



Town of West Boylston
140 Worcester Street, West Boylston, Massachusetts 01583

[Zoning Board of Appeals] Meeting Minutes

Date / Time / Location of Meeting	Thursday, July 16, 2020/7:00 p.m./ <u>NOTE: THIS MEETING WAS HELD REMOTELY (ZOOM), ACCORDING TO GOV. BAKER'S INSTRUCTIONS, DUE TO THE CORONAVIRUS AS TOWN HALL HAD REMAINED CLOSED. PUBLIC ACCESS TO THE MEETING WAS ALLOWED THROUGH ZOOM INSTRUCTIONS GIVEN ON THE POSTED MEETING AGENDA.</u>
Members Present	Chris Olson (Chair), Barur Rajeshkumar (Vice-Chair), David Femia (Clerk), John Benson, Nathaniel Orciani and Secretary Toby Goldstein
Members NOT Present	Andrew Feland, Mark Wyatt and Charles Witkus (all Associate Members)
Invited Guests	

Welcome – Call to Order **Time: 7:05 p.m. (by Mr. Olson)**

Approval of Previous Minutes **Minutes of November 21, 2019**

Motion Originator **Mr. Femia (approved as written)**

Motion Seconded **Mr. Rajeshkumar**

Roll Call Vote was taken (5 “yes”, 0 “no”, 0 “abstained”)-minutes were approved as written

Treasurer – Financial Report **N/A**

Motion to Accept **N/A**

Seconded **N/A**

At 7:05 pm, Mr. Olson called the meeting to order; he noted that it had been quite a while since the last meeting (November 21, 2019) and welcomed back the ZBA members.

Minutes of November 21, 2019 Meeting:

After review of the draft minutes by the ZBA members, with no comments or corrections made, Mr. Femia made a motion to approve the minutes as written. Mr. Rajeshkumar seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken:

Mr. Rajeshkumar – “yes”

Mr. Orciani – “yes”

Mr. Olson – “yes”

Mr. Benson – “yes”

Mr. Femia – “yes”

With a vote of 5 “yes”, 0 “no” and 0 “abstained”, the minutes were approved as written.

Public Hearing, James A. Thompson and Anastasia Patsiouris, Petition for (2) Variances, 3 Evans Road:

(Attorney George Kiritsy represented). Mr. Olson read aloud the order from Governor Baker’s office regarding meetings during the COVID-19 pandemic, suspending certain provisions of the Open Meeting Law (March 12, 2020) and (March 23, 2020, as amended) and placing strict limitations on the number of people that can gather in one place; he explained that this meeting of the West Boylston ZBA will take place remotely and every effort will be taken to ensure that the public can adequately access the proceedings and he explained that the public does have access to this meeting remotely, as they can log in to Zoom, using the instructions given on the posted meeting agenda. Mr. Olson explained the rules of the public hearing to Mr. Kiritsy; Mr. Kiritsy will make his presentation, then will take questions and comments from the board, and then the hearing will open to the public (if anyone is attending the meeting) for comments and questions. Mr. Femia then read aloud the public hearing notice, which also included the above explanation of the remote meeting process.

