

**ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING PLACE: SELECTMEN'S HEARING  
ROOM, MARSHFIELD TOWN HALL OCTOBER 22, 2019 7:00 P.M.  
MEETING MINUTES**

*Members Present:*

*Lynn Fidler  
Brian Murphy  
Heidi Conway  
Richard Murphy  
Mark Stiles  
Larry Keane*

*Also Present:*

*Jeremiah Folkard, Building Commissioner  
Robert Galvin, Town Counsel*

RECEIVED  
MAY 23 AM 11:55  
MARSHFIELD TOWN CLERK

Ms. Fidler called the meeting to order at 7:02 P.M. and advised that the meeting was being recorded by Marshfield Community Television (MCTV) and voices and images were being recorded. She welcomed the students from Marshfield High School that were in the audience.

**#19-65: William Pappastratis:** The Petitioner is seeking a Variance in accordance with §305-10.11 of the Marshfield Municipal Code to for relief from §305-6.01 "Applicability of Dimensional and Density Regulations" and §305-6.02 "Table of Dimensional and Density Regulations" that require a lot width of 80' in an R-3 zoning district on the property located at **275 Elm Street** which is further identified on the Assessors' Maps as being on parcel H16-03-12 and is located in an R-3 zoning district.

Ms. Fidler stated that there were a few Agenda items that would not be heard tonight. She stated that **Case #19-65** for William Pappastratis, 275 Elm Street, had been withdrawn without prejudice on October 21, 2019.

**#19-70: Stephen and Elizabeth Howley:** The Marshfield Board of Appeals will hold a Public Hearing on October 22, 2019 at 7:00 P.M. pursuant to the Marshfield Municipal Code in accordance with a Remand Order by the Land Court in the case of Donald Almeida, Jeremiah Eck, Kevin Sullivan, and Kenneth Meuser v. Zoning Board of Appeals of Marshfield, Lynne E. Fiddler, Francis X. Hubbard, Mark Styles, Richard Murphy, and Brian P. Murphy as they are members of the Zoning Board of Appeals of Marshfield, Stephen Howley and Elizabeth Howley (Land Court No. 17 MISC 000652 (HPS)). This matter arose out of an appeal filed by Donald Almeida, et al., regarding the Zoning Board of Appeals grant of zoning relief to Stephen and Elizabeth Howley. This hearing is to consider the modified plans for a Special Permit/Finding/Variance and/or any other relief deemed necessary to raze and reconstruct the dwelling on the property located at **225 Bay Avenue**, parcel M05-10-37, which is located in an R-3 zoning district. Public Hearings were previously held for Cases #17-33, #17-43 and #17-51.

Ms. Fidler stated that she would read **Case #19-70** for Steven and Elizabeth Howley, 225 Bay Avenue, into the record but it would be continued to the November 12<sup>th</sup> meeting. She then read it into the record and stated that the Board had now opened the hearing and made a motion to continue it to November 12, 2019. The motion was seconded and all were in favor.

Ms. Fidler said that from this point on the Board would hear Cases #19-53A, #19-63, #19-64,

**ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING PLACE: SELECTMEN'S HEARING  
ROOM, MARSHFIELD TOWN HALL OCTOBER 22, 2019 7:00 P.M.  
MEETING MINUTES**

#19-67, #19-68, #19-69, #19-72 and then #19-66 and #19-71.

**#19-53A: Edward and Molly Fogarty:** The Petitioners are seeking a Special Permit in accordance with §305-10.12 of the Marshfield Municipal Code to construct a one (1) story addition 10' off the existing rear and approximately 32' wide, continuing 5' out beyond the north side of the existing structure and 5' x 14' along the north side of the structure on the property located at **19 Bayview Street** which is further identified on the Assessors' Maps as being on parcel K12-03-15 and is located in an R-3 zoning district.

