. Mr. Donovan stated the distance is
23 between 7' and 8', from where the proposed garage would be and the existing home, on the side
24 of the home he stated there is a couple of things that would prevent this project as being done as
25 an attachment, that the electrical utilities do run right there on that side in between the driveway
26 and the back of the home, there's also an existing fireplace that is on that side, and that you could
27 see where the back deck is, the well was actually placed right to the corner of that back deck, and
28 he believes attaching it there would make it more difficult to access the well in the future. Mr.
29 Dahlberg asked the applicant if he could slide the garage back behind the deck, or add on to the
30 existing garage towards the road. The applicant stated that you couldn't add it to the front as that
31 part does actually have the septic, and as far as pushing it to the back he doesn't believe it's
32 feasible because the slope that is on the eastern side of the property does also slope towards the
33 back, and that is where the existing well is, so to try and push it in that direction he believes
34 would cause an issue with that. Mr. Olivier asked if the well was by the corner of the driveway.
35 The applicant showed the Board a photo showing where it was, and that in that area the gas line
36 would also have to be moved, and stated where the well is it does drop down in the back.
37 Chairman Craig asked if there was an existing garage on the property, the applicant stated that
38 there is a 2-car stall garage attached, and that you would pull into the right. Chairman Craig
39 stated he didn't realize there was an existing garage there, and asked if this would be a second
40 garage, the applicant stated yes, Mr. Olivier asked what the purpose of the second garage was,
41 and the applicant stated to store vehicles, he has three vehicles registered at that property and he
42 intends to possibly buy a fourth. Board member Kenneth Clinton then stated that he wanted to
43 go back to the applicant's understanding of the Open Space Division, and asked the applicant if
44 he understood what an Open Space Subdivision is, and that it is open lots and how they are
45 designed. The applicant stated that he believed so. Mr. Clinton went on to state that this allows

TOWN OF NEW BOSTON
NEW BOSTON ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
Minutes of 2022

1 the developer to reduce the lot size and frontage, to then condense and have a more dense,
2 compact development, which reduces the infrastructure too, and the trade-off is that there is a lot
3 more open space on the property to have left as forest and undisturbed area, and therefore it is a
4 bit of a trade off, and it comes with, in this case, he has 150' of frontage where 200' is the
5 requirement, 2 acres is the requirement for a lot size and he has 1.4 acres, and that he purchased a
6 substandard lot, and are asking for a higher density use on a lot that wasn't designed for it. Mr.
7 Clinton went on to say he looks at the side setback and in the applicant's particular case as even
8 more important than if it was a standard subdivision or a standard lot that's not part of a
9 development where it may be extremely reasonable to go into the side setback; here your
10 incursion into the side setback drastically affects the abutter, Mr. Clinton said he did drive by the
11 property and took a couple of pictures which he showed to the Board and the applicant, and
12 stated he took a picture of the applicant's house and the abutter's house. Chairman Craig asked
13 the applicant to confirm they were pictures of his house, which he did. Mr. Clinton advised that
14 he believed the surveyor must have stuck a couple of long stakes on the applicant's lawn, and the
15 applicant confirmed this, and Mr. Clinton stated he also took a picture of straight down the lot
16 line between the applicant's house and his neighbor's house so he could understand where this
17 was proposed, and he stated that he didn't realize until he was on the site that the applicant
18 already has a two-car garage already built onto the house, so what the applicant is asking for is
19 an additional two-car garage, which is fantastic, he wished he had 4 cars and extra garage space
20 to store them, however, he is concerned that perhaps the garage could have been placed in a
21 different spot, perhaps not attached given the utilities, and the fireplace vent, and he suspects that
22 it could be pushed back quite a bit, right to the tree line, where he has his fire pit, and he thinks
23 that is a very logical place to put it, and then possibly shift it off the lines, so he is not looking for
24 a variance at all, so he looks at this location as more of a want as opposed to a need, and he also
25 has some concerns about how close to the lot line, and there is no buffer, there are no trees, and
26 he thinks the neighbor has a couple of small trees that are more landscaping and decorative, but
27 there is nothing between you two, and the picture that the applicant provided for the sample
28 garage, he believes the applicant's application says it is architecturally and aesthetically similar,
29 and Mr. Clinton disagrees, the garage looks fairly utilitarian, and does not, in his opinion, match
30 the aesthetics of the applicant's home nor the abutter's home in type and style, and he is
31 concerned by that, and the most important part of the garage is probably the side view from your
32 abutter; are they looking at just a blank wall with a roof, and then when they look out their
33 windows from their yard they are going to see one large mass of detached garage with no
34 aesthetics at all really, or architectural detail, which then blends into your entire house and the
35 side of your house, so all he'll [abutter] see is garage, 4 bays' worth of garage is what they will
36 experience, and Mr. Clinton was very interested to see if the abutters would show up, or provide
37 any correspondence tonight, either in support or opposition, he is surprised that they are not
38 participating, and as far as the topography goes, upon looking at the initial plan he recognizes
39 from both of these that the applicant's house is built with fill around it so your transition from the
40 road to your house, your house is actually acting as...Mr. Clinton asked if there was a walk-out
41 there, the applicant stated there was a walk-out basement, Mr. Clinton said that makes sense
42 from what he sees on the topography, he went on to say, however, that on the left side, the
43 driveway side, suggests that there is not a bad spot to place the garage, that actually the
44 topography would not prevent you, the applicant may not want it there, but he believes he could
45 put it there without seeking a variance, so he has some troubles with that. Mr. Donovan asked if

