

TOWN OF OLD ORCHARD BEACH
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING MINUTES **September 27, 2010**

<p>Call to Order at 7:05 pm</p>	<p>Call to Order</p>
<p>Pledge to the Flag</p>	
<p>Roll Call: Present: Vice Chair Robert Quinn, Mr. Philip Weyenberg, Chairman DeLeo, and Tianna Higgins. Mr. Phil Denison excused. Staff: Mike Nugent, Code Enforcement Officer. Tori Geaumont, Secretary to the ZBA.</p>	
<p>ITEM 1: Tabled Variance: Michael & Rose Grimanis, owners of 15 Milliken Street, MBL 205-6-10, in the DD1 Zone to permit the adjustment of the rear yard, left side, and right side yard setback, as well as lot coverage for the construction of a deck. The owner is the appellant.</p>	<p><u>Item 1: Tabled Variance:</u> <u>Michael & Rose Grimanis, 15 Milliken Street MBL 205-6-10</u></p>
<p>Rose Grimanis, owner of 15 Milliken Street. Mrs. Grimanis explained her desire to build the deck and that she had changed the application to show this is a deck with one step as opposed to a deck with a handicap accessible ramp. Chairman DeLeo called for any abutters or correspondence. PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED AT 7:10 P.M. Mr. Weyenberg asked if this was tabled or approved at the last meeting. Chairman DeLeo explained that there were some discrepancies in the application at the last meeting thus it was tabled. Chairman DeLeo read the criteria for number one. With regards to part A. The land in question cannot yield a reasonable return unless the variance is granted the appellant stated construction of a small deck and one step will be much more appealing to potential tenants. Mr. Quinn stated he was concerned about building a structure there just to make it more appealing. This could be accomplished by stone work or landscaping. Mr. Weyenberg stated the total lot coverage would be close to 50% which is considerable. Ms. Higgins asked Mrs. Grimanis why she did not have any alternative than to build the deck. Mrs. Grimanis stated that to do anything else was too cost prohibitive. She stated her husband can build the deck cheaper than having someone do the stone work or landscaping. With regards to part A. Mr. Weyenberg disagreed. Ms. Higgins agreed. Mr. Quinn disagreed. Chairman DeLeo agreed. With regards to part B. The need for a variance is due to the unique circumstances of the property and not to the general conditions in the neighborhood the appellant stated our yard needs to be improved. As it is my 73-year-old, husband has a hard time cleaning</p>	<p>PUBLIC HEARING</p>

TOWN OF OLD ORCHARD BEACH
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING MINUTES September 27, 2010

<p>Ms. Higgins agreed. Chairman DeLeo agreed. With regards to part B. The requested reduction is reasonably necessary to permit the owner or occupant of the property to use and enjoy the property in essentially the same manner as other similar properties are utilized in the zoning district the appellant stated this property as it sits has no decks or porches. Houses in all zoning districts, not just R2, commonly have a deck or porch, multiple or either, or even a combination of both. It would be reasonable to reduce the front setback on this corner lot property to allow the owners to enjoy a porch. Mr. Quinn agreed. Mr. Weyenberg agreed. Ms. Higgins agreed. Chairman DeLeo agreed. With regards to part C. Due to the physical features of the lot and/or the location of existing structures on the lot, it would not be practical to construct the proposed expansion, enlargement or new structures in conformance with the currently applicable yard size or lot coverage requirements the appellant stated the proposed porch will be located in the larger section of the lot left by the original placement of the existing house. An alternate location for the porch on the low would increase nonconformity with the town's ordinances. Mr. Quinn agreed. Mr. Weyenberg agreed. Ms. Higgins agreed. Chairman DeLeo agreed. With regards to part D. The impacts and effects of the enlargement, expansion or new principal building or structure on the existing uses in the neighborhood will not be substantially different from or greater than the impacts and effects of a building or structure which conforms to the yard size requirements the appellant stated the existing use on the property is a single family home. After the porch addition is built the lot use with remain a single family home. This will cause no impacts or effects on the existing uses in the neighborhood. Mr. Quinn agreed. Mr. Weyenberg agreed. Ms. Higgins agreed. Chairman DeLeo agreed. Mr. Quinn moved to permit the reduction of the front yard setback to allow the construction of a 3-season room. Ms. Higgins seconded. Motion passes unanimously.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Motion</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Vote</p>
<p>ITEM 3: Variance: Jeff & Pam Chute, owners of 62 Winona Avenue, MBL 320-8-2 in the R3 Zone to permit the adjustment of the side yard</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Item 3: Variance, Jeff & Pam Chute, 62</p>