Mr. Kiritsy then explained that he was representing the applicants, Mr. Thompson and Ms. Patsiouris, who applied for (2) variances from the ZBA. He gave a history of ownership and subdivision of the properties at 3 Evans Road and 1 Evans Road. He began by stating that, in 1954, a subdivision took place that created Lots 15 and 16. Lot 15 became 3 Evans Road, with an area of 17,750 square feet, and Lot 16 became 1 Evans Road, with an area of 12,488 square feet; these were the original lots, and they were developed. Mr. Kiritsy continued, that in the early 1990’s, Lot 15 (3 Evans Rd.) was purchased by the Lundstroms, and Lot 16 (1 Evans Rd.) by the Asheys. He explained that the Superior Court allowed the Lundstroms to claim a small portion of Lot 16 by adverse possession; 1,160 square feet was taken from Lot 16, so Lot 15 was made bigger and Lot 16 smaller. A variance was granted by the ZBA for this as the change made Lot 16 smaller than the minimum zoning size. Mr. Kiritsy continued, that in 2002, Lot 16 (1 Evans Road) was sold to the Aherns, who still own it now. In 2004, the Lundstroms sold 3 Evans Road to the Thompsons. Mr. Kiritsy explained that, when the Aherns bought 1 Evans Road, they thought that they owned the entire lot and did not realize that they had 1,160 square feet less than the total amount. By requesting the variances today, Mr. Kiritsy explained that the Thompsons want to give back that 1,160 square feet of land to 1 Evans Road and therefore restore the property lines to what they were originally. However, he asserted, zoning had changed over the years since the 1950’s, and the Thompson property, being less than the required 40,000 square feet under the zoning bylaws, would be even more nonconforming by giving up the 1,160 square feet, so they needed a variance to give back the 1,160 sq. feet; but he noted that this would cause 1 Evans Road to be more conforming than it is now. In summary, he said that the applicants are asking to allow the variances to restore the property lines, and he noted that they thought that there needs to be additional engineering and surveying but that the variance will allow them to return the properties to the original configurations.

Mr. Benson next commented, that when he read the petition filing, it appeared that the resulting properties would be slightly different than the configuration in the 1950’s but he wanted to clarify that the owner is looking to return the properties to the 1950’s configurations. In response to Mr. Benson, Mr. Kiritsy verified that

the applicants are looking to restore the original configuration, and referred to Exhibit 8 showing the Superior Court's approved plan (in the submitted petition paperwork), for Parcel A (the small parcel taken from Lot 16, which showed that swapping the 1,160 square feet would restore the original configuration (Mr. Kiritsy apologized, that this plan was given to him by the surveyor, then his office and the applicant prepared the petition and Exhibit 1 does not match the Superior Court's judgment; they are disregarding the new design and going back to the original configuration, which is the Superior Court's decision). In response to Mr. Benson, Mr. Kiritsy verified that the variance would reduce the area of 3 Evans Rd. by 1,160 square feet, and the frontage by 18.48 linear feet, which would be consistent with Parcel A. To verify, Mr. Olson assumed that the applicants were going by Exhibit 8, they would return to the order before the court decision in 1992, and for the first variance 3 Evans Rd. would decrease in area by 1,160 sq. ft., and in the second variance, the existing frontage would decrease from 118.48 feet to 100 feet, which was the original frontage of 3 Evans Rd.; he noted that this was part of the court judgment also so now they would be returning the properties to the original configuration. Mr. Kiritsy continued that, in Exhibit 4 in the petition package, the original configurations of Lots 15 and 16 are shown, where Lot 15 had 100 feet of frontage, and they would be going back to that now. In response to Mr. Benson, Mr. Kiritsy replied that Exhibit 4 would be the end result if the variance is granted, and added that that this would be what existed prior to the 1992 court decision.

Mr. Femia then asked, if this was a court case and the court ruled in favor, why would the parties have to go before the ZBA for a variance in 1994? Mr. Kiritsy explained that, even though the court ruled in that way, by 1994 the zoning changed, and the lot became more nonconforming., and perhaps the owners (Asheys) wanted to go before the ZBA so that they would not have an illegal lot; that is actually what the applicant is doing now. In response to Mr. Femia, Mr. Kiritsy replied that the variance allowed the decrease in size by 1,168 square feet, but does not believe that they dealt with frontage, and added that they probably still had sufficient frontage on 1 Evans Road, just a loss of area as far as zoning was concerned. Mr. Olson continued, that while looking through Exhibit 9 (which was the variance issued in 1994), he saw that the decision says that there was a building permit granted for a garage at the time, and he opined that part of the issue for the ZBA was that the owners at 1 Evans Rd. had a building permit before the court decision was given, but then the side was chopped off and they no longer had the legal side setback, so Mr. Olson thought that the variance allowed them to build the previously-permitted garage, based on the earlier plan that had the side yard. Mr. Kiritsy did not know if that was the case, but he thought that this interpretation made sense.

