

## HULL ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

**Applicant:** John A. Riley

**Property:** 5 Nantasket Avenue

**Date:** Thursday, February 21, 2013

**Time Meeting Began:** 7:32 p.m.

**Time Meeting Concluded:** 8:05 p.m.

**Place of Meeting:** Hull Municipal Building, Main Meeting Room

**Zoning Board Members Present for Hearing:**

Alana Swiec, Chair	<b>Sitting</b>	Attending	Absent	Abstain
Dr. Roger Atherton, Clerk	<b>Sitting</b>	Attending	Absent	Abstain
Atty. Mark Einhorn, Member	<b>Sitting</b>	Attending	Absent	Abstain
Phillip Furman, Associate	Sitting	<b>Attending</b>	Absent	Abstain

### **Others in Attendance:**

*Karen Morgan, Recording Secretary*

*John A. Riley, Applicant – 16 East Street, Hingham*

*Bonnie B. Hobbs, Applicant – 16 East Street, Hingham*

*Nicholas Cotoulas, Abutter – 10 Nantasket Avenue, Hull*

**General Relief Sought: New Hearing** - Filed by John A. Riley, of Hingham, on property at 5 Nantasket Avenue to demolish existing structure and rebuild new structure to include 1 residential unit and 1 commercial space. The residential unit will be expanded into a second story. The proposed mixed-use building with second story expansion of residential unit requires a special permit from the ZBA. All existing and proposed setbacks are less than required; existing lot coverage of 56% remains the same; proposed height of 25.6' is less than allowed 40'. Parking for existing use should be grandfathered with use; parking for expansion requires 2 spaces for residential use and one space for commercial.

**General Discussion:** Ms. Swiec said that that the Board has a plan that came with their packet and Ms. Hobbs submitted a new one. Ms. Hobbs said it was the same but did not know if the Board had any copies.

Ms. Hobbs addressed the Board that this is a new application. It is completely different. It is a one single unit and one commercial space; which is what is existing as far as use goes. Since she is adding more space to the residential unit, this is what will be processed and in need of a special permit. She got the approval from Con Comm. and the footprint was reduced by 4 ft. on the long side of the existing footprint. She did this so they can get staff parking on the side, tandem parking, and reducing lot coverage. Ms. Hobbs points out to Mr. Atherton where the long side is on the site plan. She continued

to say that she added the paved walkway. She also wanted a pergola, and a curb cut which the Police Dept. and Dept. of Public works are looking into.

Ms. Hobbs continues to state that it now has a plate height of 10 ft. She said that there will be one street parking space; which would be the third parking space.

Mr. Atherton indicated he has some issues with the current plans submitted. On the plans he has with him now, it does not show all the details mentioned. It shows some items that it does not show on other plans submitted. The storage is not shown. Items were moved and items were eliminated. The car was moved, but it is not shown in the plan. The pergola and the extension out back does not show on the plan. It was changed showing a different entryway in which the older plan had.

Ms. Hobbs said that the building footprint foundation plan. This is the same plan as the other one. Mr. Atherton said that the new one shows an increase of lot coverage, this plan does not accurately reflect the two different plans. Ms. Hobbs said that one plan was from her last submission (2009). Mr. Atherton said that they are not-coordinated. Ms. Hobbs said that she will get her current plan coordinated. Mr. Atherton said that the storage and relocation of the parking needs to be shown in the revised plan.

At this point, Mr. Atherton and Ms. Swiec review the plans. Mr. Atherton said that the relief that is needed is parking without the usual 3 ft. from the lot line is what the applicants are seeking.

Ms. Swiec asked if it was one residential unit, but two floors with expanded residential space. Ms. Hobbs said yes.

Mr. Atherton feels that an updated plan needs to be submitted and suggested conducting a site visit. Ms. Swiec said that we need to vote contingent on the new plans. Mr. Einhorn said that we do not need the revised plan to do a site visit.

Mr. Cotoulas, an abutter at 10 Nantasket Ave., indicated that Mr. Riley is a good neighbor and is doing the right thing.

**Action Taken, if any:**

**Hearing will continue to April 4, 2013, 7:30 p.m. Each member will conduct an individual site visit on their own accord. A revised plan needs to be submitted beforehand.**

*Recorded by Karen Morgan*

Approved by Roger Atherton

---

**All actions taken:**

*All action taken includes not only votes and other formal decisions made at a meeting, but also discussion or consideration of issues for which no vote is taken or final determination is made. Each discussion held at a meeting*

*must be identified; in most cases this is accomplished by setting forth a summary of each discussion. A verbatim record of discussion is not required.*