Ms. Fidler read **Case #19-53A** into the record and turned the hearing over to Dick Rockwood who represented the Petitioners. Mr. Rockwood pointed out the front and back of the house and stated that the Petitioners had come before the Board previously for a deck but that wasn't going to work because of the setback. He said this is a one (1) story house with a one (1) story addition which will be thirty feet (30') from the property line and is nonconforming on both sides. He said they will add one bedroom and expand another; this is basically a ten foot (10') addition. Ms. Fidler asked if there was a deed and Ms. Porreca said it was in the file from the previous hearing. Ms. Fidler asked if there were any questions from the Board, Mr. Folkard or the audience and there were none. She made a motion to close the hearing which was seconded and all were in favor. She made a motion to grant the Special Permit which was also seconded and all were in favor.

**#19-63: Nancy and Thomas Brandon:** The Petitioners are seeking a Special Permit in accordance with §305-10.12 of the Marshfield Municipal Code to raze the existing non-conforming structure and rebuild a new 40' x 24' two and one half (2½) ) story dwelling with a 24'6" x 11' rear deck with a 4' landing and stairs to grade, a 24'6" x 7' two (2) tier covered porch with a 4' landing and stairs to grade on the front of the structure and a 7' x 8' balcony on the front of the dwelling off the half story on the property located at **4 Bay Street** which is further identified on the Assessors' Maps as being on parcel M04-14-03 and is located in an R-3 zoning district.

Ms. Fidler read **Case #19-63** into the record. Mr. Rockwood represented the Petitioners and he said they were proposing to raze the existing dwelling and construct a new two and a half (2½) story dwelling which would be put on pilings. He said the house is currently 900 square feet on the Assessor's record and they will be building 990 square feet which will have under 2,600 square feet of living space. Mr. Rockwood said they need to elevate the house and the mid-point of the roof will be thirty-three feet (33') and will comply with FEMA for elevations. This is on a barrier beach and will meet all zoning setbacks. Ms. Fidler asked if there were any questions and Mr. Folkard asked if the third floor would be two-thirds (2/3) of the floor below; Mr. Rockwood said it would be less than 66% but he did not have the math with him. Mr. Folkard asked if they were putting a roof on the front porch or would it be open. Mr. Rockwood said it would be open and asked Mr. Folkard which one he was talking about; Mr. Folkard said the one on front, on Bay Street. Mr. Rockwood pointed out the Bay Street side with the pointer and said he didn't know if the street side was correct. Mr. Folkard asked if it was only 13.8' from the front lot line and Mr. Rockwood said it was. Mr. Folkard said they need fifteen feet (15') and Mr. Rockwood



**ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING PLACE: SELECTMEN'S HEARING  
ROOM, MARSHFIELD TOWN HALL OCTOBER 22, 2019 7:00 P.M.  
MEETING MINUTES**

said the existing house is nonconforming and they are conforming with that. Ms. Fidler asked if they should go to the Site Plan and Mr. Rockwood said that 13.8 feet from the property line is the existing porch which is four feet (4') high. Mr. Folkard asked what the existing building out back was because he didn't have this plan. Mr. Rockwood asked if he had the Stenbeck and Taylor plan and Ms. Fidler said it was dated September 11<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Folkard said if it is an open deck it can encroach by two feet (2') but Mr. Rockwood is saying it is a two (2) story deck. Mr. Rockwood said he has photos of the existing structure and Mr. Folkard asked if that was the outline of the existing building. Mr. Rockwood said he could see the existing building but they went forward twenty feet (20'). Ms. Fidler said it was 28.2 feet to the back corner. Mr. Rockwood said that could be twenty-eight (28) providing the beam holding the deck is thirty feet (30') and he is allowed a two foot (2') cantilever. Mr. Folkard said that he is allowed to encroach the setback by two feet (2'); it doesn't have to be a cantilever if it's not over four feet (4') and an open deck with no roof, they can encroach into the setback; he said the back was okay.

