

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND

MINUTES
THE ZONING BOARD OF REVIEW
OF BRISTOL, RHODE ISLAND

15 JULY 2024
7:05 PM
BRISTOL TOWN HALL
BRISTOL, RHODE ISLAND

BEFORE THE TOWN OF BRISTOL ZONING BOARD OF REVIEW:

MR. CHARLES BURKE, Vice Chairman
MR. DONALD S. KERN
MR. GEORGE D. DUARTE, JR., Alternate
MS. KIM TEVES, Alternate

ALSO PRESENT:

ATTORNEY ANDREW TEITZ, Town Solicitor's Office
MR. EDWARD TANNER, Zoning Officer

Susan E. Andrade
91 Sherry Ave.
Bristol, RI 02809
401-253-5570

INDEX

Page

1. Approval of minutes:	
06 MAY 2024	
03 JUNE 2024.....	3
Continued Petitions:	
2. 2024-22 – Petition of Amanda L. Valentino.....	5
New Petitions:	
3. 2024-23 – Petition of Michael V. Porco.....	20
4. 2024-24 – Petition of Vasco Castro, III.....	23
5. Adjournment.....	24

15 JULY 2024

The meeting of the Town of Bristol Zoning Board of Review was held and called to order at 7:05 p.m. by Vice Chairman Charles Burke at Bristol Town Hall, 10 Court St., Bristol, RI

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Vice Chairman Burke called for approval of the May 6, 2024, and June 3, 2024 minutes

X X X X X X

MR. BURKE: Any questions on the May minutes of 2024, any comments? Can we get a motion to approve please.

MR. KERN: I make a motion to approve the May 6th minutes, as written.

MR. DUARTE: Second.

MR. BURKE: All in favor:

MS. TEVES: Aye.

MR. DUARTE: Aye.

MR. BURKE: Aye.

MR. KERN: Aye.

MR. BRUM: Aye.

X X X X X X

(MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVE)

X X X X X X

MR. BURKE: Approval of the minutes for June 3, 2024. Any questions? Can I have a motion please.

MR. KERN: Motion to approve the June minutes.

15 JULY 2024

MS. TEVES: Second.

MR. BURKE: All in favor:

MS. TEVES: Aye.

MR. DUARTE: Aye.

MR. BURKE: Aye.

MR. KERN: Aye.

MR. BRUM: Aye.

X X X X X X

(THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED)

(Minutes were approved)

15 JULY 2024

CONTINUED PETITIONS:

2. 2024-22

AMANDA L. VALENTINO

**20 Beach Rd.: R-10
Pl. 64 Lots 90 & 91**

Dimensional Variances to construct a 16' x 24' accessory garage structure with less than the required front yard and less than the required right-side yard, and greater than permitted lot coverage by structures.

Amanda Valentino, 20 Beach Road, presented the Petition to the Board. She explained that they are trying to build a detached garage, a small one-car garage on the property for purposes of storage for all their belongings, including that of their one-year-old son. They do not have a basement in the dwelling and only a small attic space and need to find more storage space. The reason for the second floor is also for additional storage and an extra bonus room for their son and another family area.

The reason for the variances request is that they have an above-ground pool that was there when they purchased the house nine years ago. When they did the architectural design and spoke with the contractor, they were told that getting too close to the pool could make it collapse. Additionally, there are some very large trees in their yard and are hoping not to have to take them down, as they do create privacy not only for them but also for other neighbors. In addition to the pool, there is a relatively brand-new deck that encircles most of the pool that they added on in August of 2017, constructed with tree and would like to not have to take that down as well.

Mr. Burke noted the lot coverage issue also. He stated that there is correspondence about removing some of the structures. Ms. Valentino stated that the existing structures are small sheds, which go part and parcel to why they are asking for the garage. If

15 JULY 2024

they are able to build the proposed garage, the hope is to take down some of that shed space. The lot coverage is minimal, but either way the whole idea is that if they can have the garage, they can take some of those structures down.

