Call to order: Vice-Chair Murch called the meeting to order at 7:12 pm

Present: Vice-Chair David Murch; Tom Hennessey and Greg Dean

Staff: Alex Sirois, CEO and Sandy Fredricks, Administrative Assistant/Recording Secretary

Absent: Patricia Beaton

Murch advised that due to the resignation of Len Cirelli, the Board needed to vote for a Chair for this meeting.

Hennessey moved to elect Murch chair of the meeting.
Dean seconded.
Vote: 3/0/0

Old Business

Public Hearing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPLICANT</th>
<th>Robert E Guy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>367 Webbs Mills RD; 010/124/000; Zone R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>Setback Reduction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Murch moved to remove the application from the table
Dean seconded
Vote: 3/0/0

Murch read emails received from Phil Saucier, the Town’s attorney, regarding clarification of Setback Reduction and a Variance

The Board discussed the status of the application and stated the Applicant had done what was required of him. The Board reviewed Article 6 D as it related to the application.

The Board determined that all criteria were met by the applicant.

Hennessy moved to approve a Setback Reduction to 13’1” on the East side of the property.
Dean seconded.
Vote: 3/0/0

It is the sole right and discretion for the Appeals Board to take agenda items out of order.
New Business

Public Hearing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPLICANT</th>
<th>Charles Rogers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>49 Inlet Point Road; 020/007/000; Zone LRR1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>Setback Reduction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Murch asked the applicant to present his case. Applicant stated he wished to construct a 24’ x 22’ garage. He continued he has very limited area where a garage could be built.

Murch asked how much of a reduction was being looked for. Applicant stated he is more than 100’ from the water, more than 20’ from the side and proposing a rear setback of 10’ to 14’.

The Board asked if this is a primary residence as well as if there is an existing survey. Applicant stated this is a seasonal residence and he has a survey from November 20, 2014 but it says it is not a boundary survey.

The Board indicated they were uncertain that the proposed location is 100’ from the water nor did they feel the setback would meet the minimum requirements.

Discussions took place between Board and Applicant regarding survey and distance from the water. Sirois showed the lot on Google Earth stating a ground length of 120’ ±

Murch opened Public Hearing.
Shawn Higgins, 51 Indian Point Road asked which side of the lot the proposed garage would be located. She was concerned about the drainage. Rogers stated it is on the left side opposite the drain.

Murch closed the Public Hearing at 7:55.

Murch stated the Board is uncertain that the 22’ x 24’ garage would fit on the lot and would prefer a survey be done. The Board will accept a lot sketch by a surveyor with their signature and stamp as well as providing an “as built” verification by the surveyor after construction.

Hennessey moved to table the application subject to resubmittal with a dimensional corrected Site Plan survey depicting all setbacks. Dean seconded.
Vote: 3/0/0

It is the sole right and discretion for the Appeals Board to take agenda items out of order.
Murch stated the Board held a Site Walk on June 19th, 2021 and asked the Board if they had any questions from that Site Walk. There were no questions.

Applicant stated his request was for a setback reduction to allow him to split the lot and give a lot to his daughter. The setback reduction was necessary to create a legal lot. The Board asked Sirois if they can grant a setback reduction for a lot that did not yet exist. Sirois indicated they may.

Murch opened the Public Hearing. There being no comments, he closed the Public Hearing at 8:08 p.m.

The Board reviewed Article 6 D of the Ordinance and stated applicant requested a 5’ setback reduction to be within the 15’ setback. The Board determined all requirements of Article 6 D were met.

Hennessey moved to approve a side setback reduction to 15’.
Dean seconded.
Vote: 3/0/0

Murch stated the Board held a Site Walk on June 19th, 2021 and asked the Board if they had any questions from that Site Walk. There were no questions.

Applicant presented his case. His mortgage company picked up that the “lean-to” shed connected to the house didn’t fit the full setback requirement of 20’; it is 17’. He further stated it is only one corner of the shed that is not in compliance.

The Board and applicant discussed details of the structure and setback reduction required. Sirois advised applicant will need to apply for an After-the-Fact Building Permit once reduction is granted.

Murch opened Public Hearing. There being no comments, the Public Hearing was closed at 8:25 p.m.

Murch read email from DEP which stated the Department had no objection or comment.

The Board discussed if the requested reduction would be the least amount necessary to correct the matter. The Board and the Applicant discussed the issues that may arise if
the “as built” survey showed at a distance that is greater than requested and granted.

The Applicant stated he wished for the Board to move forward with the application as submitted.

Hennessey moved to grant a side setback reduction to 16’. Dean seconded.
Vote: 3/0/0

**Code Enforcement Officer Communications**
Sirois commended the Board for their performance.
He informed the Board that the Town had just posted a position for a Full-Time Assistant Code Officer who would mostly be doing field work.

**Adjournment**
Hennessey moved to adjourn.
Dean seconded.
Vote: 3/0/0
Adjourned: 8:47 p.m.