Ms. Fidler asked Mr. Rockwood if he wanted to think about this and he said that he would make it conform. He then asked Mr. Folkard if a covered porch had to be fifteen feet (15') and Mr. Folkard replied yes. Mr. Rockwood said that if they make it fifteen feet (15') he can change it in the next couple of days. Ms. Fidler asked if the 13.8 feet would be 15 feet and Mr. Rockwood said they would do the 15 feet to meet the requirements. Ms. Fidler asked where the thirty was and asked if the 28.2 feet was the existing. Mr. Rockwood said it was not the existing that the existing is 31.8 feet but it could be 28.2 feet. He said the error here is that this can't be any less than fifteen feet (15'); Ms. Fidler agreed. Mr. Rockwood said if the Board could put that as a Condition he would bring in a new site plan. Ms. Fidler said that for the record there was also a letter from Ann and Bill Kelly dated October 21, 2019 and said she wasn't sure if Mr. Rockwood was aware of it. He said that he saw it late this afternoon. Ms. Fidler asked if the Board had the letter and if they had a chance to review it. Mr. Rockwood said it's not a Variance, it's a Special Permit and they are doing everything they have done for twenty (20) years.

Ms. Fidler asked if there were any questions from the Board and Mr. Stiles asked if they would make it a five foot (5') porch. Mr. Rockwood said it was actually a covered porch in the front and he will make it fifteen feet (15'). Mr. B. Murphy said they would put in language that they have to conform to Zoning. Ms. Fidler asked if there were comments or questions from the Board or public. Marybeth Corbett from 6 Bay Street, aka 9 Bay Avenue, asked if they would be coming closer to the lot line. Mr. Rockwood said no, they were staying where the existing house is. Ms. Corbett stated that she thought Mr. Rockwood had said the square footage was bigger. Mr. Rockwood said the living space on the first floor is probably forty square feet larger and they have the porch going "this way". They aren't getting closer sideways; they can't get any closer, the existing setback is 9.91' and they will be at 10.3' which is a little further away. Ms. Fidler asked Ms. Corbett if she could see the faint red line on the plan; Ms. Corbett said she couldn't see it in the notice but she can see it where Mr. Rockwood is pointing. Ms. Fidler asked for additional questions and Bill Kelly stated he was the co-author of the letter that was received. His first question is a general one and he asked if the existing house was a nonconforming structure. What he is hearing is that they are using that house as a reference point; someone



**ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING PLACE: SELECTMEN'S HEARING  
ROOM, MARSHFIELD TOWN HALL OCTOBER 22, 2019 7:00 P.M.  
MEETING MINUTES**

mentioned the existing house is ten feet (10') instead of fifteen feet (15') for the setback. He said if they have a tabula rasa the whole house is coming down; therefore they aren't constricted by the nonconforming issues. Mr. Kelly said it calls for a house that will be ten feet (10') from the setback required from Ms. Corbett's house and he said they aren't using any of the old house. Ms. Fidler said this was common practice. Mr. Kelly asked why not take advantage of the freedom they have to move the wall any way, shape or form; alternatively they have seen homes in other sections of Marshfield that are 5,000 square foot lots reducing the width of the house to twenty feet (20'). He said it's not the case that the new house will be built pretty much in the old footprint; the new house is 15-25% wider and longer than the existing structure. Mr. B. Murphy said they have the right to the preexisting nonconforming status. Ms. Fidler said she heard his argument but the Zoning Board allows the existing nonconformity; with this particular property the side setbacks will be the same or less than; they can't be more nonconforming. She said as Mr. Rockwood had pointed out, the front has to meet the fifteen feet (15'). She said she understands his point but when they raze it they are allowed that nonconformity. She asked if there were more questions and as she moved to close another abutter said she had a question about the conversation about the front. How far back will the porches be? She knows the plans don't currently reflect what they will change it to but wanted to know how far from the setback they will be. Mr. Rockwood said the setback on the surveyor's drawing has to be fifteen feet (15'). He isn't sure how it fell through the cracks but they have the right to fifteen feet (15') on the sides and front and thirty feet (30') in the rear. The abutter asked if they were coming closer to the street because they are entitled to that because of the existing house; Mr. Rockwood agreed but said they can't be less than fifteen feet (15'). The abutter asked if there would be two (2) porches and a balcony and Mr. Rockwood said yes.