Mr. Burke asked if she would be willing to commit to reducing the lot coverage. Ms. Valentino stated that is the intention. Mr. Burke asked again if she would be willing to commit. Ms. Valentino stated yes and that right now they have a larger shed, and the intention right now is to take that down and create more space. Mr. Burke explained that he would be a lot more comfortable if they didn't want the entire property covered with structures. Ms. Valentino stated she would rather have more grass for her son to play in and have more space and not have everything covered by structures.

Mr. Burke stated that the placement of the garage from the front yard is no further forward than the primary structure. Ms. Valentino stated that is her understanding as well. Mr. Burke stated that would then leave a 3-foot distance between the structure and the property line to the neighbor on the west. Ms. Valentino stated that she has spoken to that neighbor and that she has personally spoke with at least a dozen neighbors. There have been a lot of letters or support from neighbors throughout the neighborhood, spoken to everyone directly, everyone has been in support. The direct abutting neighbors were sitting in the audience. Her intention is to be fully transparent with all neighbors, make sure that they understand what's going on, the purpose of why they want to use it.

Mr. Kern asked why they were only using the three-foot rule and how close they would be to the pool deck if they moved it back, moving it six feet away from the west side. Ms. Valentino stated that the reason is to try to avoid getting too close and having the pool collapse. She also wants to avoid taking out as many trees as possible.

15 JULY 2024

Ms. Valentino also explained that they need room for egress between the pool and the garage, so that everything isn't clustered too close, which is also the reason that having the stairs on the outside, to have multiple egresses in case of emergency coming out the back.

Mr. Duarte asked if it would be possible to move the pool to the east side of the property. Ms. Valentino explained they actually discussed that, but the problem is that it creates the problem where they built the deck around the pool. They would have to then reconfirm a trex deck that has been there that they paid for and built themselves. Mr. Duarte stated that basically it comes down to the lack of return on the investment on the trex, as you would have to take it down and relocate the pool and build the deck again, to reflect the same type of structure that they have around the pool. From an expense perspective it could be burdensome. Ms. Valentino stated that it would be a burdensome expense for sure; but in addition, she doesn't know if it would be physically possible to move it to the east side. There's a propane tank, there are a lot of other structures on the east side of the house that she doesn't know if they would be amenable to build a pool off of what is the bathroom on the bottom floor. She doesn't know the mechanics of it. There is also the oil tank back there.

Ms. Teves stated that Ms. Valentino mentioned that if she were to be able to add to the coverage of the property with adding this garage and the above additional space, that she would remove one of the sheds towards the back of the property. Which seems to be a shed that she pointed to and asked that if the shed were to be removed, then they would be able to exercise the option of moving the pool in order to avoid having to go that close to the property line.

Ms. Valentino asked if she meant to take down the pool, the deck and the shed? Ms. Teves stated not to take down all of it, but that she would get rid of one of the structures because of the lot coverage. Mr. Burke stated that there is a really big shed in the back, if it is

15 JULY 2024

removed, they would have more space to relocate the pool and the deck, which would eliminate the need to have it three feet from the property line.

Ms. Kit McGinn, 64 Beach Road spoke in favor of the Petition. Her family has been living on that road for well over 100 years. The only point she could make at this time without hearing the objections is that if there is a question about the stairway coming down from the second floor of the proposed structure, she sees it, as having been a Housing Officer, as a secondary means of egress, which is one of the key parts of building any kind of structure. If its meant for storage and there is no other exit other than through the garage, that's a danger about to happen. Having a stairway coming another way out of the structure is something that should be done.