TOWN OF OLD ORCHARD BEACH
 ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING MINUTES September 27, 2010

<p>setback to allow the construction of a porch.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Winona Avenue</u> <u>MBL 320-8-2</u></p>
<p>Adam Goodwin, representing Carl Goodwin, Inc. Mr. Nugent explained the need for this to return to the board. The correct protocol was unknowingly overlooked, and the DEP requests that in a situation such as they be notified 20 days before the meeting. As they were not we felt it was appropriate to bring this back in front of the board after the 20-day time period. This will make it legal and bonding. Chairman DeLeo asked what the DEPs response to this was. Mr. Nugent explained there is an advisory letter that was given to each of the board members and then read that the DEPs recommendation was to not grant the variance. The board is not obligated to follow that recommendation and can do what they thing is correct and prudent. Mr. Weyenberg asked if the DEP has authority over the town. Mr. Nugent stated they do not have the power to negate the variance. Mr. Goodwin explained that the proper protocol was not followed. Mr. Quinn questioned the two different interpretations from the DEP. Mr. Nugent explained that there are two different rulings because they are regarding two different things. One is regarding Shoreland Zoning, and the other is regarding the National Resource Protection Act. Mr. Quinn asked if the prior variance had been recorded. Mr. Goodwin stated it had. Mr. Quinn asked what bearing that would have on this. Mr. Nugent explained that staff would create a new variance approval certificate, and they would need to register it in Alfred. If the board does not approve we would need to do steps to negate the current variance. Mr. Goodwin read a letter into the record.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">PUBLIC HEARING</p>

TOWN OF OLD ORCHARD BEACH
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING MINUTES September 27, 2010

I am here before the Zoning Board of appeals on behalf of the Chutes today to reapply for the variance that was granted to us on July 26th, 2010. On May 8th, 2009 Chris Coppi of the Department of Environmental Protection Bureau of Land and Water Quality met with the Chutes, Carl and I onsite at 62 Winona Avenue. After his site visit and office research he deemed in a letter to the Chutes completed June 19th, 2009 that their “property is adjacent to a freshwater wetland as defined by the Natural Resources Protection Act (NRPA). The Department does not have adjacency jurisdiction to the freshwater wetland and therefore, a permit is not required for activities within 75 feet of the wetland.” Not needing a permit from the DEP we went to the town to see the steps required to get approval for what we wanted to do. First step was here in front of the Zoning Board of Appeals. Even after we were successfully granted the variance approval by you, we knew that there were other steps to complete prior to a building permit could be obtained. By law we are told the approval of the variance had to be sent to the DEP or state for their approval before thing could continue. Turns out that the DEP was supposed to be given the chance to input their recommendations or suggestions on the topic to be heard here at the Zoning Board of Appeals. Fine. I have no issues with proceed. This being an oversight nullifies our previous approval that was registered with the registrar of deeds on August 5th, 2010, Book 15,911 Page 427. So, we are here before you again for approval of our variance request, but this time with the input of the DEP despite there letter stating we did not need a permit from them to complete our project.

In the letter to the town from Mike Morse, Assistant Shoreland Zoning Coordinator for the Bureau of Land and Water Quality, his comments make no mention of DEP rules, laws, or restrictions. His letter on the other hand does not support our effort to obtain a variance and states reasons why the answers for our application to you, the Zoning Boards of Appeals, should not pass He does not state any reasons why the DEP would not permit this project.

In conclusion, we stand here before you again today to reapply for a variance that would allow Jeff and Pam Chute to add a covered porch, whose footprint had to be taken for a utility room to house a furnace due to the floodplain, in their efforts to make their property at 62 Winona Avenue a year-round home in which they can someday retire. The board found our reasons to be sufficient on July 26th of this year, and considering there are no DEP laws or rules stating otherwise we hope the board will again approve our request for this variance.

Thank you

Chairman DeLeo called for any abutters or correspondence.

Jeff Chute, owner. Mr. Chute understood that they are limited to the footprint, and there is a need to show hardship for this variance. He and his wife feel having a home approximately 700 sf is hardship.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED AT 7:23 P.M.