Mr. Folkard asked if there was anything he could answer and Ms. Fidler advised that he was the Building Commissioner. Mr. Kelly said he was just asking for a rationale; if they have a clean slate he doesn't see any reason why they don't take advantage of it. Mr. Folkard said the Zoning Bylaws allow you to raze your house and put it back on the same footprint. He said a lot of what they are doing is increasing the front because they can; they can increase it up to the required zoning setbacks. Mr. Folkard said they could bring it up to the fifteen feet (15'); they can't encroach on the side any further. They are keeping the thirty feet (30') in the rear but the deck can encroach by two (2) feet per the Bylaws. Jack Webb, 20 Bay Street, asked if the porch is fifteen feet (15'), can the stairs extend into the fifteen feet (15'). Ms. Fidler said the porch isn't fifteen feet (15'); it is fifteen feet (15') from the front. Mr. Webb asked if the stairs can go into the fifteen feet (15') and can the end of the stairs be less than fifteen feet (15'). Mr. Folkard said the stairs are a means of egress and they can encroach the setback no larger than the minimum width requirement for the stairs. He can't add another deck to the side but he can add the width of the stairs for egress. Mr. Webb asked if he could go to the street and Mr. Folkard said he doesn't need to go to the street; they would turn the stairs so they wouldn't come out that far.

Mr. Rockwood said the way he has always done it is that he can't exceed fifty percent (50%) if the setback so there is nothing within seven and a half feet (7½'). He said it isn't the street, it's the property line; there is seven (7) to eight (8) feet until the pavement. Someone asked about parking and Ms. Fidler said that parking as identified on the plan. Mr. Rockwood said there is a gravel driveway on the site plan in front of the house; he pointed out the parking area on the side



**ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING PLACE: SELECTMEN'S HEARING  
ROOM, MARSHFIELD TOWN HALL OCTOBER 22, 2019 7:00 P.M.  
MEETING MINUTES**

and front; he said the side fifteen feet (15'). Mr. Rockwood said the house next door is five feet (5') from the property line.

Ms. Fidler made a motion to close which was seconded and all were in favor. She asked if the Board needed to deliberate and Mr. R. Murphy mentioned the Condition. Ms. Fidler made a motion to grant the Special Permit which was seconded and all were in favor. She stated the Condition is that the comment/word "ocean" should be eliminated from the plans and site plan. She asked Mr. Rockwood when this would be available and he said by the end of the week because it needs to be stamped.

**#19-72: Michael and Beth Niarchos:** The Petitioners are seeking a Special Permit in accordance with §305-10.12 of the Marshfield Municipal Code to construct a 24' x 12' second story addition to the existing dwelling on the property located at **105 Bay Avenue** which is further identified on the Assessors' Maps as being on parcel M05-05-30 and is located in an R-3 zoning district.

Mr. B. Murphy asked if they could move Mr. Rockwood's other case up since it was last. Ms. Fidler read **Case #19-72** into the record and turned it over to Mr. Rockwood. Mr. Rockwood said he did the architectural work for the Niarchos and they are not expanding the footprint; they are expanding a bedroom and a bathroom. They are here because the side and front setbacks are nonconforming. Ms. Fidler asked if there were any questions and there were none. She moved to close the hearing which was seconded and all were in favor. She made a motion to grant the Special Permit which was seconded and all were in favor.

**#19-64: Kathleen Fox and Terrance Power:** The Petitioners are seeking a Variance in accordance with §305-10.11 of the Marshfield Municipal Code for relief from §305-6.01 "Applicability of Dimensional and Density Regulations" and §305-6.02 "Table of Dimensional and Density Regulations" that require a twenty foot (20') side setback in an R-1 zoning district on the property located at **2193 Main Street** which is further identified on the Assessors' Maps as being on parcel E20-01-02 and is located in an R-1 zoning district.

