

HULL ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

Applicant: Karen McDonough

Property: 10 G Street

Date: Thursday, January 14, 2013

Time Meeting Began: 9:40 p.m.

Time Meeting Concluded: 10:06 p.m.

Place of Meeting: Hull Municipal Building, Main Meeting Room

Zoning Board Members Present for Hearing:

Alana Swiec, Chair	Sitting	Attending	Absent	Abstain
Dr. Roger Atherton, Clerk	Sitting	Attending	Absent	Abstain
Atty. Mark Einhorn, Member	Sitting	Attending	Absent	Abstain
Phillip Furman, Associate	Sitting	Attending	Absent	Abstain
Jason McCann, Associate	Sitting	Attending	Absent	Abstain
Patrick Finn, Associate	Sitting	Attending	Absent	Abstain

Others in Attendance:

Karen McDonough, Applicant

Mr. McDonough, Applicant's Spouse

Greg Ernst, Of Champion Builders

Karen Morgan, Recording Secretary

General Relief Sought: New Hearing – Opening of a Public Hearing on an application filed by Karen McDonough regarding property at 10 G Street, Hull, MA which according to the application seeks: To apply for a Special Permit to Construct a 12' x 12' Sunroom Addition.

General Discussion:

Ms. Swiec – Our resident engineer, Roger Atherton, always does an analysis sheet of the application and do you have a copy, because if not we have extras? It shows what exists, is proposed, and is allowed.

Mr. Furman – The only thing that matters is the 4.4 %. That's all they have to understand.

Mr. Atherton – It shows the various criteria that are in the zoning bylaws about how much you are supposed to have. The requirement in a single family zone is 6,500 sq. ft. You have 3,244, which is under-sized, and that is helping to create the lot coverage issue. The next line down, that PENC, that means it's pre-existing non-conforming. You have side set back issues. The minimum standard is 30% or less of lot coverage. You have right now 31.9%, or 32% lot coverage. As Mr. Finn said earlier and the

Board has said in the last 7 years, it has been very reluctant to let anyone increase their lot coverage above 30%. You come in with 32% and then you want to be adding this enclosed structure as a sun room which you have every right to, but because you are non-conforming on so many aspects of the property and that additional space being enclosed, adds another 4.4%, so you are up around 36%. The issue for your structure and your request is - are we willing to let you go from 32% to essentially 36%? All of that has to do with seeing the property and how it fits together.

The front set back is supposed to be 25 ft. You have about 15. You have a smaller front setback than you are supposed to have. Your side setback is 6.7 ft. and you are supposed to have 10. The right side setback is 5.2 and it should be 10. The rear set back is fine.

Mr. Furman – And that's where they are extending, in both the rear and the side setbacks.

Mr. Atherton – The main issue to me is the lot coverage and it's up to you to tell us why you think you should be allowed to do what you requested. Mr. Lombardo said that you can't until you convince us.

Ms. McDonough – We're the ones with the 2 bedrooms, 2 bathrooms with 696 sq. ft. of living space that was mentioned at the last Hearing. With that, I was Karen Bell in 1997 and then got married and we moved him in with all his stuff and we've been happily cohabitating since then. Now we are at a point that a family member is moving into the home and that's our spare room that will be the bedroom. We have no storage underneath or attic on top. We need some room for living space and with someone else coming into the home, it's tight and a sunroom was financially the most feasible option.

Mr. Atherton – There isn't anything wrong with the request...It's just we have bylaws we have to follow.

Ms. McDonough – I understand.

Mr. Furman – That's one reason because it's a hardship because they have someone moving in. And it's small.

Ms. McDonough – If you would like a site visit, I can only have you in one at a time.

Ms. Swiec – On your assessor's sheet, did you own the property in 2012?

Ms. McDonough – Yes.

Ms. Swiec – So there was a permit that issued on June 25, 2012, what was it that you did back then?

Ms. McDonough – The fireplace, the wood burning stove.

Ms. Swiec – That's internally?

Ms. McDonough – Yes, that's inside.

Ms. Swiec – Any exterior renovation?

Ms. McDonough – Yes, siding, they fixed the deck.

Ms. Swiec – It looks like an addition of the back of the house and a shed in the back.

Ms. McDonough – That's the laundry room, that was there when we got the house.

Mr. Atherton – This looks different than the drawn plan that bothered me. It looks like an L-shaped structure.

Mr. Finn – Is the shed in the calculation?

Mr. Atherton – Yes it is.

Mr. McCann- You are removing the deck that is already there, have you thought about actually building the sunroom further to the left because right now you are extending the non-conformity into the right setback.

Mr. Finn – You are extending the non-conforming side setback, which doesn't have to be, if you just shift it over.

Mr. Ernst – I have to think about it a little bit. I'm just filling in for the guy who should be here. It should be on the photos, there is probably a reason why.

Ms. McDonough – That's the only place you can access the house, that's where the bathroom and all of the water pipes are. It's going from where we had it originally right to that other edge so if we need to get under the house for the pipes.

Mr. Finn – Are you building on the existing deck?

Mr. Ernst – This is a concrete slab that is not code compliant.

Mr. Finn – Or the plan it says deck but it's not.

Mr. Furman – How big is the shed?

Mr. Atherton – It is 10' x 8'.

Mr. Furman – Just a suggestion, if you remove the shed, you eliminate probably most of the lot coverage, though you probably want and need it.

Mr. Atherton – Good idea though.

Mr. Furman – This lot was 6,500 sq. ft. and they are increasing lot coverage by 2.2% with the shed.

Mr. Ernst – The house is probably at a maximum about 15 to 18 ft. to the ridge line.

Mr. Atherton – That's why I had a question mark on the sheet because I didn't know the height.

Mr. Finn – Jason wants to see the elevation to see if we need to allow the SP to let you extend the non-conforming side setback.

Mr. Atherton – I put down on that sheet, one parking space. I sent the ZBA an email that was wrong because you have two spaces and they are compliant.

Mr. Furman – Why don't we set up a site visit?

Mr. Finn – If you can describe to the Board what you are proposing is not substantially more detrimental to the character of the neighborhood - that would be helpful to your case.

Ms. McDonough – I can't see any way it would be detrimental. A lot of homes have done work and added rooms. I would like to have a little bit of extra space that will help the value of the home and as a consideration for everyone who will be in my home.

Mr. Finn – Would you say that the neighboring properties are similar in size as yours, with small lots and large lot coverage, so that what you are proposing wouldn't be any more detrimental?

Ms. McDonough – No, it's no different from what is already there.

Mr. Finn – There was no minimal lot size in Hull when these lots were laid out then the State made it 5,000 ft. and then it went to 6,500 sq. ft. minimum lot size. There are a lot of lots that were just combined when they changed the zoning, but those are all laid out as small lots.

Mr. McCann – I would like to see the property.

Motion: Ms. Swiec makes a motion to continue the Hearing until February 6, 2014 at 7:45 p.m.

Member	Motion	Second	For	Against
Alana Swiec, Chair	X		X	
Dr. Roger Atherton, Clerk		X	X	
Atty. Mark Einhorn, Member				
Phillip Furman, Associate			X	
Jason McCann, Associate			X	
Patrick Finn, Associate			X	

Action Taken, if any:

A site visit will take place on Saturday, January 25th at 10:30 a.m.

Recorded by Karen Morgan

Approved by Roger Atherton

_____ Date _____