Mr. Femia then asked, if the ZBA approves the variances, would the properties have to meet the minimum setback requirements, acknowledging that they are nonconforming lots, or are they "grandfathered" in due to the different zoning in the 1950's? Mr. Olson responded that there are not any changes to the buildings or structures proposed on these two lots, and not an increase of nonconformity, but at 1 Evans Rd., it would be better if they get the land back on the side yard as it will increase their conformity. At 3 Evans Rd., the lot is smaller, therefore there will be more nonconformity, and a decrease in frontage but to 100 feet which the ZBA can authorize. Mr. Femia then asked Mr. Olson if the applicant must provide the board with the site plan once the work is complete, to show what had been done? Mr. Olson responded that Exhibits 8 and 4 will represent the new lot lines (Mr. Femia stated that he did not see those exhibits prior to this), and opined that the only thing changing here was the applicant moving the lot line slightly, as it was before 1992.

Looking at the plan that the board was given, Mr. Femia remarked that 1 Evans Rd., on the corner, appeared to be right on the property line. Mr. Olson responded that this is the current lot line, which is close to the corner of 1 Evans Rd.. (Mr. Rajeshkumar held up the plan for those attending to see). Mr. Femia then asked if the second plan with the straighter line showed the new lot line? Mr. Kiritsy replied that it was not exactly correct and, referring to Exhibit 8, he explained what it was that the applicant was looking to do (Mr. Rajeshkumar also put up that plan).

Mr. Benson then asked Mr. Kiritsy if any lot will be nonconforming regarding setbacks when the lot lines are restored? Mr. Kiritsy replied that he did not think so. He added that 1 Evans Rd., which is now nonconforming as the lot line runs right up to the house, will increase in conformity but it will not be 25 feet from the property line; the properties will be conforming in setback. Mr. Kiritsy then showed the board the current and proposed lot lines (which were the original between Lots 15 and 16). Mr. Olson clarified that, regarding the current lot line, the distance between that and the side would be 18 feet. Mr. Kiritsy described that there is a "triangle" (the parcel of land in question) and at Evans Road 18 feet is the greatest width of the parcel, then it pinches in; at the house, it is perhaps 15 or 16 feet wide then pinches in at a sharper angle. Mr. Olson noted that 10 feet is required for the side yard, so it would be compliant. Mr. Femia asked, if the board approves the requests, would they receive a final plan to show the work done? Mr. Kiritsy asserted that the plan that they currently had was surveyed and recorded and can be used, so there would be no new plan, noting that the present one was approved by the court and the property owners were just looking to "swap" back land. He pointed out that Parcel A is the land that will be conveyed from the Thompsons to the Aherns. Mr. Benson then asked about the triangle, and wanted to verify that the straight line on the plan would be the change and the previously crooked one would be erased? Mr. Kiritsy said that was correct.

Mr. Rajeshkumar then asked Mr. Kiritsy why the applicants want to do this? Mr. Kiritsy explained that 3 Evans Rd. currently has less than 40,000 square feet, so they would be increasing the nonconformity of the lot if they give back the land and need a variance to do so. Mr. Kiritsy confirmed with Mr. Benson that Lot 15 (3 Evans Rd.) would increase in nonconformity, but 1 Evans Rd. will increase in area and the setback will be more conforming so that property will increase in conformity in every way. Mr. Kiritsy continued to Mr. Rajeshkumar that Lot 15 will be shrinking and will be more nonconforming, but that change will not make as great a difference as it will to Lot 16 that will obtain area and setback. Mr. Rajeshkumar reiterated his question of why the applicant needs to do this? He opined that he did not see hardship, one of the criteria for a variance. Mr. Kiritsy asserted that there were several reasons; one was for both owners to have a clear title, another was that it would be easier for the owner of 1 Evans Rd. to use that piece of land, and reiterated that the owners want the original configuration but need permission from the ZBA to do so.

