

Zoning Board of Appeals
MINUTES
Wednesday, March 27, 2024
7:00 PM

To all persons interested in or affected by the actions of the Zoning Board of Appeals, you are hereby notified, pursuant to Section 11 of Chapter 40A of the General Laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and all amendments thereto, that a public hearing on the following appeals will be held on Wednesday, March 27, 2024, at the time indicated:

The Zoning Board of Appeals Public Hearing will be held by remote participation methods. Public access to this meeting shall be provided in the following manner:

1. The meeting will be televised live via Xfinity Channel 8 or high definition Channel 1072. It may also be accessed via the Government Access Channel live stream on the Town of Barnstable’s website: <http://streaming85.townofbarnstable.us/CablecastPublicSite/watch/1?channel=1>
2. Real-time access to the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting is available utilizing the Zoom link or telephone number and Meeting ID provided below. Public comment can be addressed to the Zoning Board of Appeals by utilizing the Zoom link or telephone number and Meeting ID provided below:

Join Zoom Meeting Option	Telephone Number Option
https://townofbarnstable-us.zoom.us/j/81040104648	US Toll-free 888 475 4499
Meeting ID: 810 4010 4648	Meeting ID: 810 4010 4648

Applicants, their representatives and individuals required or entitled to appear before the Zoning Board of Appeals may appear remotely, and may participate through accessing the link or telephone number provided above. Documentary exhibits and/or visual presentations should be submitted in advance of the meeting to anna.brigham@town.barnstable.ma.us so that they may be displayed for remote public access viewing.

3. Copies of the applications are available for review by calling (508) 862-4682 or emailing anna.brigham@town.barnstable.ma.us.

Call to Order

Chair Dewey calls the meeting to order at 7:04 PM with an introduction of Board Members:

Member	Present	Absent
Dewey, Jacob – Chair	X	
Bodensiek, Herbert – Vice Chair	X	
Pinard, Paul – Clerk	X	
Alves, Manny	X	
Hansen, Mark	X	
Hurwitz, Larry	X	
Johnson, Denise	X	
Webb, Aaron		X

Also in attendance is Jim Kupfer, Assistant Director of Planning & Development; Anna Brigham, Principal Planner; and Genna Ziino, Administrative Assistant.

Notice of Recording

This meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals is being recorded and broadcast on the Town of Barnstable’s Government Access Channel. In accordance with MGL Chapter 30A §20, I must inquire whether anyone is recording this meeting and if so, to please make their presence known.

Minutes

January 24, 2024 & February 7, 2024 - Mark Hansen moves to approve both sets of minutes. Manny Alves seconds.

Vote:

Aye: Jake Dewey, Herb Bodensiek, Manny Alves, Mark Hansen, Larry Hurwitz, Denise Johnson

Nay: None

Abstain: Paul Pinard (Not present at January 24, 2024 meeting)

Old Business

7:00 PM

Appeal No. 2023-042

Baker & Moir, as Appellants

Patricia Baker and David D. Moir, as Appellants, are appealing the issuance of Building Permit BLDR-23-780 issued on November 1, 2023 to EJ Jaxtimer for the construction of a 3,100 sq. ft., 3-bedroom home for Janet Holian, Trustee of Holian Family Realty Tr. The subject property is located at 240 Windswept Way, Osterville, MA and 250 Windswept Way, Osterville, MA as shown on Assessor's Map 051 as Parcel 012-001 and 012-000, respectively. It is located in the Residence F-1 (RF-1) and the Resource Protection Overlay District (RPOD). Continued from January 24, 2024 and February 28, 2024.

Chair Dewey assigns himself, Herb Bodensiek, Paul Pinard, Mark Hansen, and Denise Johnson.

Attorney Benjamin Tymann is representing the applicants. Attorney Mike Ford is representing the property owner and updates the Board that the Building Commissioner issued on Monday a notice of suspension of the building permit after Attorney Ford realized that the ANR plan the building permit was based on had an incorrect wetland line. He wants to allow the property owner to go before the Planning Board with a new ANR plan. Attorney Ford and Attorney Tymann jointly request a 60-day continuance.

Chair Dewey moves to continue this to May 22, 2024. Herb Bodensiek seconds.

