

1 Mr. Smith replied yes and that the house was within the 250 foot buffer. That has no
2 bearing on the accessory dwelling unit.

3
4 Mr. Chatmas inquired whether Mr. Foote understood that this dwelling unit would not be
5 a rental. Mr. Foote stated he understood.

6
7 Chairman Johnson reminded Mr. Foote this unit would not be a home business. Mr.
8 Foote agreed.

9
10 Mr. Chatmas asked about parking for the unit. Mr. Foote stated there was ample
11 parking for four cars. One space is directly in front of the in-law apartment.

12
13 Mr. Smith stated the ordinance calls for two parking spaces for the single family and one
14 for the accessory dwelling unit. So there is surplus parking area.

15
16 Mr. Chatmas questioned whether any internal modifications had been made at this
17 point. Mr. Foote replied they had not.

18
19 There was a discussion between Mr. Chatmas and Mr. Smith concerning the need for a
20 building permit to do the inside work. Mr. Foote will obtain a building permit for the entry
21 way changes. Mr. Smith will inspect the accessory dwelling unit to make sure there are
22 proper smoke detectors and egress window(s). The Zoning Board would not be held
23 responsible for ensuring safety measures for the unit.

24
25 Mr. Chatmas noted that the application meets code and satisfies the ordinance.

26
27 After inquiring and finding no further comments, Chairman Johnson closed the public
28 portion of the meeting:

29
30 Conclusions:

31
32 1. The proposed use will not create hazardous traffic conditions when added to existing
33 and foreseeable traffic in its vicinity. All were in favor.

34
35 2. The proposed use will not create unsanitary conditions by reason of sewage
36 disposal, emissions to the air, or other aspects of its design or operation. All were in
37 favor.

38
39 3. The proposed use will not adversely affect the value of adjacent properties. All were
40 in favor.

41
42 4. The proposed site plan and layout are compatible with adjacent property uses and
43 with the Comprehensive Plan. All were in favor.

44
45 5. The design and external appearance of any proposed building will constitute an
46 attractive and compatible addition to its neighborhood, although it need not have a
47 similar design, appearance or architecture. All were in favor.

48
49

1 Judgment:

2

3 A motion was made by Mr. Gulino and seconded by Mr. Thibodeau to approve the
4 application of Dana L. Foote, 21 Linwood Street, for a conditional use permit for a 535
5 square foot accessory dwelling unit. All were in favor.

6

7 Chairman Johnson noted there were four conditions of approval:

8

9 1. There shall be one dedicated parking space for the accessory dwelling unit.

10

11 2. No home occupation or home business is permitted now or in the future.

12

13 3. The single family and accessory dwelling units shall be held in the same ownership.

14

15 4. An attested copy of this conditional use permit shall be filed in the Cumberland
16 County Registry of Deeds within ninety (90) days of this approval.

17

18 Chairman Johnson congratulated the Footes on the approval of the application.

19

20 **F.** Communications – Mr. Smith reminded board members of the invitation to attend
21 orientation and refresher training the first Monday in February.

22

23 **G.** Adjournment – Motion by Mr. Black to adjourn; seconded by Mr. Howe. All were in
24 favor. Meeting adjourned at 7:25 pm.