TOWN OF NEW BOSTON
NEW BOSTON ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
Minutes of 2022

1 he could speak to the neighbors and the Lot # 19-21 comment, and was told yes. Mr. Donovan
2 stated he does not have anything officially written from them, and that he did discuss it verbally
3 with them, and that he did also post on a Facebook group that the neighborhood all has access to,
4 and that they have confirmed to him that they do not have an issue with it, that they said they
5 actually thought it was a good idea. Mr. Clinton stated that, that was good anecdotal
6 information, though without them expressly stating their support the Board has to assume that
7 they are least not opposed since they chose not to be here and provide that information.
8 Chairman Craig stated that their [neighbors] support does not determine the Board's decision,
9 and that from a zoning perspective the Board is looking at the whole provision. Mr. Clinton
10 stated that, to him, the overriding factor is that this is part of an open space subdivision, with
11 reduced frontages which means the development is already condensed, already has tighter
12 spacing between homes, and in this case there is no buffer whatsoever between homes, and as he
13 goes through the five criteria, quite frankly, he doesn't believe any of the five criteria have been
14 met; he would be happy to hear any more comments from the applicant or the Board, but he has
15 a difficult time with this, probably if it was in a conventional subdivision or in a lot that was not
16 part of a subdivision, that had a lot more buffer, a lot more separation, he might feel differently,
17 but in this particular case, in these circumstances, he has a hard time supporting the variance.
18 Mr. Dahlberg stated that he concurs on every single point, and he agrees with Mr. Clinton's
19 position. Mr. Donovan asked if he could speak to the aesthetic. Chairman Craig stated yes. The
20 applicant said this was a sample photo of a project which the contractor he proposes to be using
21 did, and that it would not be identical to what he would be using, for example, on the main home,
22 on the roofline, on his existing home where the A[s] come down, where the roof kind of goes
23 back in, gable, that would be one of the aspects of the garage to associate it more closely with the
24 look of the home, and as far as other aesthetics he is certainly hoping to try and match in other
25 ways as well. Chairman Craig asked if the applicant could clarify that he testified earlier that the
26 property drops off in the back, where does it drop off and could he show the Board on one of the
27 plans where it drops off and suggested they use the materials the applicant used for his narrative,
28 that he (Chairman Craig) doesn't see any topographic lines on them, but asked where it starts to
29 drop off. Mr. Donovan approached the Board and indicated that when you are at the back point
30 where the deck is, there is a drop there that starts to go down this way (indicating down to the
31 right back of the property when looking at the front of the property), and it also drops back as it
32 goes back towards this direction here (indicating down to the left in the back of the property).
33 Mr. Olivier asked where the walkout is, and Mr. Donovan stated that the walkout is down in the
34 back corner, the back right. Chairman Craig asked how much from the walkout does it drop off
35 quick. Mr. Olivier pointed to where he thought the walkout was, and if it was in another area,
36 the ground starts dropping off in another area, it is going to get steep quick, he asked if there was
37 a retaining wall there. The applicant stated there is a small retaining wall about 15' or so from
38 the back corner that holds the ground there, and then from there it's like a 10' drop from the start
39 of that retaining wall to the areas back in this direction (indicating back to the edge of the
40 property in the back of the house). Chairman Craig stated that assuming that this plan is
41 dimensionally correct, why can't he (the applicant) pull it back and put the garage back here
42 (indicating a point further back behind the house). Mr. Donovan stated he did not believe that he
43 would be able to be within the setback back in the area (indicated by Chairman Craig), he
44 believes there would be too much groundwork that would need to be done in the area (indicated
45 by Chairman Craig), and that it would also place the garage between the well and the rest of the

TOWN OF NEW BOSTON
NEW BOSTON ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
Minutes of 2022