Vote:

Aye: Jake Dewey, Herb Bodensiek, Paul Pinard, Mark Hansen, Denise Johnson

Nay: None

Appeal No. 2023-042 Baker & Moir is continued to May 22, 2024.

7:01 PM

Appeal No. 2023-044

Alliegro

George and Debra Alliegro have petitioned for a Variance pursuant to Section 240-13 E. RF-1 Bulk Regulations – Minimum Side Yard Setback. The Petitioners seek a variance to construct an unconditioned, screened porch over an existing patio 12.6 feet from the lot line where 15 feet is required. The subject property is located at 202 Sea View Avenue, Osterville, MA as shown on Assessor's Map 138 as Parcel 014. It is located in the RF-1 Zoning District. Continued from January 10, 2024, January 24, 2024, February 7, 2024, February 28, 2024, and March 13, 2024.

Chair Dewey assigns himself, Mark Hansen, Herb Bodensiek, Paul Pinard, and Larry Hurwitz.

Attorney Michael Schulz is representing the applicants. He explains that the property is subject to an existing special permit, 2016-018. The dwelling is consistent with the rest of the neighborhood in terms of size and setback on the lot. The proposed porch would provide shade for the southerly facing patio, which is exposed to direct sunlight for the entire day. He suggests that the Board could find a topography issue in the raised nature of the patio. Having to remove, regrade, and reconstruct would be a significant financial hardship when all the applicant wants to do is add a cover to provide shade. The existing raised patio isn't a detriment, and a screened porch wouldn't be a detriment. The applicants spoke to the direct abutters, who were unable to write letters of support but do not oppose the project.

Back to the Board for questions. Mark Hansen asks if this were a deck attached to the house would they need relief. Attorney Schulz answers that yes, there would still be encroachment. He explains that in order to construct a screen porch that would look proper according to elevations and the size of the house, they would have to remove the existing bluestone patio.

Chair Dewey opens for public comment. There is none. The Chairman moves to close public comment. Mark Hansen seconds.

Vote:

Aye: Jake Dewey, Mark Hansen, Herb Bodensiek, Paul Pinard, Larry Hurwitz

Nay: None

The Board deliberates. Mark Hansen says the exhibits show that the patio is a significant structure and there wouldn't be any way to make it smaller without destroying it—this speaks to hardship. Chair Dewey thinks the structure is centered on the lot so there isn't a lot of wiggle room. Paul Pinard thinks the patio was already approved, so he has no problem approving the covering separately.

Paul Pinard makes a motion to approve with the following findings:

1. Owing to circumstances related to soil conditions, shape, or topography of such land or structures and especially affecting such land or structures but not affecting generally the zoning district in which it is located; he finds it important to not deconstruct the existing patio
2. A literal enforcement of the provisions of the zoning ordinance would involve substantial hardship, financial or otherwise to the petitioner; he finds that requiring them to deconstruct would be extensive and expensive
3. Desirable relief may be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and without nullifying or substantially derogating from the intent or purpose of the zoning ordinance. He finds that there was no negative public comment, and since the patio already extends into the setback, adding screens and a cover does not substantially derogate.

Mark Hansen seconds.

Vote:

Aye: Jake Dewey, Mark Hansen, Herb Bodensiek, Paul Pinard, Larry Hurwitz

Nay: None

Paul Pinard says the appeal is subject to conditions 1-5 from Staff Report dated January 11, 2024.

Vote:

Aye: Jake Dewey, Mark Hansen, Herb Bodensiek, Paul Pinard, Larry Hurwitz

Nay: None

Variance No. 2023-044 Alliegro is granted with conditions.

7:02 PM

Appeal No. 2023-045

Alliegro

George and Debra Alliegro have applied to modify Special Permit No. 2016-018 Modification No. 3 to allow for the construction of a screened porch over an existing patio, which would increase the lot coverage from 16.2% to 18.3%. The subject property is located at 202 Sea View Avenue, Osterville, MA as shown on Assessor's Map 138 as Parcel 014. It is located in the RF-1 Zoning District. Continued from January 10, 2024, January 24, 2024, February 7, 2024, February 28, 2024, and March 13, 2024.

Chair Dewey assigns himself, Herb Bodensiek, Paul Pinard, Mark Hansen, and Larry Hurwitz.

