

Telephone (603) 673-8855 Fax (603) 673-8136

## TOWN OF BROOKLINE, NEW HAMPSHIRE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

P.O. BOX 360 – 1 Main Street BROOKLINE, NH 03033-0360

http://www.brookline.nh.us

### BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MINUTES Wednesday, July 10, 2019 7:30pm

Present: George Foley, Chairman

Peter Cook, Vice Chairman Webb Scales, Member, Clerk Marcia Farwell, Member

Jill Adams, Alternate, Voting for Kevin

Absent: Kevin Visnaskas, Member and Charlotte Pogue, Alternate

**George** asked Jill to vote for Kevin. **Jill** Agreed. In attendance for this discussion is the Building Inspector Romeo Dubreuil. David Partridge is also in the audience as he is interested in being on Board.

#### Case 417

George read the hearing notice "Applicants Brittany MacFarland & Christopher Henchey applied for a building permit to allow an ADU on the second floor of the hanger located on the property. This permit was denied because the building is 3,000 sf when a residential hanger should only be 2,000 sf. The applicants are requesting an Appeal from an Administrative Decision. Lot E-3-6 located at 16 Pigeon Hill Road consisting of 2.162 acres." George said fee have been paid and the abutters have been notified. Marcia said which is it is the ADU is too big or is the hanger is too big. George said the hanger is to big. Christopher said when the first set out to do this they were unaware of the technicalities behind any of it. It wasn't until they started down the path of putting in an ADU did they realize that the IBC codes state that a residential hanger can only be 2,000 sf and the one we bought is 3,000sf. We purchased this house and the hanger in 2015 we didn't have it built. This hanger was built and permitted by the town in 2010. Brittany said there are many fly in communities across the country and they are allowed to build above 3,000 sf this would include the space for the plane and the living area. Britany said she had spoken to the previous owner and asked how he was able to build it to commercial standards as opposed to residential standards. He said he had to build this to commercial standards because it was 3,000sf and that's what it called for. Brittany said the Building Inspector was concerned with jet fuel storage in the hanger, but a jet couldn't fit on this runway. We just have aviator fuel in the hanger. Peter asked if they use it as a hanger. Brittany said yes, they have a plane. They didn't when they first bought the house. George asked if this is attached to the house. Brittany said no. Marcia said what you plan to do with the ADU.

Christopher said his parents will move in once they retire. Marcia said she though an ADU needed to be attached to the main dwelling. Webb said no it can be detached. It must be secondary and accessory to the main dwelling unit. Brittany said when this was built it was rough plumed for an office space on the second floor. But never hooked up and finished. But we were told we couldn't even finish it to make it a play room. George read the letter from the Building Inspector which stated:

"As per section 412 in the 2009 International building code.

Residential aircraft hangar. An Accessory building <u>less than 2,000</u> square feet (186m) and 20 feet (6096mm) in building height constructed on a one-two-family property where aircraft are stored. Such use will be considered as a residential accessory use incidental to the dwelling.

The building in question is actually a 3000 square foot air plane hangar (2 story's) that is not allowed in residential zone. Therefore, to allow it to be used as a ADU would be making the building/structure more non-conforming.

Here is one concern.... if the town allows this application and somebody gets injured who would then be held liable for creating an unsafe situation.

And then there is the inspections to insure it is code compliant? How could that be accomplished."

**George** said the Building Inspector is saying that this is already too big to be a residential aircraft hanger. **George** read section 412.3 of the IBC which states:

" 412.3.1 Definition. The following word and term shall, for the purposes of this chapter and as used elsewhere in this code, have the meaning shown herein.

**RESIDENTIAL AIRCRAFT HANGAR.** An accessory building less than 2,000 square feet (186 m<sup>2</sup>) and 20 feet (6096 mm) in height, constructed on a one- or two-family residential property where aircraft are stored. Such use will be considered as a residential accessory use incidental to the dwelling.

**412.3.6 Height and area limits.** Residential aircraft hangars shall not exceed 2,000 square feet area and 20 feet in height."

Marcia asked if this is the International Building Codes . Webb said yes. George asked if the hanger is higher than 20 feet. Christopher said yes, it is. George asked if the run way was on their property as well. Christopher said no we are adjacent from it. Peter asked Romeo to explain how we are beholden to the IBC code. Romeo said this is a state building code law. Webb said the conundrum here is we have a property with a non-conforming building on it a building that doesn't not conform to building code and state law. A building that should not have been built to this size. We cannot change or vary the International Building Codes. Peter in terms of you appealing the Building Inspector's decision, what do you think he did wrong. Brittany said well there is more than one over sized hanger in this area. She feels it should have been approved because the purpose is residential. Just because it was built to commercial standards doesn't mean they are using it as a commercial hanger there convince doesn't allow it. Marcia's said what he did wrong was denied the permit. Brittany said if the town gave the building permit to build it originally, would it be fair to say the person was negligent when the hanger was being built because the rule was in the book then. Romeo said he believes this was an oversight yes. As he has discovered today almost all the hangers in this area are all oversized.

He has not checked for permits for all the hangers. Brittany said should they have asked for a variance. Webb said you would need to ask the state to vary the IBC codes this isn't something we can do. Brittany asked if the office space could still be completed if they had originally planned to have an office on the second floor. Dave Partridge said it sounds like they should ask for a variance from the State laws. He doesn't see where the Building Inspector was wrong.

Webb said he doesn't believe the Building Inspector is wrong in this case. Romeo said he would reach out to the insurance company to see if they will cover this. In reference to the square footage he didn't even calculate the second floor it would be almost twice the size that it should be. Christopher said if he takes the plane out of this hanger and stored their vehicles there then this would be a garage. Marcia said the previous entity allowed this to happen it is not their fault and she believes the Board should allow them to be able to do this. Brittany said if they store their cars in the hanger then it will be a garage. If we made it a garage could they come back to apply for the ADU. Jill said she would speak to the state and find out what they can do going forward.

Peter made a motion to reject the appeal thereby uphold the Building Inspector decision. Webb seconded. Vote yes 4-0. Marcia abstained.

#### **Minutes**

Webb made a motion to approve the minutes of June 12, 2019 as written. Peter seconded. Vote yes 3-0.

Webb move to approve the August 8, 2018 as written. Seconded by Marcia. Vote yes 5-0.

#### New Alternate

Adjourn

Made a motion to recommend to the Selectboard that Dave Partridge be appointed as an Alternate of the Zoning Board of Adjustment with a term expiring on March 31, 2022. Seconded by Marcia. Vote yes 5-0.

# Peter made a motion to adjourn at 8:12 pm. Webb seconded. Vote yes 4-0. George W Foley III, Chairman, Cote Chairman, Webb Scales, Member, Clerk, White Law Marcia Farwell, Member, Me

Minutes submitted by Kristen Austin