## SHARON ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MINUTES OF WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 14, 2020

**LOCATION OF MEETING:** In compliance with the Governor's emergency declaration relative to the conduct of public meetings, the Town arranged to conduct board and committee meetings using Zoom video/audio conferencing in an effort to minimize the spread of COVID-19. Interested citizens received directions on how to attend the meeting remotely in the Agenda as posted on the ZBA website and the Town. This meeting was presented with the video and/or audio available for later broadcast. The Zoning Board of Appeals is focused on observing the spirit of the Open Meeting Law during this temporary emergency situation to assure accountability for the deliberations and actions of elected and appointed officials conducting the public's business.

A virtual meeting of the Sharon Zoning Board of Appeals was held on Wednesday October 14, 2020, at 7:00 P.M. The following members were present as established by roll call: Abe Brahmachari, Joe Garber, Steve Weiss, Sam Reef, and David Young. Mr. Brahmachari opened meeting noting Covid19 protocols per the Governor of MA and procedural ground rules.

## 7:03 PM- 15 Franklin Road, Case 1854—Continued

Mr. Brahmachari made a motion to continue the case to November 4, 2020. Mr. Garber seconded. Board approved the continuation unanimously 5-0-0 (Brahmachari, Garber, Weiss, Young, Reef). This case was previously continued by the applicant due to Covid concerns. Because of the delay, re-notice for the public before the November 4, 2020, will include abutter mailing and re-posting of the legal notice in the Times Advocate.

## 7:03 PM- 23 Suffolk Road, Case 1864—New Case

Present for the applicant: Arindam Chattopadhyay and his architect, James B Michael Jr., AIA – Theodhosi + Michael, Sharon MA

Documents included: application filed on September 4, 2020, plot plan by Professional Land Surveying, Weymouth, MA dated August 9, 2016, and a two-paged Addition Proposed Plan by Theodhosi + Michael Architecture, Sharon, MA dated August 31, 2020.

Mr. Brahmachari read the legal notice as it appeared in Times Advocate September 30, 2020 and October 7, 2020; a letter from Kevin Davis, Board of Health agent dated September 24, 2020; and a letter from John Thomas, Conservation Commissioner, dated September 21, 2020.

Applicant's architect, Mr. Michael, explained expansion to home to the south including a powder room, a prayer room right off the dining room for private religious practices, and a deck extending over an existing concrete patio. So it's a relatively small enclosed addition and then a 120- or 130-square-foot increase in lot coverage.

Extent of relief is to ask for a 14 foot setback instead of 20 foot setback. House itself is inside of the 20 foot setback –nonconformance that places it at about 14.9 feet. Addition is coplanar with the existing house.

This is a three-bedroom home with no second floor. Home is a little over 1,000 square feet. They are well within the 20-foot rear setback per architect.

Board discussed deck size and that it isn't encroaching any more on the shed. Also noted, the 14 feet should be spelled out in the documents, as it is currently not.

Previous project came in front of board for a 12- x 12' addition and added about four years ago.

Board member concerned that the house itself is not parallel with the property line. New deck will be pretty close to 14.0 feet if built coplanar, which increases the non-conformity. Architect conceded deck can be moved over a few inches. Architect would like the built portion -- powder room and prayer room -- to be coplanar with the house itself. Board members do not like idea of increasing the nonconformity.

Mr. Chattopadhyay said prayer room will not be open to the public. It will be open to their family members and friends in case someone is there, not a commercial thing. Currently their prayer room is in one of their bedrooms so they are just moving it to a separate location.

Board discussion to redraw before the vote showing project not increasing the non-conformity. Architect said it is a minor redraw and in terms of nonconformity, due to the concrete patio, with the exception of the proposed deck they aren't increasing the nonconformity. Concrete is already at 14.3 or maybe more at the corner. Chair said concrete patio is more of a landscape item in Board's consideration. Board will need new drawing showing the dimensions maintaining the current nonconforming setback in order to hold a vote.

Mr. Chattopadhyay requested ZBA continue case.

Chair motioned to continue Case 1864 23 Suffolk Road to November 4, 2020. Mr. Garber seconded. This vote was by roll call and approved unanimously, 5-0-0 (Brahmachari, Garber, Weiss, Young, Reef).

Motion to approve the ZBA minutes from September 30, 2020, meeting. Mr. Garber seconded. This vote was by roll call and approved unanimously 5-0-0 (Brahmachari, Garber, Weiss, Young, Reef).

The meeting adjourned at 7:47 P.M.

Respectfully submitted.