Attorney Michael Schulz is representing the applicant. He explains that Condition No. 3 of the existing special permit (2016-018) required approval from this Board for any changes. The addition of the structure over the porch would count toward lot coverage but not toward gross floor area. Still, they will remain under the 20% lot coverage limit—they are going from 16.2% to 18.3% lot coverage. Abutters did not oppose.

Chair Dewey opens for public comment. There is none. The Chairman moves to close public comment. Paul Pinard seconds.

Vote:

Aye: Jake Dewey, Mark Hansen, Herb Bodensiek, Paul Pinard, Larry Hurwitz

Nay: None

Larry Hurwitz moves to approve with the following findings:

1. Whether or not the application falls within the category specifically excepted by this chapter. He finds that it does.
2. An evaluation of all the evidence presented at the public hearing by the petitioner and interested parties as it relates to the fulfillment of the spirit and intent of this chapter without substantial detriment to the public good or the neighborhood affected. He finds that it is, particularly since abutters have not objected.
3. A site plan has been reviewed and found approvable in accordance with Article IX herein subject only to the issuance of a special permit.
4. The proposed alteration/expansions are not substantially more detrimental to the environment, community and/or historic character of the neighborhood than the existing building or structure.

Mark Hansen seconds.

Vote:

Aye: Jake Dewey, Mark Hansen, Herb Bodensiek, Paul Pinard, Larry Hurwitz

Nay: None

The Chairman says the Board suggests the following revised Conditions No. 2 and 3 for the modification:

2. The total lot coverage of all structures on the lot shall not exceed 18.3% and the floor-area ratio shall not exceed 29.9% pursuant to plans prepared by Northside Design dated May 10, 2023 and Sullivan Engineering dated November 29, 2023.
3. All other conditions remain in full force and effect.

Vote:

Aye: Jake Dewey, Mark Hansen, Herb Bodensiek, Paul Pinard, Larry Hurwitz

Nay: None

Special Permit No. 2023-045 Alliegro is granted with conditions.

New Business

7:03 PM

Appeal No. 2024-006

518-556 Yarmouth Road LLC

518-556 Yarmouth Road LLC has filed an Appeal of an Administrative Official's Decision in accordance with 240-125 B. (1)(A) and M.G.L. Chapter 40A Section 8. The Appellant seeks to overturn the Notice of Violation and Order to Cease, Desist, and Abate from the Building Commissioner, dated January 19, 2024. The violation determined by the Building Commissioner is of the Barnstable Zoning Ordinance Chapter 240 Section 61 C Prohibited Signs. Specifically, the recent building construction includes a functioning lighting provision serving to outline portions of the building. The subject property is located at 556 Yarmouth Road, Hyannis, MA as shown on Assessor's Map 344 as Parcel 076-001. It is located in the Business (B) Zoning District.

The Chairman assigns himself, Herb Bodensiek, Paul Pinard, Mark Hansen, and Manny Alves.

Attorney Mike Ford is representing the applicant and is joined by the property owner, Mr. Laham. Attorney Ford explains that around Christmas, Building Commissioner Brian Florence informed him that the lighting at the location was in violation of the ordinance. The lighting had been on the plans for the building permit that were approved. Deputy Commissioner Carter came to a meeting at the site and explained that the lighting is prohibited under Section 240-61C because it is a display of lighting by tubes of lights that outline portions of a building. Attorney Ford believes that in order for 61C to kick in, it has to be a sign. A sign is defined as any permanent or temporary structure, light, letter, word, banner, etc. or any other device which is used to advertise, inform, or attract the attention of the public and is designed to be seen from outside the building. He believes this light is not there to advertise or inform, so it must be the Building Department's opinion that it's there to attract the attention of the public. Attorney Ford explains that each tube of light is actually two companion LED strips that run together. Mr. Laham organized to have one strip of the lights turned off and while Mr. Carter said it wasn't as bright as before, it still did not fix the problem and so the Building Department issued a notice of violation. They are here to appeal that. Since then, Mr. Laham has had a dimmer installed that can dim the one strip of light that's left.

Attorney Ford says his first argument is that this lighting was shown on the plan for the building permit and was described as recessed LED. It was not deemed a sign and there was no discussion of this light at Site Plan Review. He believes this doesn't meet the definition of a sign and believes anything could attract the public's attention. He walks the Board through photos (document entitled "Jeep Photo from Applicant") showing the lights and the changes Mr. Laham made in an attempt to comply.