Mr. Femia then discussed the frontages for both properties with Mr. Kiritsy, who reiterated that 1 Evans Rd. would obtain more frontage, area and better setback. In response to Mr. Femia. Mr. Kiritsy asserted that 100 ft. of frontage was all that was required but 3 Evans had 118 (Mr. Femia noted that it was still less than the 120 ft. required in the bylaws), and with the changes, 3 Evans would have 100 ft. of frontage and 1 Evans would have 170 ft. (Mr. Kiritsy discussed with the board how these numbers were obtained, and that 1 Evans would increase in frontage by 18 feet and 3 Evans would decrease in frontage by 18 feet).

Mr. Femia and Mr. Benson then opined that a special permit rather than variance might be needed as a special permit could decrease the frontage; Mr. Olson, however, referenced Sec. 4.2C in the bylaws, which stated that the ZBA can reduce frontage, but for a lot less than 40,000 square feet in area, a variance was required. Mr. Benson questioned if the board granted a variance to decrease the size of the lot, would they be circumventing the the restriction the Town gave them on granting special permit powers? Mr. Olson, reading aloud the second sentence of Sec. 4.2C, said that a special permit could be granted by the ZBA only for a residential lot with a 40,000 square foot minimum area, and authority is granted to issue a special permit for a conforming lot to decrease frontage to 100 feet, but not on a substandard lot; so he opined that the question was if the board was inclined to reduce the frontage to 100 ft. by variance as they cannot give a special permit? Mr. Benson then questioned if the ZBA had the authority to decrease frontage in this case, which they do not otherwise have, can they sidestep that restriction by granting a variance? He opined that perhaps they can because a variance has a higher standard than a special permit, but wondered if they have legal authority to do this? Mr. Kiritsy replied that only the ZBA has the authority to grant a variance for any request covered under the zoning bylaws which gives them authority to do so, and acknowledged that a higher standard is required. In response to Mr. Benson, Mr. Kiritsy replied that the

Zoning Act requires in the zoning bylaws the authorizatiion to grant variances, but the only exception was that they could not grant variances for use unless the bylaws expressly authorizes use variances.

In response to a question from Mr. Femia as to why the issue of frontage was not addressed in 1992 when the property owners came before the ZBA, Mr. Kiritsy clarified that 3 Evans Rd. went from a frontage of 100 ft. to 118 ft., and 1 Evans Rd. needed a variance for the lost 18 ft. for which they applied in 1994. Mr. Femia also opined that he did not see any of the three criteria for a variance to have been met. Mr. Kiritsy responded that he opined that the shape of the property was unique at 1 Evans Rd. as it was, therefore it would need the variance. (At this point, there were sounds from the Zoom transmission for some reason that momentarily interfered with hearing the meeting).

Mr. Femia then asked if it was possible for the board to approve one variance request and not the other? He commented that the applicant had to demonstrate that all of the requirements of the variance were met and opined that he did not see hardship proven. Mr. Kiritsy responded that the applicant could have granted exclusive use of that piece of land to the Aherns so they could use it, but they did not want to be dishonest so they came to the ZBA, and explained that exclusive use would not clear the title. Also, in response to Mr. Femia's question, Mr. Kiritsy opined that he did not see how the board could grant one variance to make the lot larger and not also grant the other for increasing the frontage. Mr. Benson reiterated several reasons why the applicant took this action; to make things right, and as a matter of equity they will change the lot lines rather than grant an easement, it was a cleaner way to handle the situation and it would make the transfer of title easier someday. But he thought that what the board struggled with was if the board can grant this without "shoe horning" into the variance rules to achieve equity, and from a strictly legal perspective, how would the board support a decision that the variance rules were met? Mr. Kiritsy responded that the property had not changed since they obtained a variance in 1994, when there were soil issues. Mr. Benson responded that he was still struggling with the question of limits on the board's authority. Mr. Kiritsy responded that the owners would not have to go to the bank for things such as partial releases or granting of easements, and opined that there would be such minimal impact by the change that the public would not oppose it.

