

Board of Adjustment
October 25, 2011

Present: Bob Stetson, Brenda Tillberg, Kevin Brown, Ted Desmond, Peter Grant, Paul Jackman

Witnesses: See Attached List

Meeting called to order at 7:33 by Kevin Brown

Continuation of Application # 11-35 of Terasem Movement TransReligion Inc. for conditional use approval for change of use from office/residential/community facility mixed use to solely community facility use located at 2 park place (parcel #235032). The property is located in the Residential, Office, Commercial zoning district. Said application requires approval under Section 341 Conditional Uses.

Kevin swore in Jim Dumont's clients Nick Mayer and Steve Revell.

Jim explained the different tasks that were assigned from the last board meeting. He noted that after discussing with the client and working together with the neighbors they have created a two phase project. Bob noted that before phase one is even explained the board should make a decision as to whether this is acceptable or not. Kevin felt that the phases should be explained to the board so they are in complete understanding of what Terasem proposing.

Steve Revell (who drafted the proposals) discussed what he was asked to do, and explained the process that they went through creating the 18 parking places for the community facility. Steve referred to the first hearing it where was explained that the traffic flow seemed to be a major concern. In phase one that is proposed he pointed out where each of the seven parking spots would be and the different traffic signs that would also be put in place to clarify the traffic flow. This was a more attractive plan as it was a plan that the neighbors agreed with because they felt that it would not ruin their view.

On phase two the first seven parking spaces would remain the same and the next eleven spaces were angled parking spaces in the lot behind the Terasem. Steve also demonstrated on the phase two drawing the traffic circulation that would be in place while also addressing the view of the neighbors as a continuing concern. Kevin questioned what the roadway would be made of, Steve explained that it will remain grass. Brenda suggested that there be something that explains that those parking spaces that the extra eleven spots in phase two are considered auxiliary parking. Paul questioned the angle of the parking spaces in the phase two, and thought that perhaps that they be angled the other way. After discussion by the group it was decided that it would be easier to keep the parking spaces the way that they are drawn in phase two.

Peter Meyer expressed his appreciation to Jim and his clients for working together with him and his family to help satisfy all parties. Peter Meyer then discussed the arbor that is next to the building. He felt that by moving this structure, it would not only be difficult but it would also create more exposure to the parking area. Peter Meyer suggested that

they not move the arbor if it isn't needed. He continued by talking about his concern for the minimum of 18 spaces for the community facility in fear that at a later point in time more than 18 cars will be parking back there. Katie Raycroft-Meyer then expressed her apprehension for the extra eleven spaces and even if they are considered an auxiliary parking area if this is a parking lot, people will park back there if they want. Kevin explained that with this being a conditional use, the board can create limitations for the community facility to minimize the use of this parking lot. In response, Katie then discussed that she wanted the board to consider doing this as a two-phase process while having something that triggers the community facility to then return to the board to get the second phase approved.

Kevin then articulated the importance whether either of these phases will actually work, it could be drawn on paper, but it might not work realistically. Jim then expressed the willingness that he and his client have to make one of these two plans work with the intention of satisfying what the board agrees with most. Ted asked if the owner was in agreement to not having access to this lot at all. Steve explained that simply the lot would be mowed and unless the lot was needed for parking in which case, the shrubs would have to be torn down by someone else. Brenda discussed with Steve and Kevin the one lane created with the arbor being there. Steve suggested that instead of having the bushes there to prevent unauthorized use by car, they could put a post in the ground that is removable to create available parking if needed.

Jim posed the quest of what would trigger the Terasem to come back to ask for phase two. Kevin suggested that if there was more need than the seven spots provided they would have to come back to the board to re-discuss phase two. Peter Grant expressed his concern for determining if more spaces are needed because people would take up spots designated for other parking. Kevin responded with different solutions that could be made, they could create a standard to put in place if this was not happening. Bob did not feel that this would work to hold people accountable for parking in other spots, he thinks that there needs to be 18 spaces because that is what is required with the zoning bylaws. Peter Meyer suggested that there be a ceiling on the phase two if that were the plan to be put into place to prevent more that the allotted number of cars back there.

Kevin moved to go into deliberative session at 8:25 seconded by Bob. All voted to close the public hearing.

The group reconvened to discuss the meeting minutes. For the September 27th minutes Brenda wanted to change sight to site. On the second page to clarify the parking lot was not a structure and to strike the following sentence. All were in favor of approving the amended September 27th minutes.

The group then returned to deliberative session.

For the reasons set forth above, and on the motion of Tillberg, seconded by Grant, the ZBA hereby grants Terasem conditional use approval for Application 11-35 to use 2 Park Place as a community facility, subject to the conditions set forth below. The ZBA vote on the motion for conditional use approval was 4-2 with Tillberg, Jackman, Grant, and Desmond voting in favor, and Brown and Stetson voting against.