Attorney Ford addresses a letter sent by Robin Anderson from the Building Department (document entitled "Building Dept Staff Report"), who suggests that the fact that it was in the building permit doesn't mean anything because sign applications are made separately. Attorney Ford reiterates that he disagrees that this lighting is a sign which is why they didn't submit it with their signage.

Back to the Board for questions. Larry Hurwitz asks the applicant if they consider the lit words signs. Attorney Ford says yes, and they did get sign permits for those. Manny Alves asks how this is intended not to attract attention. Attorney Ford says there are no lights on a building that don't attract attention of some form, but the question is can you single one out and call it a sign just to make it subject to a prohibition. Chair Dewey wonders why it frames the windows. Mr. Laham says it is a design intent, and it's not only around the windows but also the entrance and service drive. The total width of the lights is about 3 inches. Mr. Laham says there will be cars on display inside that showroom.

Deputy Commissioner Jeff Carter says Section 240-61C says that including lights which outline any parts of a building or which are affixed to any ornamental portion thereof are prohibited under the sign ordinance. The definition of sign spells out that a light is considered a sign and any device which is used to advertise, inform, and attract the public and is designed to be seen from the outside of the building is a sign. Regarding the lighting being depicted in the building plans, the Building Inspector doesn't review aesthetics for signs during the building permit process. That's done through sign permitting, and these were not included in the sign package. The Building Department received a complaint, and that's how this process began.

Mark Hansen asks if the intent of 240-61C is for safety or aesthetics. Jeff Carter says the intent is to say that drawing attention makes it a sign, and that section is trying to regulate signs. Mark Hansen isn't sure it's intuitive to consider this lighting a sign. Mr. Laham explains to the Board that he has made effort to keep this project by the books, and he does not think it's fair to identify this after the fact as a sign. Chair Dewey responds that the Board wants to help him find the correct path to allow for these lights, but the Board can only interpret the ordinance. Paul Pinard asks who the complaint was filed by. Jeff Carter doesn't know.

Chair Dewey opens for public comment. There is none. Attorney Ford says the Board's job is to stand in the shoes of the Building Commissioner and so can make any decision the Commissioner could have made. He encourages the Board to consider the dimmer option, potentially as a condition. Chair Dewey moves to close public comment. Mark Hansen seconds.

Vote:

Aye: Jake Dewey, Herb Bodensiek, Paul Pinard, Mark Hansen, Manny Alves

Nay: None

The Board deliberates. Larry Hurwitz asks Mr. Laham to describe the dimming process. It was installed just like one in a home, and it's currently at the lowest setting. Mark Hansen asks Jeff Carter if the issue is mainly about drawing attention. Jeff Carter says it is a combination of reading what's prohibited: the combination of it being a sign and the attraction of the lights makes it prohibited. He doesn't know what level of lighting would not attract attention. Chair Dewey reminds the Board that they are deciding to either overturn or uphold the Building Commissioner, and they may not be able to condition this. The Board discusses that this should come back as a variance, as they cannot determine an appropriate level of illumination or decide what's not used to attract.

Manny Alves makes a motion to uphold the ruling with the following findings:

The Board affirms the Building Commissioner's findings that the lights installed that outline the sections of the building at 556 Yarmouth Road are in violation of Part 1 of the Town of Barnstable General Ordinances, Part 1, Chapter 240 Section 61. He finds that the Commissioner's decision is consistent with the statute. The definition of sign includes a light used to attract attention and under 61C, any display lighting which outlines any part of a building is prohibited. He finds that the Board should uphold the determination. Paul Pinard seconds.

Vote:

Aye: Jake Dewey, Herb Bodensiek, Paul Pinard, Mark Hansen, Manny Alves

Nay: None

In Appeal No. 2024-006 518-556 Yarmouth Road LLC, the Building Commissioner's decision is upheld.

7:04 PM

Appeal No. 2024-007

Lion LLC

Lion LLC has applied for a Special Permit pursuant to Section 240-57 Circumstances Warranting Reduction of Requirements, to the extent necessary. The Applicant proposes to add 18 additional seats to their existing restaurant and has been advised at Site Plan Review by the Building Commissioner that the proposed new off-street parking area, consisting of 12 spaces being leased from the Airport, requires a Special Permit. The Applicant suggests that the Board could alternatively find that the proposed additional off-street parking is a permitted use under Section 240-51 A and zoning relief would not be required. The subject property is located at 15 Hinckley Road, Hyannis, MA as shown on Assessor's Map 311 as Parcel 020. It is located in the Business (B) Zoning District.