Mr. Benson then asked if there was a financial hardship argument regarding refinancing the property? Mr. Kiritsy replied that financial issues included refinancing, mortgage, and selling, because of having property lines vs. easements, and that the Thompsons are paying taxes for a parcel that they do not want, and that it would have been easier if the bylaws allowed a special permit in this case; however, he noted that both lots were created in the 1950's, and zoning changed since then. Mr. Benson responded that the board is held to a higher standard for a varia nce, and he did not know if the board had the authority to lower the variance standard to create equity. Mr. Kiritsy opined that most situations do not meet all the standards of a variance, and asserted that, to grant a variance, the board has to look deep into the situation; he opined that there are not many situations where the properties have this configuration where the lot is surrounded on three sides by road, and asserted that the applicant is not looking to create a buildable lot, just to move the lot line which he opined would make it better.

In response to Mr. Benson, Mr. Kiritsy suggested to include in the decision the shape of the lot, the current configuration, and that the property is surrounded by road on three sides and no further expansion is allowed in any direction; he asserted that all of these things would indicate hardship, and reminded the board of the 20-day appeal period and that anyone can express opposition.

Mr. Femia then read aloud from the ZBA decision from 1994's variance, stating that building permits were given previously and asked if the court knew? Mr. Kiritsy replied that the court ruled that the Lundstroms used the triangle of land for 20 years, and that Exhibit 8 showed the second amended judgment. He explained that, if someone occupied property for 20 years, they own it by adverse possession, so the Lundstroms owned that piece of property. The Aherns did not know this when they bought the property, and they are now trying to refinance the property but don't have title to that small piece of property. Mr. Benson then asked if they made a claim on title insurance? Mr. Kiritsy replied that he had done that and it was being reviewed, also giving information as to

from whom this was being sought and opining that the insurance company should be happy that the applicant is trying to do this. Mr. Kiritsy then referred the board to Exhibit 3, which showed the Aherns' property as 12,488 square feet when they purchased it, which is not what they actually own, as the Asheys lot had lost the 1,160 square feet two years before.

Mr. Femia then discussed some reservations that he had; he considered what needed to be proven in the variance, he opined that more should have been taken care of in the court case years ago, and he noted that at that time they were seeking one variance, not two. Mr. Kiritsy responded that no variance is now being asked for on 1 Evans Rd., but both are for 3 Evans Rd., he noted that only a small chunk of frontage is involved, and that the land the Thompsons want to give back is a small parcel relative to that lot, a parcel which the Aherns thought that they were getting with the property. He thought that the ZBA was allowed to grant variances for situations such as this.

The board members then discussed what they could write in their decision to say that they found the conditions to be met for the variances. Mr. Kiritsy responded, that he thought the shape of the property, financial hardship, and was not detrimental to the public good, and therefore the board could grant a variance. Mr. Olson responded that the only criteria he thought that fit was for "shape", otherwise he did not see the other criteria being met for the variance and thought that the board was struggling with that. Mr. Kiritsy reiterated that the shape was a challenge, as the property is bounded by two roads, and he believed that the financial situation would affect both parties if the owner was to sell it or try to refinance it and for tax reasons, and that he saw no substantial detriment to the public good. He also did not see any way that the bylaw would be nullified by doing this. He also believed that this would be in the best interest of all concerned, including the Town.

Mr. Benson asserted that, if the board grants a variance, it would create a problem for 3 Evans Rd. as they would lose land and frontage. Mr. Rajeshkumar said that he struggled with this. Mr. Kiritsy responded that they could do an easement but opined that was not the best solution; he noted that the Aherns use that piece of property but the Thompsons pay taxes on it. He opined that the board has the opportunity to do the right thing and fix what the Lundstroms and Asheys, who did not get along, did years ago. He opined that the reason why the bylaws allow variances is that it is the best way to deal with situations such as this.

Mr. Femia asked why this was not taken care of in 1994? Mr. Kiritsy replied that the Aherns never saw that 3 Evans Rd. owned the 1,160 square feet (which was deeded to the Lundstroms, shown in Exhibit 2). Mr. Femia and Mr. Benson then discussed why or why not this situation should not be solved in court now.