With regards to part A. The land in question cannot yield a reasonable return unless the variance is granted the appellant stated the lot we are working with is located in an A flood zone and is encroached by a wetland. Due to the flood zone and the new home being built for 4 season permanent residence use, the existing covered porch square footage needs to be applied as a utility room. A variance to reduce the wetland setback allowing us to

TOWN OF OLD ORCHARD BEACH
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING MINUTES September 27, 2010

<p>build an attached enclosed porch would allow a reasonable return. Mr. Quinn agreed. Mr. Weyenberg agreed. Ms. Higgins agreed. Chairman DeLeo agreed. With regards to part B. The need for a variance is due to the unique circumstances of the property and not to the general conditions in the neighborhood the appellant stated despite the area at the rear of the lot being labeled a wetland, the Maine Department of Environmental Protection does not hold enforcement of activities such as ours in this areas vicinity as stated by the DEP in a letter to the homeowner after two site visits. Seeing as the state will allow our activities we would ask the Town of Old Orchard Beach to grant a variance to reduce the wetland setback. This differs from much of Ocean Park that is related by the DEP. Mr. Quinn agreed. Mr. Weyenberg agreed. Ms. Higgins agreed. Chairman DeLeo agreed. With regards to part C. The granting of the variance will not alter the essential character of the locality the appellant stated the granting of our variance would allow us to build a house in its existing footprint with the addition of a covered porch that conforms to the lot line setbacks and lot percentage coverage maximums as laid out in the town's ordinances, therefore the granting of our variance will not alter the character of the locality. Mr. Quinn agreed. Mr. Weyenberg agreed. Ms. Higgins agreed. Chairman DeLeo agreed. With regards to part D. The hardship is not the result of action taken by the appellant or a prior owner the appellant stated when this and surrounding lots were created there were no zoning ordinances. When the house was placed and built around 1920 there was also no zoning or wetland setbacks. The lots size, shape, and proximity to the wetland and when it and the house were created compose the hardship. The formation of flood zones and their attached building requirements add to that hardship. Mr. Quinn agreed. Mr. Weyenberg agreed. Ms. Higgins agreed. Chairman DeLeo agreed. Mr. Weyenberg moved to permit the reduction of the wetland setbacks at 62 Winona Avenue. Ms. Higgins seconded. Motion passes unanimously</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Motion Vote</p>
<p><u>ITEM 4: Miscellaneous Appeal:</u> Joyce & Ernest A. Young, owners of 52</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Item 4:</u> <u>Miscellaneous</u></p>

TOWN OF OLD ORCHARD BEACH
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING MINUTES September 27, 2010

<p>Evergreen Avenue, MBL 311-22-1, in the R2 Zone to permit the reduction of the rear yard setback to allow for the construction of code-compliant stairs. The owner is the appellant.</p>	<p><u>Appeal: Joyce & Ernest A. Young, 52 Evergreen Avenue, MBL 311-22-1</u></p>
<p>Ernest A. Young, owner of 52 Evergreen Street explained the need for new stairs. They owners have lifted the house to replace the foundation, and subsequently the house is higher up. Therefore, there is the need for additional stairs to reach the ground. With code requirements of rise and run, the stairs will not go out into the setback.</p> <p>Ms. Higgins asked if the steps were there before.</p> <p>Mr. Young explained there was no need for a railing due to the lack of height of the stairs, and therefore, you could step off of the stairs in any direction.</p> <p>Chairman DeLeo called for any abutters or correspondence. PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED AT 7:48 P.M.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">PUBLIC HEARING</p>
<p>With regards to part A. The existing buildings or structures on the lot for which the limited reduction of yard size/limited expansion of lot coverage is requested were erected prior to the date of adoption of this provision or the lot is a vacant nonconforming lot of record the appellant stated the house was built in 1940 before code restrictions.</p> <p>Mr. Quinn agreed.</p> <p>Mr. Weyenberg agreed.</p> <p>Ms. Higgins agreed.</p> <p>Chairman DeLeo agreed.</p> <p>With regards to part B. The requested reduction is reasonably necessary to permit the owner or occupant of the property to use and enjoy the property in essentially the same manner as other similar properties are utilized in the zoning district the appellant stated we need stairs to porch for safety. House was raised thus the stairs cannot be put on prior foot print. We need more stairs due to raising the structure.</p> <p>Mr. Quinn agreed.</p> <p>Mr. Weyenberg agreed.</p> <p>Ms. Higgins agreed.</p> <p>Chairman DeLeo agreed.</p> <p>With regards to part C. Due to the physical features of the lot and/or the location of existing structures on the lot, it would not be practical to construct the proposed expansion, enlargement or new structures in conformance with the currently applicable yard size or lot coverage requirements the appellant stated we need stairs to porch for safety. The house was raised and the stairs cannot be put on the prior foot print. We need more stairs due to raising the structure.</p> <p>Mr. Quinn agreed.</p> <p>Mr. Weyenberg agreed.</p> <p>Ms. Higgins agreed.</p>	