Mr. Mitch Myette, 16 Beach Road, spoke against the Petition. He stated that he used to live in Newport and moved away from there back in 1993 to get away from living close knit to other homes; and this is a very pristine area. His problem with the structure being so close to the house is that they have a lot of molds, and they don't want to be that close. Why not put in the 30-foot back and 6 feet in for the variance. He read "one accessory dwelling unit shall be allowed in an owner-occupied property, where the proposed ADU is located within the existing footprint of the primary structure, or existing accessory attached or detached structure and does not expand the footprint of the structure". He noted that the language does not specify existing prior to the passing of this law, once built a detached building is existing and asked if everyone is going to be able to build apartments on Beach Road, and what is that going to do to the area, because there's nothing that says that they can't build an apartment. If it is for storage, they're not going to carry bicycles and stuff up to the second floor. If you need storage, you can

15 JULY 2024

put it on the first floor. He confirmed that part of his concern is that it will be turned into an apartment. They already have a neighbor that has two people living downstairs as a rental.

Mr. Burke stated that they can have people living in their house, but they can't have a separate dwelling unit, unless it meets the requirements of the Town. Mr. Myette asked if that's where the Town is going. Mr. Burke explained that is not what is being asked to be approved, the Board is asked to approve a conforming accessory structure that dimensionally is not in the location per the Code.

Mr. McGinn stated that there is a lot to think about and the other thing is what kind of adverse effects it is going to have if they try to sell his property with a structure so close and they are going to lose their privacy. He confirmed that he did not build his current home, it was built in the 1940's but they added a second floor to it, as it was just a little cottage. He asked if the law allows them to build an apartment complex. Mr. Burke again explained that was not being discussed or reviewed. The application isn't to build an apartment. Mr. Myette asked then why they would have a deck on the second floor. Mr. Burke explained that per the application, it is going to be used as a rec room, which is allowed.

In response to Mr. Myette questioning whether it could happen in the future, Mr. Teitz explained that it is likely that under the law that in the future that they would be able to convert it into an apartment; although it would be extremely small, approximately 262 square feet for the upper floor. Once it's an existing structure; and there is some debate on what an existing means. Does it mean when they passed it in 2022, does it mean 2024, or does it mean any once its existing. But assuming that it means once it exists otherwise, that it does appear that they could convert to a residential dwelling. It would be a very small one, it would be upstairs, and it seems like it wouldn't be big enough. Although, if they wanted to eliminate the garage

15 JULY 2024

and have both floors of the garage as housing, they could. He confirmed that they would be talking about the new laws that are in effect, as they have been passed and signed by the Governor, in the future. He instructed the Board to look at the question of perhaps making conditions, such as removal of the shed to reduce lot coverage and they should look at where it is on the lot and look at the size of it. Even if it were a residence of that size, would it be a problem; because there would not be more than one person in there at that size, it's pretty small. It is something to look at overall in the Board's consideration of looking at the hardship; whether they've met the Standards and whether they would have a negative impact to the neighborhood. Would there be any more negative or significant impact if there were someone living there, than if it were built there as it is.

Mr. Myette asked why she can't add the structure to the existing home. The Board agreed that it would be significantly more costly to do that and it's already non-conforming.

Ms. Donna Bergeron, 16 Beach Road, spoke against the Petition. She stated that the concerns are that the structure they're proposing is very close to their existing home. And probably very comparable to the size of their existing home; length, width, whatever it is. The other question is that they already have an existing shed on the property and they're looking to have storage. Has there been any consideration in perhaps remodeling that shed; it is fairly large, its been on the property for quite some time and it wouldn't create any of this adversity. Because what they're proposing, in their opinion, is going to impact their privacy and also perhaps have an impact on resale of their home, given that it is extremely close.