1 existing home, he stated it becomes a much more encompassing project at that point, and as far
2 as the beauty of the lot and the enjoyment of the lot he doesn't think it would look better
3 personally if they are talking about how it would look for the neighbors or for people driving by,
4 he thinks having the garage that far from the existing home would actually look more unusual
5 than the position he is proposing. Mr. Olivier stated if he put the garage here or here (indicating
6 further back on the property) it is going to block the well either way. Mr. Clinton stated it is a
7 trade off with the utilities, either changing the propane tank location and that line verses the line
8 for the well and that line is a lot easier than the line for the propane. Mr. Olivier stated that if it
9 goes in this area (indicating the back of the property) it blocks the well, either way if something
10 goes wrong with the well you (the applicant) is not going to get a rig back there to get to the
11 well, if you put it in your driveway or you put it behind the house on the property. Chairman
12 Craig agreed this was a very good point. Mr. Olivier stated if the applicant had 8' between the
13 house and the new garage that he has now he is about to be over the property line, a little more in
14 the front, but if he pulls it back and shifts it over a little he should be okay. Mr. Donovan stated
15 it would have to go 8' from the line which would put it touching, (Chairman Craig said behind
16 the deck), if it was all the way back there (indicating towards the back of the property), he stated
17 you start to have an issue with again, you have a drop off back there, pointing to the area back
18 there where the fire pit is, the area where the fire pit is, is raised up, but everything around there
19 does drop back and it would require a lot of dirt and excavation to be able to do that, and again...
20 Mr. Olivier stated from that picture there (indicating the picture the applicant submitted with the
21 materials) it drops back and then goes up to the wood line, or this is all (indicating the back of
22 the property) going back to the wood line. Mr. Clinton stated that after the fire pit he suspects it
23 all goes back to the wood line, that he did not walk the applicant's property, he just drove by and
24 witnessed, he sensed that the tree line is lower in the back of the property. Mr. Donovan stated
25 that it is a bit more raised in this area (indicating the back of the property), but it does drop and
26 continues to drop and is a little steeper in this area and all the way towards the back side. Mr.
27 Clinton stated that in addition to a 4' cross wall in the back of the proposed garage it would be 6',
28 and 2' out of the ground. Mr. Olivier stated it was doable. Mr. Clinton stated it is entirely
29 doable. Mr. Dahlberg stated he has seen many garages done like that, where you have 4' in the
30 back and 6' in the front just to make the grades work. Mr. Clinton stated he understands where
31 the applicant is coming from, not trying to ruin his day, but objectively when he looks at this he
32 has concerns on a number of levels and he truly believes that more so where his fire pit area is, is
33 a far more suitable location to not require a variance, which would not seem obtrusive to his
34 neighbor, or in the future to people who may buy that home, as opposed to the single massing
35 field of 4 garage bays all at once would have on them, and they may not understand it right now,
36 but he is in this business so he understands it extremely well, and so he thinks that whether it is
37 the exact same garage configuration or certainly a location, he wouldn't need this Board at all, he
38 could just get a building permit and be ready to go, but we are just deliberating right now, this is
39 an open discussion, especially since there are no abutters here, this is a bit of a free-for-all.
40 Chairman Craig stated that his personal opinion is that he guesses he would feel a little
41 differently if he (the applicant) didn't already have a 2 car garage and there was some more
42 space between the lots, that is about as naked and open as it gets, there is just nothing there, and
43 there isn't room to put buffers and things, so he thinks the setbacks are important. Mr. Olivier
44 stated if the applicant really wanted to, he could pull tandem, and just make it longer, that he
45 knows it's a pain to go in and out if you have something behind it, but just build more of a

TOWN OF NEW BOSTON
NEW BOSTON ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
Minutes of 2022