TOWN OF OLD ORCHARD BEACH
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING MINUTES September 27, 2010

<p>Chairman DeLeo agreed. With regards to part D. The impacts and effects of the enlargement, expansion or new principal building or structure on the existing uses in the neighborhood will not be substantially different from or greater than the impacts and effects of a building or structure which conforms to the yard size requirements the appellant stated there will be no impact. Mr. Quinn agreed. Mr. Weyenberg agreed. Ms. Higgins agreed. Chairman DeLeo agreed. Ms. Higgins moved to permit the reduction of the rear yard setback to allow for the construction of code-compliant stairs. Mr. Weyenberg seconded. Motion passes unanimously.</p>	<p>Motion Vote</p>
<p>ITEM 5: Variance: Edward & Laurie Nasta, owners of 97 Union Avenue, MBL 314-14-1 in the R2 Zone to remove the condition of approval from prior variance.</p>	<p><u>Item 5: Edward & Laurie Nasta, 97 Union Avenue MBL 314-14-1</u></p>
<p>Edward Nasta, owner of 97 Union Avenue explained that the property has 2 units in addition to the single family home. The prior owners obtained a variance in 1985 to convert an existing barn into two units. The problem is the variance had the condition that the units only be used for family members. Mr. Nasta is asking the board to remove the condition regarding family members. Mr. Nugent explained that this condition was known to Mr. Nasta as the potential new owner. The prior owner has been renting the property to people other than family, and this had been recently discovered. The property has been being rented for a very long time. Chairman DeLeo asked if there is adequate parking. Mr. Nugent stated this has been always considered legally non-conforming. There is plenty of off-street parking. Mr. Weyenberg stated he felt there would be adequate room for parking. Ms. Higgins felt the board needed to be specific on what they would be granting. Mr. Nugent stated that technically he is asking to adjust the density. He stated it is a permitted use, but is over density. Mr. Quinn asked if this was a permitted use in the zone, and that is why it is in front of the zoning board not the planning board. Mr. Nugent confirmed this. Chairman DeLeo called for any abutters or correspondence. PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED AT 8:02 P.M.</p>	<p>PUBLIC HEARING</p>
<p>Chairman DeLeo read the appeal. With regards to part A. The land in question cannot yield a</p>	

reasonable return unless the variance is granted the appellant stated in 1985 the zoning board granted a variance for Bolduc family to "to convert existing barn attached to house into two apartments for family use (to grown sons)". The two apartments were created and occupied until recently. Property changed hands in 2006 and new owner was granted rental permits for two apartments in question. Without the variance I cannot make use of the apartments.

Mr. Quinn agreed.

Mr. Weyenberg agreed.

Ms. Higgins agreed.

Chairman DeLeo agreed.

With regards to part B. The requested reduction is reasonably necessary to permit the owner or occupant of the property to use and enjoy the property in essentially the same manner as other similar properties are utilized in the zoning district the appellant stated this property has been in legal use as a four family property since 1985. The lot is a big, corner lot with ample private parking to accommodate 4 units. There is also on-street parking on both adjacent streets. Property is designed as 4 unit property and functioned successfully as one for 25 years.

Mr. Quinn agreed.

Mr. Weyenberg agreed.

Ms. Higgins agreed.

Chairman DeLeo agreed.

With regards to part C. The granting of the variance will not alter the essential character of the locality the appellant stated the apartments have been occupied for 25 years. Many neighboring properties are multi-family dwellings. Granting this variance will not result in a change from prior use of the apartments, nor affect the character of the neighborhood, or pose any health or safety problems. In fact, recent upgrades to the property have lessened any potential health or safety risks. Also, regardless of whether apartments are occupied by relatives or non-relatives has no effect on the neighborhood.

Mr. Quinn agreed.

Mr. Weyenberg agreed.

Ms. Higgins agreed.

Chairman DeLeo agreed.