Mr. Robert Pease, 23 Beach Road, spoke against the Petition. He stated that as he understood from the applicant, they want to put this addition directly next to (he held up a visual)

15 JULY 2024

and continued to show that they want to put the Shed directly next to 16 Beach Road, within six feet of the house and at the same time keeping the distance from their own house 33 feet, because it's too expensive to move an above-ground pool. He doesn't think it's right. They should move it right next to the existing breezeway. In fact, when this proposal originally came up, he thought he would let it go, and he did let it go, because the notice read that it was going to add a garage with some storage next to the existing house. For some reason it was postponed, and the second notice came and that's when he dug into the meat of what they were asking for and became quite alarmed and then had more questions than answers. It appears to him that they just don't want to be bothered with the expense, but at the same time have very little concern for what it is going to do with the visuals of the neighborhood. And directly affecting not just 16 Beach Road, but everybody else's. He thinks it's in poor taste and it could be done tastefully in other ways that may or may not be a little more expensive to them. He doesn't see that there is any variance needed at all.

Ms. Kit McGinn reapproached and stated that she certainly understands that people are concerned about privacy. But she also knows that on the street there are several houses that are very close to each other and gave examples. If there are trees in between, if they are not noisy neighbors, she doesn't see the problem. She can certainly see why they might not want to add structure to a house that was built in 1950; it certainly would be not only an expense, but potentially could have a negative effect on the existing house. They don't know what the structure is, they don't have a basement and very little attic. Some in the area don't even have basements. She understands the reason for the request, and she would not want to put a structure into a building that is that old; tear open a wall and who knows what's inside of it. If they're proposing to meet the requirement for not having greater than permitted coverage on the lot, then

15 JULY 2024

she thinks that would suffice. She doesn't know what the variance is that is required from one house to another; but she could certainly testify that on that road there are many houses that are within feet of each other. She again talked about the safety of having the outside stairway and asked if they were to have someone live there, would they have to come back to the Town and then there would be the expense of plumbing and more electricity. She doesn't think that having dealt with the applicant that that is the intention.

Mr. Myette stated that Ms. McGinn is talking about a lot of properties on the road that are close to each other, and he doesn't see it.

Ms. Valentino stated that to respond. She believed that Mr. Burke brought up the property at 16 Beach Road being very close to the property to begin with. She doesn't know when they moved into 16 Beach Road, but she can tell the Board that there had to have been a variance for that property to be that close. Mr. Burke stated that not having been built in 1930; there were no Ordinances back then. Ms. Valentino stated that they are dealing with a property that is already very close to her property line to begin with. They had a survey done that solidified and clarified what the property lines are, which is now being disputed at this point, which was done back in 2020. Additionally, she knows the concern was privacy and there are many trees that are right now covering the view of what would be the garage. Part of the variance is because they want to keep those trees, out of respect for the neighbors. She remembers having this conversation with Mr. Myette back on May 16th. He doesn't have to hear a little kid running around constantly, as potentially the garage is going to give him more privacy than what he has right now with a kid and a dog next door. The other thing is that there is a very old fence that she did not bring up, but it is about to fall down, her guess would be some time this winter and that privacy is going to be completely out the window. Her proposal would be to

15 JULY 2024

also, even though it's not in the sketch, but with the garage they have to rebuild that fence. And that would only add to the privacy between 16 and 20 Beach Road. She has had this conversation with Mr. Myette, and she would like to think that as neighbors, that if they had a question as well that they would just go to her and ask. She can answer any questions, and they did have a very long conversation on May 16th. She noted that this is a very close-knit neighborhood and as being the Secretary of the neighborhood association, she knows that the persons at 16 Beach Road are not members. Additionally, she knows that there was an anonymous letter that was going around the neighborhood regarding the apartment concern. She stated that the intent is not at all at this point to build an apartment. If the objectors had actually looked at what the plan is, they would notice there is no plumbing. They live in a beautiful neighborhood and would like to add a deck to the bonus room to be able to see the Bay, she thinks it would be silly not to have that.

Mr. Burke stated that he believes in her intent, but if she were to sell the property and the next person looks at it and they see a structure and if it's legal then a lot of people would do it.

Ms. Valentino stated that she knows that things can change but went into great detail on her intent to stay on that property for the rest of her life.