1 tandem garage. Chairman Craig stated even if the applicant's neighbor were here saying "ya, I
2 don't care", it's a planned neighborhood and once somebody does something like this the
3 dominoes start falling and it really changes things. Mr. Olivier stated that he feels there are a
4 couple of more options. Mr. Donovan stated that within the Indian Falls, Lorden Road area there
5 are multiple other homes that do have garages that are larger than 2 stall garages, that it's not
6 uncommon for the neighborhood, there's obviously differences in each lot, but it's not non-
7 conforming to the general type of home in the neighborhood. Mr. Clinton stated he cannot
8 disagree with that, that he drove through the entire development on more than one occasion. Ms.
9 McKim stated it is not a hardship. Mr. Clinton went on to say but at that time it was the original
10 placement of the home without a variance being sought, so these are different circumstances.
11 Mr. Donovan stated he does feel like there was some context provided on the fact that the plans
12 were diverted from initially by the builder, and the actual home itself he is having a little trouble
13 understanding how it got signed off on with the layout that it has, just where the original plans
14 were, moving the septic... Mr. Dahlberg stated (holding the picture of the original plans) that
15 those were just suggestions for the Planning Board so they could see how it the lot could be
16 developed, the plan wasn't approved saying you have to build this on this lot. Mr. Clinton stated
17 those types of plans show something is possible and feasible, but not necessarily the specifics
18 that it will absolutely be built in those particular locations, there a proof that the lot is
19 developable. Chairman Craig asked the applicant had anything else he wanted to add that he
20 thinks the Board hasn't covered. Mr. Donovan stated if the Board feels it would affect your
21 decision to have input from the neighbors he would be happy to come back with that before the
22 Board makes a decision. Chairman Craig stated that in this case it probably wouldn't make a
23 difference in his mind, he can't speak for anyone else, he doesn't feel the applicant meets the
24 criteria, and don't shoot the messengers, they don't write these ordinances, the Town does, and
25 variance laws are supposed to be pretty strict, otherwise the ordinance becomes meaningless.
26 Mr. Olivier stated if the Board were to grant it when you have other options then other people are
27 going to want things like this granted too, and he understands that the applicant is saying that it is
28 going to cost a little bit more money to push it back and everything, but it definitely seems
29 doable. Mr. Donovan stated his main motivation wouldn't be the cost of it, but the actual
30 functionality and layout, he doesn't see that as conforming of a plan as to what's existing there.
31 Chairman Craig stated he would be losing some of his backyard in exchange for the building.
32 Mr. Donovan stated that his only other question would be, right now it's proposed to be roughly
33 3' from the proposed 20' setback, would it make any difference if it was closer to the 20' setback,
34 if it was somewhat smaller and could be 4' from the setback. Chairman Craig stated that he
35 thinks the applicant would have to go through the Building Inspector first. Chairman Craig
36 stated that the applicant can probably see which way this is headed, and to get formal... Mr.
37 Clinton stated before the Board gets formal, he believes there are two options, one they could go
38 through the process of voting and it is likely to fail, can the Board allow the applicant to
39 withdraw the application so that he wouldn't have a denial. Chairman Craig said absolutely.
40 Mr. Clinton went on to say he then wouldn't have a denial on file, and if the applicant chooses to
41 do something slightly different he can come back without fear of it being considered too similar
42 to the previous one. Chairman Craig that he is not sure that it makes any difference one way or
43 the other, but that's certainly a reasonable option. Mr. Donovan stated he would prefer that
44 option at this time. Chairman Craig suggested that maybe the applicant could go back and talk to
45 his contractor, talk to the Building Inspector about other options and see if something else might

TOWN OF NEW BOSTON
NEW BOSTON ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
Minutes of 2022

1 work. Mr. Donovan said he could do that. Mr. Clinton concurred with Shannon on that option,
2 she agreed. Chairman Craig told the applicant he appreciated his time, and the application is
3 withdrawn. Chairman Craig then stated that ended the Public Hearing on that application,
4 advised the applicant that he was welcome to remain. Mr. Donovan stated with all due respect
5 he would probably take off, that he appreciated the Board's time and he will see if there is
6 something else that can be done. Mr. Olivier asked if his electrical service is underground, Mr.
7 Donovan stated that it was, that it runs underneath the driveway from the front of the property,
8 that initially that was one of his considerations, to see if an addition was feasible, and it did not
9 seem to be. Mr. Oliver stated if the applicant got a meter on the outside of the new garage and
10 attach it to the garage, and probably be within the setback, or close to it, and then he would just
11 have to vent his stove in a different way. Mr. Donovan stated he would probably lean more
12 towards that option than moving it back. Mr. Olivier stated that is what he would do. Mr.
13 Donovan stated there are other new homes that were built within the last year or two that have a
14 similar design to his house and he's seen one with a third car garage stall on the side, truth be
15 told he doesn't feel it looks as aesthetically pleasing as a detached structure would be, but he
16 understands that is an option, so he is going to see if it's feasible. Chairman Craig stated don't
17 underestimate what Mr. Olivier was saying about getting a well truck back there, that he has
18 lived here for over 30 years and has had multiple times he has had to have his pump pulled and
19 have his well redrilled. Mr. Olivier stated the pump pulls aren't a concern but the applicant can't
20 put the well anywhere else because he has his septic in the front. Chairman Craig advised that it
21 is important to have access for those trucks because they are huge and if they have to get in there.
22 Chairman Craig again thanked Mr. Donovan, and the applicant thanked the Board and left the
23 meeting.

24
25 Chairman Craig advised that unless there is any other business he would entertain a motion to
26 adjourn.

27
28 Kenneth Clinton made a **MOTION** to adjourn, Anthony Olivier seconded the motion,
29 and it **PASSED** unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

30
31
32 Respectfully submitted,

33
34 Lorraine McKim

Minutes Approved:

March 15, 2022