With regards to part D. The hardship is not the result of action taken by the appellant or a prior owner the appellant stated although I have made repairs and cosmetic improvements to the property, I have not created any new apartment or added to existing structures. The prior owner did not create any new apartments or add to existing structures. Current issue (two apartments for family use) came to light as a result of zoning research done by enforcement officer this past spring when property came on market

TOWN OF OLD ORCHARD BEACH
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING MINUTES September 27, 2010

<p>and was ultimately purchased by me. Mr. Quinn agreed. Mr. Weyenberg agreed. Ms. Higgins agreed. Chairman DeLeo agreed. Mr. Quinn moved to grant the variance and remove condition of family use. Mr. Weyenberg seconded. Motion passes unanimously</p>	<p>Motion</p> <p>Vote</p>
<p>ITEM 6: Miscellaneous Appeal: Richard Hilton, owner of 8 Benoit Avenue, MBL 211-7-31 in the R2 Zone to permit the reduction of the left side yard setback to allow for the construction of stairs and a landing and the reduction of the right side yard setback for the construction of an addition. The owner is the appellant.</p>	<p>Item 6: <u>Miscellaneous Appeal</u> <u>Richard Hilton</u> <u>8 Benoit Avenue</u> <u>MBL 211-7-31</u></p>
<p>Richard Hilton, owner of 8 Benoit Avenue, approached the board and handed out pictures of the current stairs and the area where he wishes to expand. He stated the stairs are currently very dangerous. Mr. Weyenberg asked if there would be a handrail for the steps and questioned how dangerous it would be without the stairs. Mr. Hilton stated he would need guardrails for safety. Mr. Quinn commented that Mr. Hilton had made great improvements to the property and felt he was a real asset to the community. Chairman DeLeo called for any abutters or correspondence. PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED AT 8:11 P.M.</p>	<p>PUBLIC HEARING</p>
<p>With regards to part A. The existing buildings or structures on the lot for which the limited reduction of yard size/limited expansion of lot coverage is requested were erected prior to the date of adoption of this provision or the lot is a vacant nonconforming lot of record the appellant stated this home was built in 1943 and has not been updated in any way. Mr. Quinn agreed. Mr. Weyenberg agreed. Ms. Higgins agreed. Chairman DeLeo agreed. With regards to part B. The requested reduction is reasonably necessary to permit the owner or occupant of the property to use and enjoy the property in essentially the same manner as other similar properties are utilized in the zoning district the appellant stated I cannot open the back door with someone standing on the existing porch. The existing porch is unsafe and needs to be replaced so I would like to enlarge it by two feet at the same time. My home is currently 785 sf with only one bedroom. I would like to add a 12' x 12' room on the back of my home so that I could invite family or friends to stay a night or two. Mr. Quinn agreed.</p>	

TOWN OF OLD ORCHARD BEACH
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING MINUTES September 27, 2010

<p>Gay Mueller, 50 Church Street. Ms. Mueller stated her support of this. She felt Mr. Schneider was a wonderful neighbor and a great asset to the town. She would like to see him be able to continue to improve the property. PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED AT 8:21 P.M.</p>	
<p>With regards to part A. The existing buildings or structures on the lot for which the limited reduction of yard size/limited expansion of lot coverage is requested were erected prior to the date of adoption of this provision or the lot is a vacant nonconforming lot of record the appellant stated the house was built in 1940. Mr. Quinn agreed. Mr. Weyenberg agreed. Ms. Higgins agreed. Chairman DeLeo agreed. With regards to part B. The requested reduction is reasonably necessary to permit the owner or occupant of the property to use and enjoy the property in essentially the same manner as other similar properties are utilized in the zoning district the appellant stated the deck shall be attached to the existing home for structural stability. The existing home is within the ROW and is legally non-conforming. Mr. Quinn agreed. Mr. Weyenberg agreed. Ms. Higgins agreed. Chairman DeLeo agreed. With regards to part C. Due to the physical features of the lot and/or the location of existing structures on the lot, it would not be practical to construct the proposed expansion, enlargement or new structures in conformance with the currently applicable yard size or lot coverage requirements the appellant stated the proposed deck would be built on two sides of the home furthest away from the two parallel streets (16th Street and Church Street). Mr. Quinn agreed. Mr. Weyenberg agreed. Ms. Higgins agreed. Chairman DeLeo agreed. With regards to part D. The hardship is not the result of action taken by the appellant or a prior owner the appellant stated this is true. Mr. Quinn agreed. Mr. Weyenberg agreed. Ms. Higgins agreed. Chairman DeLeo agreed. Ms. Higgins moved to permit the reduction of the right side setback to allow for the construction of a deck. Mr. Weyenberg seconded. Motion passes unanimously.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Motion Vote</p>
<p>ITEM 8: Extension of Variance Approval: Peaches LLC, owner of 88-90</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Item 8:</p>