Ms. Valentino continued and stated that, again, when she spoke with Mr. Myette, he had to think about it for a while and she just wished that he would have come back to her and had a conversation. The question regarding Ms. Bergeron concern of the shed in the back yard and why not build on to it; she doesn't even know how they could structurally put a driveway going to the back yard for a garage or build on that. As Ms. McGinn said, the house was built in 1935, and the shed was there before they purchase the property. The structure of the shed is very

15 JULY 2024

poor, no true foundation, its all coming up at this point. In order to build on top of that, that wouldn't make any sense. The closing matter is that they were very cognizant and conscious about making sure that whatever building was going to go there would fit in with the fabric of the neighborhood.

X X X X X X

MR. BURKE: I'd like a motion to close the public comments.
MR. TEVES: I'll make a motion to close the public comments.
MR. KERN: Second
MR. BURKE: All in favor:
MS. TEVES: Aye.
MR. DUARTE: Aye.
MR. BURKE: Aye.
MR. KERN: Aye.

XX X X X X X

(THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED)

Discussion was held in detail on the new laws and that they can't use that to say that well they can't do it because of something that somebody might do in the future. He is uncomfortable with the side yard variance; he was okay with the front yard variance, because the proposed accessory structure doesn't intrude any further into the front yard. He would like a concession from the applicant on restoring the lot coverage to under the maximum amount.

Mr. Tietz stated they could make it a condition that the existing structures either be removed or reduced in size, so that a survey be presented prior to issuance of a building permit for this garage that shows compliance with the lot coverage.

15 JULY 2024

Mr. Tanner added that the proposed garage is 384 square feet, shed number 2 shown on the applicant's survey plan, which he believes is the shed that the applicant indicated I going to come down, the survey plan says its 451 square feet. Unless the applicant says no that she wants to keep the two and she was looking at the one. He thought it was shed number 2, they could make some kind of condition that says that within so many months of a Certificate of Occupancy the shed number 2, giving them time to move their stuff, would be removed. He would like to the Board to reference exactly what they want removed in their decision from the site plan.

Mr. Duarte believes that at some point they need to take into the concerns of the abutting neighbor. He understands the need for storage, giving the current circumstances. But he also believes that at some point the concerns of the abutting neighbor should be addressed. The size of the structure and how close it is to the side yard and thinks that the Board should speak to it.

Ms. Teves stated that she likes the conditions with the removal of the shed, which offsets everything by adding the garage. She also thinks that the stairs coming off the second floor does indicate the potential of future use of having that as something otherwise. As far as safety is concerned, unless someone is residing there, then really you don't need two points of egress; it's being used for storage. So, the stairs might be something that everyone might be willing to forego.

Mr. Burke stated that his take is that it's a 16-foot-wide garage; you can't put stairs in there and put a vehicle in it. He believes the outside stairs are the only way to get upstairs. Because otherwise they would try to build a 22' wide or 24' x 24' and put stairs inside.

15 JULY 2024

Mr. Kern stated that he was in agreement that he did not like the west boundary being only 3 feet; that should be maintained at 6 feet. He had a big problem trying to figure out how moving something 3 feet closer to a pool will affect the integrity of the pool, which is almost 30 feet away. He also agreed with the setback on the front yard, as long as it stays no further away than the main house. He would also like a reduction of the lot coverage.

Mr. Burke stated that just to confirm that the new regulation which drives the setbacks for a non-conforming lot, the actual by right for the setback for the side yard is 5.7 feet, because it's under 10,000. Mr. Tanner stated that he would round it up to 6, because the ratio on this lot is so small, he usually doesn't get down to the inches. Mr. Burke stated that the front yard would be 19 versus 30 on the front yard.