Ms. Fidler read **Case #19-64** into the record. She said they would start with the site plan and would be talking about the garage. She asked Ms. Fox to explain to the Board what they were trying to do. Kathleen Fox said the garage is under the right portion of the house but it isn't long enough to accommodate two (2) cars. They want to extend and square off the garage so the cars can be parked in tandem. She said it is adding approximately seven and a half feet (7½'). She said the corner would put them at eighteen feet (18') and not the twenty feet (20') that is required so that is why they are asking for a Variance. Ms. Fox said it was the only place they could do it; the whole backyard is septic; it's too narrow on one side and the front yard is very rocky and there is elevation; there isn't any other place to add on. Ms. Fidler asked if there were questions from the Board and asked Mr. Folkard if he had looked at it. He said that he had and he talked to Ms. Fox about this. He said the way the lot goes there aren't a lot of choices to get the second

**ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING PLACE: SELECTMEN'S HEARING  
ROOM, MARSHFIELD TOWN HALL OCTOBER 22, 2019 7:00 P.M.  
MEETING MINUTES**

car in and he doesn't see a problem. Ms. Fidler said the Variance is for the shape and topography of the land and the soil. She can see by the elevation the topography of the land is something the Board may consider for a Variance; she isn't sure how the Board feels about the shape of the land. Ms. Fox said the abutters are the marina and they won't be a bother; Ms. Fidler said there is a list of abutters. Mr. Stiles asked if Ms. Fox got a letter from the direct abutters like Mr. Roht. She said that Helen Burgess is behind them; she does not have any idea if Mr. Roht sent a letter but she did make him aware. Mr. Stiles asked if this was on the corner of Littles Lane and 3A and Ms. Fox said that it was. Ms. Fidler read the names of abutters who submitted letters of support. Ms. Fox said Burgess is closest, she is right behind them; the Chatfields are across the street.

Ms. Fidler asked the Board if they had any questions about this being a Variance. Mr. Stiles asked Ms. Fox if she has spoken to Mr. Roht. She said she had talked to him about what they wanted to do and he said that whatever they wanted to do on their property was their business. Mr. Stiles asked if the Littles Lane side could work and Ms. Fox said not, that it would just be that little corner. Mr. B. Murphy started to say that on the Site Plan, if they ran it eighteen feet (18') and Mr. Stiles asked if it would be to the existing corner then it probably isn't twenty feet (20'); Mr. B. Murphy agreed that it looked less than twenty feet (20'). Ms. Fidler asked if the shed had been removed and if the driveway would remain the same. Ms. Fox said the shed was removed the first week they moved in and the cement deck was just removed this past week. She said the porch was changed so it now meets the setbacks where it didn't before; their means of egress and entrance are not going to change and it's still a good distance from the road and sidewalk. Ms. Fidler asked if there were more questions and said she would lean towards a combination of topography and shape and Mr. B. Murphy agreed. There were no questions from the Board or the public and Ms. Fidler made a motion to close the hearing which was seconded and all were in favor. She made a motion to grant the Variance as applied for which was also seconded and all were in favor.

**#19-67: Patrick Brennan:** The Petitioner is seeking a Special Permit in accordance with §305-9.01 and §305-10.12 of the Marshfield Municipal Code to construct a 24' x 16' addition, a 24' x 10' deck and a 23.25' x 6' covered porch on the property located at **49 Tupelo Road** which is further identified on the Assessors' Maps as being on parcel I14-03-18 and is located in an R-1 zoning district.

Ms. Fidler said they would skip **Case #19-66** and she read **Case #19-67** into the record. Patrick Brennan said the purpose of this request is because this is a preexisting nonconforming lot in an R-1 zoning district that requires 40,000 square feet and this has 36,009 square feet. Frontage requires forty feet (40') and this has 36.7 feet. He said they are proposing to put a 24' x 16' addition with a 24' x 10' deck and off that a 23.25' x 6' covered porch. Mr. Brennan said that all improvements would comply with the side and rear setbacks but it is preexisting nonconforming. Ms. Fidler asked if there were any questions from the Board, Mr. Folkard or the public and there were none. She made a motion to close the hearing which was seconded and all were in favor. She made a motion to grant the Special Permit which was also seconded and all were in favor.



**ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING PLACE: SELECTMEN'S HEARING  
ROOM, MARSHFIELD TOWN HALL OCTOBER 22, 2019 7:00 P.M.  
MEETING MINUTES**

**#19-68: Kathleen Kennedy:** The Petitioner is seeking a Special Permit in accordance with §305-10.12 of the Marshfield Municipal Code to construct a 22'8" x 16' deck on the rear of the existing dwelling on the property located at **737 Ocean Street** which is further identified on the Assessors' Maps as being on parcel L09-10-14 and is located in an R-3 zoning district.

Ms. Fidler read Case **#19-68** into the record. Mr. Kennedy said they wanted to add a deck to the existing house and the deck would be level with the house. He said it would go straight out with railings and they will adhere to all setbacks. Ms. Fidler stated that they can't endorse the shed and asked if there was a deed; Ms. Kennedy had the deed. Ms. Fidler stated they were nonconforming on side setbacks and Ms. Kennedy said they were at 7.5 feet. Ms. Fidler asked if there were any questions from the Board or public and there were none. She made a motion to close the hearing which was seconded and all were in favor. Ms. Fidler made a motion to grant the Special Permit which was also seconded and all were in favor.

**#19-69: Josimar Fernandes:** The Petitioner is seeking a Special Permit in accordance with §305-10.12 of the Marshfield Municipal Code to construct a 30' x 13' dormer on the existing dwelling on the property located at **1685 Main Street** which is further identified on the Assessors' Maps as being on parcel E17-07-03 and is located in an R-1 zoning district.

Ms. Fidler read **Case #19-69** into the record and asked if they were just talking about the dormer and asked Mr. Folkard if he had any comments. Mr. Folkard said that Mr. Fernandes had started the job a little while ago and he has seen it; he isn't encroaching the setback and he isn't going outside the footprint. Mr. Folkard we don't have a plot plan but Mr. Fernandes said that he had one. Mr. Folkard said he needed to bring it to the Zoning office and the Building Department. Ms. Fidler pointed out that we don't have a deed and asked Mr. Fernandes if it was in his name; he replied in his name and his wife's name. Ms. Fidler said they would condition the decision on Mr. Fernandes submitting the documents. She asked if there were any questions from the Board and Mr. Stiles asked what the nonconformity is. Ms. Fidler said it is a preexisting and nonconforming lot but he is staying within the existing footprint. Ms. Fidler asked Mr. Folkard if he were comfortable with the Board voting on this without a plot plan and he said that he was. Ms. Fidler made a motion to close the hearing which was seconded and all were in favor. She made a motion to grant the Special Permit with the Conditions that Mr. Fernandes submit an updated and correct Site Plan to the Zoning Board and the Building Department and to submit a deed to the Zoning Board. The motion was seconded and all were in favor.

The Board took a five (5) minute recess and the meeting was called back to order at 7:57 P.M.

**#19-66: VRT Corporation:** The Petitioner is seeking a Variance in accordance with §305-10.11 of the Marshfield Municipal Code for relief from §305-11.05.B "Planned Mixed Use Development - Process" which requires a minimum of seven (7) acres of land in consolidated ownership to qualify for a Special Permit within the Planned Mixed Use

**ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING PLACE: SELECTMEN'S HEARING  
ROOM, MARSHFIELD TOWN HALL OCTOBER 22, 2019 7:00 P.M.  
MEETING MINUTES**

District on the property located at **751 Plain Street** which is further identified on the Assessors' Maps as being on parcel D10-03-10 and is located in the I-1 zoning district. This parcel has been isolated from a larger parcel as a result of land taking connected with the widening of Route 139.