TOWN OF OLD ORCHARD BEACH
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING MINUTES September 27, 2010

<p>Saco Avenue, MBL 206-9-7 in the GB2 Zone to reaffirm the Variance granted on October 27, 2008. The owner is the appellant.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Extension of Variance Approval: Peaches LLC, 88-90 Saco Avenue, MBL 206-9-7</u></p>
<p>Chairman DeLeo stated there was no one here representing this item. Mr. Quinn moved to table this item until the next meeting. Mr. Weyenberg seconded. Motion passes unanimously.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Motion Vote</p>
<p>ITEM 9: Variance: John Giarolo, owner of 4 Pavia, MBL 319-13-3 in the R3 Zone to permit the adjustment of the front side setback to allow the legalization of a mislocated building. The owner is the appellant.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Item 9: Variance: John Giarolo 4 Pavia Avenue MBL 319-13-3</u></p>
<p>John Giarolo, 4 Pavia Avenue. Mr. Giarolo explained that they are selling the property, and when the survey was done for the title company, the building was found to be in the wrong place. There are many ghost pins in the area, and there was a mistake when the house was built. They need to get this variance to satisfy the title company so the home can be sold. Mr. Weyenberg asked if this was just discovered. Mr. Giarolo stated only a few weeks ago. Mr. Weyenberg questioned why this was not caught when the house was built. Mr. Nugent stated he felt that they possibly used the wrong pins to measure at the time of construction. It was a mistake. Chairman DeLeo called for any abutters or correspondence. PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED AT 8:34 P.M.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">PUBLIC HEARING</p>
<p>With regards to part A. The land in question cannot yield a reasonable return unless the variance is granted the appellant stated the request is so the building is legal and we can obtain a clear title for us to sell the property. Mr. Quinn agreed. Mr. Weyenberg agreed. Ms. Higgins agreed. Chairman DeLeo agreed. With regards to part B. The requested reduction is reasonably necessary to permit the owner or occupant of the property to use and enjoy the property in essentially the same manner as other similar properties are utilized in the zoning district the appellant stated the existing structure is not within the current setback. There will be no charges to the property so everything will remain as it is today. Mr. Quinn agreed. Mr. Weyenberg agreed. Ms. Higgins agreed. Chairman DeLeo agreed. With regards to part C. Due to the physical features of the lot and/or</p>	

TOWN OF OLD ORCHARD BEACH
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING MINUTES September 27, 2010

<p>the location of existing structures on the lot, it would not be practical to construct the proposed expansion, enlargement or new structures in conformance with the currently applicable yard size or lot coverage requirements the appellant stated this is an existing structure so everything will remain as it is.</p> <p>Mr. Quinn agreed. Mr. Weyenberg agreed. Ms. Higgins agreed. Chairman DeLeo agreed</p> <p>With regards to part D. The hardship is not the result of action taken by the appellant or a prior owner the appellant stated the existing dwelling is only 11' from the newly found property line not the required 15'. We are asking for the variance in order to gain clear title of property.</p> <p>Mr. Quinn agreed. Mr. Weyenberg agreed. Ms. Higgins agreed. Chairman DeLeo agreed</p> <p>Ms. Higgins moved to permit the adjustment of the front side setback to allow the legalization of a mislocated building. Mr. Quinn seconded. Motion passes unanimously.</p>	<p>Motion</p> <p>Vote</p>
<p><u>ITEM 10: Approval of minutes:</u> August 30, 2010. Ms. Higgins moved to table the minutes from August 30, 2010. Ms. Weyenberg seconded. Motion passes unanimously.</p>	<p>Motion</p> <p>Vote</p>
<p><u>Good & Welfare</u> Mr. Nugent stated that the ordinance revision committee is starting to meet again. If there is anything that the board would like the committee to address please let us know. Mr. Quinn stated he would like to be able to see if there is the opportunity for the board to attend a workshop regarding variances. He had been to one in the past, and it was very helpful to the board. Mr. Nugent stated that staff would get something to be board regarding this.</p>	
<p>Ms. Higgins moved to adjourn. Mr. Weyenberg seconded. Motion passed unanimously. Meeting adjourned 8:45 pm</p>	<p>Adjournment</p>

I, Tori Geaumont, Secretary to the Zoning Board of Appeals of the Town of Old Orchard Beach, do hereby certify that the foregoing document consisting of fourteen (14) pages is a true copy of the original minutes of the Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting on September 27, 2010

Tori Geaumont