Mr. Tanner stated that he didn't really discuss the stairs in his Staff report because not that they're blind to them, but as the Zoning Office and in several discussions with several Building Officials over the years and Solicitors; if you're going to allow a use, you have to allow access to it. So, as long as it's the minimal required landing, stairs to go up and down, they don't count that towards the larger footprint of the structure. However, the Board may want to dictate, or if they choose, say well maybe the stairs should be on the other side of the building, or away from the neighbor's house, or something like that. But they have to be allowed to have a set of stairs.

Mr. Burke asked Ms. Valentino if she would be amicable to 6 feet from the westerly property line, they would grant the front yard variance, and the structure can be built in the way it is described in the application and she would remove the shed that she said is in bad shape before she gets the building permit. Ms. Valentino stated that with the shed there are a lot of items in there because they don't have any other storage, she would hope to move that to

15 JULY 2024

within a certain period of time after it is built. Because the idea is to then move everything into the garage. Mr. Tanner stated that 90 days would be appropriate. Ms. Valentino stated that to clarify shed 1 was there before they bought the house, it ended up being like a treehouse, which is 100% coming out. Shed 2 is definitely coming down, but is actually a two-part structure; so, if they could get to the point where they don't have to take out the whole thing but take out shed 1. She was instructed that the larger square footage of shed, or sheds must equal the 451 square feet. Mr. Tanner suggested that the Board put in that the applicant work with the Zoning Officer and the Building Official to determine the balance of the area; and if they can't make it for some reason, they have to come back before the Board.

X X X X X X

MR. BURKE: I'll make a motion to approve and deny some requests for file number 2024-22, Amanda L. Valentino, 20 Beach Road, to construct a 16' x 24' accessory garage structure with less than the required front yard, less than the required right-side yard and greater than permitted lot coverage by structures. The Board has determined that we must deny the side yard variance request. So, the structure will need to be placed 6 feet from the westerly property line. The Board also grants an 11-foot variance for the front yard placement. The structure will be placed per the plan 19 feet from the front property line, for a variance of 11 feet. The condition for this granting of the application will be that the applicant will work with the Zoning Enforcement Officer to determine the extent of the removal of the existing accessory structures, to come within or under existing maximum lot coverage in an R-10 zone. The hardship from which the

applicant seeks relief is due to the unique characteristics of the subject land or structure, and not to the general characteristics of the surrounding area and not due to an economic disability of the applicant. We heard testimony that the applicant is going to construct this accessory structure for additional storage for vehicles, which they don't currently have and for storage of a child. The hardship is not the result of prior action of the applicant, they did not build the primary structure, or install the other structures that are on the property. The granting of the required dimensional variance will not alter the general characteristics of the surrounding area or impair the intent or purpose of the Zoning Ordinance or the Comprehensive Plan of the Town of Bristol. The proposed structure is a conforming structure by dimension and garages are allowed in the R-10 zone. The hardship that will be suffered by the owner of the subject property, if the dimensional variance is not granted, will amount to more than a mere inconvenience, meaning that it is the least required for a reasonable enjoyment of the permitted use to which the property is proposed to be devoted. What that actually means is there is no other practical way to put this structure on to the existing property. I so move.

MR. KERN: I second that.

MR. BURKE: All in favor:

MS. TEVES: Aye.

MR. DUARTE: Aye.

MR. BURKE: Aye.

15 JULY 2024

MR. KERN: Aye.

X X X X X X

(THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED)

(Petition partially granted)

15 JULY 2024

NEW PETITIONS:

**3. 2024-23
MICHAEL V. PORCO**

**11 Meadow Ln.: R-20
Pl. 66 Lot 26**

Dimensional Variances to construct an 8' x 10' accessory shed structure with less than the required rear yard and less than the required right-side yard.

Mr. Michael Porco presented the Petition to the Board. He explained that he just wants a place for storage for yard equipment, pool equipment and other things outside of his garage and into the shed. His back yard is kind of small, so he wanted to push it as far back as he can away from his house, so he is asking for relief on the side and back setbacks. He was asking for two feet on each side.