The Chairman assigns himself, Herb Bodensiek, Paul Pinard, Mark Hansen, and Denise Johnson.

Attorney Jeff Ford is representing the applicant and explains that the applicants own the restaurant in question and have added 18 seats. They have gone through Site Plan Review and were advised to seek relief for off-street parking reduction. He believes it could also be suggested that relief is not required, because Section 240-51 A allows an applicant to have off-street parking as long as it's within 300 feet and within the same district, which this is.

Attorney Ford walks through the site plan to illustrate that the parking spaces in question are next to the building but are owned by the airport. The applicant has an agreement with the airport to allow the use of those 12 parking spaces. All spaces have signage to specify that they are for the applicant's business. The restaurant and bakery has 63 parking spaces, so adding 18 seats would require them to have 2 additional parking spaces. The parking is marked just for this business and is within 300 ft. of the restaurant, so they're carrying 10 more than what's required. Manny Alves asks if Section 51 A was brought up to the Building Commissioner. Attorney Ford says yes, and they chose not to appeal his determination in order to keep the project moving along.

Chair Dewey opens for public comment. There is none. The Chairman moves to close public comment. Mark Hansen seconds.

Vote:

Aye: Jake Dewey, Herb Bodensiek, Paul Pinard, Mark Hansen, Denise Johnson

Nay: None

The Board deliberates. The Board discusses under which section they should move forward with this. Attorney Ford asks to remove suggested condition no. 3. Paul Pinard suggests a condition that a minimum of 2 spaces be maintained.

Mark Hansen makes a motion to approve based on the following findings:

1. The application falls within a category specifically excepted in the ordinance for a grant of a special permit. Section 240-57 allows for a Special Permit.
2. After an evaluation of all the evidence presented, the proposal fulfills the spirit and intent of the Zoning Ordinance and would not represent a substantial detriment to the public good or the neighborhood affected. He finds that they are providing 10 additional spaces beyond what's required, and it's a non-residential zone.
3. A site plan has been reviewed and found approvable in accordance with Article IX herein subject only to the issuance of a special permit. *(See letter dated February 16, 2024).*

Denise Johnson seconds.

Vote:

Aye: Jake Dewey, Herb Bodensiek, Paul Pinard, Mark Hansen, Denise Johnson

Nay: None

The Board decides to strike proposed condition no. 3 in Staff Report dated March 14, 2024. Mark Hansen says the appeal is subject to conditions 1-3:

1. Special Permit No. 2024-007 is granted to Lion LLC, pursuant to Section 240-57 Circumstances Warranting Reduction of Requirements, to the extent necessary. The Applicant proposes to add 18 additional seats to their existing restaurant and has been advised at Site Plan Review by the Building Commissioner that the proposed new off-street parking area, consisting of 12 spaces of which 2 must be maintained from the Airport, requires a Special Permit. The Applicant suggests that the Board could alternatively find that the proposed additional off-street parking is a permitted use under Section 240-51 A and zoning relief would not be required. The subject property is located at 15 Hinckley Road, Hyannis, MA .
2. The site development shall be constructed in substantial conformance with the plan entitled "Pain D'Avignon Restaurant Seating" by BSC Group, dated December 4, 2023.
3. This decision shall be recorded at the Barnstable County Registry of Deeds and copies of the recorded decision shall be submitted to the Zoning Board of Appeals Office and the Building Division prior to issuance of a building permit. The rights authorized by this Special Permit must be exercised within two years, unless extended.

Vote:

Aye: Jake Dewey, Herb Bodensiek, Paul Pinard, Mark Hansen, Denise Johnson

Nay: None

Special Permit No. 2024-007 Lion LLC is granted with conditions.

