

Town of Scarborough

Zoning Board of Appeals

February 11, 2009

AGENDA

1. Call to Order (7:00 P. M.)
2. Roll Call
3. Approval of Minutes (December 10, 2009)
4. Appeals
 - a. Appeal No. 2470 – A Limited Reduction of Yard Size Appeal by Robert and Linda Voskian, 18 Driftwood Lane, Assessor’s Map U21 Parcel 101, to construct an addition and a deck 10 and 13 feet respectively from the side property line in the R-2 Zone
 - b. Appeal No. 2472 – A Limited Reduction of Yard Size Appeal for Beach Briar, 17 Saccarappa Lane, Assessor’s Map U17 Parcel 48, to construct a porch 38.5 feet from the front property line and 13 feet from the side property line in the R-2 Zone
 - c. Appeal No. 2473 – A Practical Difficulty Variance Appeal by Holly and Lester Hartman, 25 Greenwood Avenue, Assessor’s Map U2 Parcel 17, to construct a porch 13 feet from the front property line in the R-4 Zone
5. Zoning Board Comments
6. Adjournment

NO NEW APPEALS SHALL BE TAKEN UP AFTER 10:30 P. M.

Town of Scarborough

Zoning Board of Appeals

February 11, 2009

MINUTES

Members Present

Staff

Mr. Blaise
Mr. Loisel
Mr. Maroon
Mr. Massengill
Mr. Temm

Mr. Grysk, Code Enforcement Officer
Ms. Logan, Recording Secretary

1. Call to Order

Mr. Maroon called the meeting to order at 7:05 P. M.

2. Roll Call

The Recording Secretary called the roll; Mr. Dougherty was absent.

3. Approval of Minutes (December 10, 2009)

Mr. Blaise moved to approve the minutes of December 10, 2009; Mr. Loisel noted that the second sentence in the fifth paragraph on page four should read, "Mr. Loisel stated that he would not like to see cars go straight...." With that amendment, Mr. Loisel seconded.

Voted 5-0

4. Appeals

a. Appeal No. 2470 – A Limited Reduction of Yard Size Appeal by Robert and Linda Voskian, 18 Driftwood Lane, Assessor’s Map U21 Parcel 101, to construct an addition and a deck 10 and 13 feet respectively from the side property line in the R-2 Zone

This appeal was tabled at the request of the appellant.

b. Appeal No. 2472 – A Limited Reduction of Yard Size Appeal for Beach Briar, 17 Saccarappa Lane, Assessor’s Map U17 Parcel 48, to construct a porch 38.5 feet from the front property line and 13 feet from the side property line in the R-2 Zone

Mr. Trevor Watson, of Eider Investments, stated that the appellants wanted to install a screened porch with a roof atop the existing deck; he stated that they needed a reduction of 1.5 feet on the front and two feet on the side. He stated that this porch would allow the home to be compatible with other properties in the neighborhood and would protect people from the insects. Mr. Watson stated that the existing deck protruded into the setback but some it would be left unscreened.

To a question from Mr. Temm, Mr. Watson replied that the roof overhang would protrude about six inches past the existing deck in one area; he stated that the overhang would maintain the detail of the existing house. To a question from Mr. Temm, Mr. Grysk replied that the appellant was before the Board because what was existing was grandfathered but any expansion required an appeal. Mr. Loisel noted that there was no visual impact from the front and only a small impact at a 45° angle.

Mr. Maroon and Mr. Watson addressed the criteria.

Mr. Maroon opened the public hearing; no one spoke for or against the appeal; Mr. Maroon closed the public hearing.

Mr. Blaise moved to approve the appeal as presented; Mr. Temm seconded.

Voted 5-0

c. Appeal No. 2473 – A Practical Difficulty Variance Appeal by Holly and Lester Hartman, 24 Greenwood Avenue, Assessor’s Map U2 Parcel 17, to construct a porch 13 feet from the front property line in the R-4 Zone

Mr. Paul Austin, architectural designer, stated that the appellants had an existing deck and house was close to the property line; he stated that they would like to add a porch to provide protection from the insects. He stated that the porch would be slightly smaller than the existing deck and there would be no lateral increase in size. Mr. Grysk noted that he and Mr. Austin had discussed the Limited Reduction of Yard Size Appeal but that would not have allowed enough space.

To a question from Mr. Blaise, Mr. Paul replied that the garage and addition that were under construction met all the requirements and they had obtained their permits from the Code Office. He stated that the owners wanted an extra bedroom and there would be no kitchen in the addition. Mr. Paul stated that the total coverage of the site was about 24.5%.

Mr. Maroon and Mr. Austin addressed the criteria as presented in writing.

Mr. Maroon opened the public hearing; no one spoke for or against the appeal; Mr. Maroon closed the public hearing.

Mr. Blaise moved to approve the appeal as presented; Mr. Loisel seconded.

Voted 5-0

5. Zoning Board Comments

There were no comments.

6. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:25 P. M.