Mr. Burke stated that a lot of people don't go into the Town and they just put their shed 6 feet, but some people do and sometimes they grant it, because they have a septic system and they come in and they can't really put it there, or they have other physical constraints or rebuilding one that was already there. But, unless there is a real reason, and a typical reason isn't that I don't want to do the 6 feet. Mr. Porco stated that it's not that he doesn't want to do it, he would if it didn't push the shed so close to his house; it would be very much in the middle of his yard. His property is sloping and he's trying to maximize his back yard, while minimizing the impact. He would if he could.

Mr. Burke stated that the lot is 130 feet deep. Mr. Porco stated that he believes his fences are on the lot line and there are shrubs behind. His neighbor has a shed, so visually he doesn't think it's an issue. Mr. Burke explained that Mr. Porco has not presented a hardship, they

15 JULY 2024

do not see that the 4-feet difference is a hardship for moving the shed. Mr. Porco stated the hardship is that he needs space and doesn't want to put the shed in the middle of his yard.

No one spoke in favor or against the Petition.

X X X X X X

MS. TEVES: Motion to close the public comment.

MR. DUARTE: Second.

MR. BURKE: All in favor:

MS. TEVES: Aye.

MR. DUARTE: Aye.

MR. BURKE: Aye.

MR. KERN: Aye.

X X X X X X

(THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED)

The Board reviewed the Petition and discussed that they usually grant similar requests due to a physical barrier; this is a 130-foot conforming lot, and all agreed that they did not see a hardship to warrant granting the request.

X X X X X X

MR. KERN: I'll make a motion for Michael Porco, 11 Meadow Lane, applicant 2024-23. Based on the evidence presented to the Zoning Board and the Board's personal inspection of the area, the Zoning Board of review hereby finds that there is no good reason to have the shed other than its moving into the middle of his lot to have it any closer to the back and side yard variance of 6 feet. The hardship from which the applicant seeks relief is not due to the

15 JULY 2024

unique characteristics of the subject land and is due to the general character of the surrounding area, or to the economic disability of the applicant. Therefore, the Board denies the applicant 6 feet in both directions.

MR. DUARTE: Second.

MR. BURKE: All in favor:

MS. TEVES: Aye.

MR. DUARTE: Aye.

MR. BURKE: Aye.

MR. KERN: Aye.

X X X X X X

(THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED)

(Petition Denied)

15 JULY 2024

4. **2024-24**
 VASCO CASTRO, III

101 Woodlawn Ave.: R-10
Pl. 41 Lot 144

Dimensional Variance to construct a six-foot height fence, portions of which would be located within the front yard from DeWolf Avenue at a height greater than permitted in a front yard on a corner lot.

The applicant was not present at the meeting. Mr. Tanner stated that he would reach out to the applicant to see what happened and felt that it would be appropriate to continue the application.

X X X X X X

MR. KERN: I'll make a motion to continue 2024-24, Vasco Castro, III, 101 Woodlawn Avenue, to continue to the next meeting, which is Tuesday, September 3, 2024.

MS. TEVES: Second.

MR. BURKE: All in favor:

MS. TEVES: Aye.

MR. DUARTE: Aye.

MR. BURKE: Aye.

MR. KERN: Aye.

X X X X X X

(THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED)

(Petition Continued)

15 JULY 2024

5. ADJOURNMENT:

X X X X X X

MR. BURKE: Motion to adjourn?

MR. KERN: So moved.

MR. DUARTE: Second.

MR. BURKE: All in favor:

MS. TEVES: Aye.

MR. DUARTE: Aye.

MR. BURKE: Aye.

MR. KERN: Aye.


X X X X X X

(THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED)

(MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:25 P.M.)

15 JULY 2024

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,


Susan E. Andrade

TOWN OF BRISTOL ZONING BOARD
MEETING HELD ON: 15 JULY 2024

Date Accepted: _____

9/3/24

Chairman: _____