7:05 PM

Appeal No. 2024-008

19 Bearse Rd LLC & 29 Bearse Rd LLC

19 Bearse Rd LLC and 29 Bearse Rd LLC have petitioned for a Variance pursuant to Section 240-125 Zoning Board of Appeals and M.G.L. Chapter 40A Section 14. The Petitioner seeks a modification of Use Variance 2023-003 to change the distance between the proposed buildings to 7.5 ft. No additional zoning relief is required. The subject properties are located at 19 and 29 Bearse Road, Hyannis, MA as shown on Assessor's Maps 310 and 311 as Parcels 288 and 039, respectively. They are located in the Residence B (RB) Zoning District.

Chair Dewey recuses himself and leaves the meeting. Herb Bodensiek becomes Acting Chair and assigns himself, Paul Pinard, Larry Hurwitz, Denise Johnson, and Mark Hansen.

Attorney Mike Ford is representing the applicant and explains that this is a modification of a use variance. The applicant wants to substitute one site plan for another. Nothing has changed except the distance between buildings, to 7.5 ft. apart rather than 5 ft. to avoid having to remove overhangs or redesign and allow the buildings to not be sprinkled.

Herb Bodensiek opens public comment. There is none. Herb Bodensiek moves to close public comment. Denise Johnson seconds.

Vote:

Aye: Herb Bodensiek, Paul Pinard, Mark Hansen, Denise Johnson, Larry Hurwitz

Nay: None

Denise Johnson makes a motion to approve based on the following finding:

1. Variance No. 2024-008 is seeking to modify Variance No. 2023-033 to allow an increased distance between the proposed buildings to 7.5 ft. No additional zoning relief is required. The subject properties are located at 19 and 29 Bearse Road, Hyannis, MA. All other conditions are in effect.

Mark Hansen seconds.

Vote:

Aye: Herb Bodensiek, Paul Pinard, Mark Hansen, Denise Johnson, Larry Hurwitz

Nay: None

Denise Johnson says the appeal is subject to conditions 1-6 from Staff Report dated March 14, 2024. Paul Pinard seconds.

Vote:

Aye: Herb Bodensiek, Paul Pinard, Mark Hansen, Denise Johnson, Larry Hurwitz

Nay: None

Variance No. 2024-008 19 Bearse Rd LLC & 29 Bearse Rd LLC is granted with conditions.

Correspondence

None

Matters Not Reasonably Anticipated by the Chair

Discussion

Board discussion and possible approval of revised Rules and Regulations regarding requests for Withdrawals and Continuances

Paul Pinard explains that the purpose was to minimize inconvenience to citizens who attend a meeting only to find a continuance or withdrawal has been requested, and to avoid insufficient time to review submissions prior to the hearing. He contacted all 15 cape towns, other MA towns, and various large US cities in his research. There were multiple reviews with the Legal Department and the Board.

Chair Dewey makes a motion to approve as written. Herb Bodensiek seconds.

Vote:

Aye: Jake Dewey, Herb Bodensiek, Paul Pinard, Manny Alves, Mark Hansen, Denise Johnson, Larry Hurwitz

Nay: None

Upcoming Hearings

April 10, 2024, April 24, 2024, May 8, 2024

Adjournment

Chair Dewey moves to adjourn. Paul Pinard seconds.

Vote:

Aye: Jake Dewey, Herb Bodensiek, Paul Pinard, Manny Alves, Mark Hansen, Denise Johnson, Larry Hurwitz

Nay: None

Documents Used at this Meeting

- January 24, 2024 & February 7, 2024 minutes
- Appeal No. 2023-044 Alliegro application packet
- Staff Report dated January 11, 2024 for Appeal No. 2024-044
- Appeal No. 2023-045 Alliegro application packet
- Staff Report dated January 11, 2024 for Appeal No. 2024-045
- Appeal No. 2024-006 518-556 Yarmouth Road LLC application packet
- Collection of photos entitled "Jeep Photo from Applicant"
- Document entitled "Building Dept Staff Report"
- Staff Report dated March 14, 2024 for Appeal No. 2024-006
- Appeal No. 2024-007 Lion LLC application packet
- Staff Report dated March 14, 2024 for Appeal No. 2024-007
- Appeal No. 2024-008 19 Barse Rd LLC & 29 Barse Rd LLC application packet
- Staff Report dated March 14, 2024 for Appeal No. 2024-008

Respectfully submitted,
Genna Ziino, Administrative Assistant

Further detail may be obtained by viewing the video via Channel 18 on demand at <http://www.town.barnstable.ma.us>