**#19-71: Benzine Development, L.L.C. and VRT Corporation:** The Petitioners are seeking a Variance in accordance with §305-10.11 of the Marshfield Municipal Code for relief from §305-6.02 "Table of Dimensional and Density Regulations" that require a minimum lot area of 40,000 square feet and a lot width of 150 feet on the property located at **751 Plain Street** which is further identified on the Assessors' Maps as being on parcel D10-03-10 and is located in the I-1 zoning district. This parcel has been isolated from a larger parcel as a result of land taking connected with the widening of Route 139.

Ms. Fidler said there were two (2) cases remaining on the Agenda, **Case #19-66** and **Case #19-71**. She then read both cases into the record. Attorney Walter Sullivan represented VRT Corporation, the property owner, and Benzine Development who has the property under their control. Mr. Sullivan explained the reason for the two (2) requests, one was filed for relief from the minimum lot area and the other from the minimum lot area and width. Mr. Sullivan explained that the taking of the land in 2011 is what caused the problem; when they looked further they realized the lot was nonconforming for the 40,000 and one hundred and fifty feet (150') width. This is the former Enterprise Drive that is now realigned; this parcel is now separate from the overall parcel. They are asking for relief from the seven (7) acre requirement and the 40,000 square feet and one hundred and fifty feet (150') width. They are just under at 37,000 square feet and one hundred and thirty feet (130'); this is all due to the realignment. Mr. Sullivan thinks it is clear that they meet the Variance requirements; a literal enforcement would mean the lot is not buildable; this is not detrimental and they still need a Special Permit from the Planning Board. They don't think it's a derogation because it was always assumed to be commercial. Mr. Sullivan said the argument is made in §305-6.06 and they need the Variance to show they are compliant with Zoning and they need something to record.

Ms. Fidler asked if the Board had any questions and Mr. B. Murphy asked for Mr. Galvin's opinion. Mr. Stiles asked how many contiguous acres they would have had if Enterprise Drive wasn't relocated; Mr. Sullivan said around eleven (11). Mr. Galvin stated that this parcel was attached to 733 Plain Street and Mr. Sullivan agreed. Mr. Galvin asked if the parcel complied with Zoning requirements before the land was taken; his question is did it have lot width when the frontage was on Plain Street. He said they could still have frontage around the bend and asked how big the lot was; Mr. Sullivan said 37,186 square feet. Mr. Galvin said the Variance was permanent for the lot; Mr. Sullivan said if the Variance was granted tonight they would go straight to the Planning Board. Mr. Galvin said the circumstances were unique and that this is a shape issue, not a soil and topography issue. Ms. Fidler asked for additional questions from the Board and Mr. Keane said the hardship was not created by them and they aren't missing by much.

Ms. Fidler asked if there were any questions from the public and there were none. She said that she was comfortable closing Case #19-66 which deals with the seven (7) acre minimum and



**ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING PLACE: SELECTMEN'S HEARING  
ROOM, MARSHFIELD TOWN HALL OCTOBER 22, 2019 7:00 P.M.  
MEETING MINUTES**

made a motion to close; the motion was seconded and all were in favor. She said they would come back to this. She said they also have Case #19-71 which involves the minimum lot area and frontage. She asked if the Board were comfortable closing and she made a motion to close which was seconded and all were in favor. She asked the Board if they wanted to give it some thought and if they wanted to deliberate now or later. She feels they should deliberate and due to the hour felt that it should be deliberated at the next meeting on November 12<sup>th</sup>. Mr. B. Murphy asked Mr. Galvin if he would write the answer and Mr. Galvin said that Mr. Sullivan would; Mr. Sullivan said that he would be happy to do it.

Ms. Fidler said that **Case #19-55**, Health Circle, will be on the next Agenda. There were no minutes to review.

Meeting adjourned 8:20 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,



Nanci M. Porreca  
Zoning Administrator

I attest the foregoing minutes were approved by the Zoning Board of Appeals at their

02/11/2020 meeting by a 5-0 vote.

Signed: Lynne S. Kohn Date: 02/11/2020