With no further questions or comments by the board (Mr. Benson commented that he was sympathetic to Mr. Kiritsy's position but was trying to look for a legal argument to make for granting this) or Mr. Kiritsy, Mr. Olson opened the meeting to public comment, asking whomever was present to give his/her name and address. Present were John and Debbie Ahern, 1 Evans Rd. Mr. Ahern said that they want to make things right and have things back the way they were, and the way that they thought the property was. Mrs. Ahern continued, that they want to clear the title on the property in case they want to sell it one day and commented that they are struggling now just to refinance it. She explained that they have been residents for 18 years and she noted that they never had a problem and want things to be smooth, and commented that they have fair and decent neighbors and they both want to make it work. Mr. Ahern added that they appreciate the thoroughness of the process, and they just want things back the way they were supposed to be.

Mr. Olson continued, opining that this came through in the presentation, and that the board recognized that the equity issue was significant, as well as the fairness issue; but, he questioned how far the board can use this to meet the legal standards for the variances?

With no further questions or comments by the public, Mr. Rajeshkumar made a motion to close the public hearing. Mr. Femia seconded. Roll call vote was taken:

Mr. Femia – "yes"

Mr. Orciani – "yes"

Mr. Benson – “yes”

Mr. Rajeshkumar – “yes”

Mr. Olson – “yes”

Now, Mr. Olson asked for any discussion by the board. In response to Mr. Femia, Mr. Olson replied that the board would have to take (2) votes, one for each variance. Mr. Benson commented that he wanted to be convinced that the board had authority. He said that he agreed with Mr. Kiritsy that this was the most equitable solution, it would improve the situation with the setback at 1 Evans Rd., and thought that the best scenario would be to reset the properties to what they were, but he struggled with the decision that this met the variance requirements and that the board is justified to grant the variances. Mr. Rajeshkumar commented that he had similar thoughts, and he did not want to set a precedent for future variances. The board members then discussed what other things could be done instead of granting the variance. Mr. Femia questioned whether or not the board would want to discuss this with Town Counsel, and how the decision would be written? Mr. Olson responded that there were two issues; one being if this situation meets the three standards of a variance, and they are struggling with the first one. Second, does the board have the legal authority to grant the variance, due to Sec. 4.2C, to reduce frontage only if the area of the lot is greater than 40,000 square feet? If the board wanted Town Counsel’s opinion, he would ask her this question, but he asserted that Town Counsel tends to leave the first question to the boards, and if they are not confident, they have to figure out an alternative. Mr. Femia then asked, regarding the owners of 1 Evans Rd. (Ahern), who said that they purchased their property in 2002, why it took so long to come back to the ZBA? In response to Mr. Orciani, Mrs. Ahern replied that they are now refinancing their house. Mr. Benson continued, that the court re-drew the property line, and opined that this might not have been recorded, so the title examiner was not aware of it, and therefore there is a claim on title insurance. The board members then discussed whether or not the variance criteria qualify, and decided that, even though other things were done over the years, they want to fix it now and have to decide if it does qualify.

With no further comments by the board, Mr. Olson asked for a motion on the first variance request. Mr. Femia attempted to make the motion, but withdrew it as there were changes in the figures of area reduction of 3 Evans Road in the paperwork and legal ad notice (which Mr. Olson deemed as “de minimus” and asserted that the concept was the same), therefore Mr. Olson asked for a motion to grant Variance #1, Under Section 4.2, to approve the reduction of area of 3 Evans Road lot from 18,866 square feet by 1,160 square feet? Mr. Rajeshkumar made the motion, Mr. Orciani seconded. The roll call vote was taken:

Mr. Femia – “no”

Mr. Orciani – “yes”

Mr. Benson – “no”

Mr. Rajeshkumar – “no”

Mr. Olson – “no”

The vote was (1) yes, (4) “no”, and the variance was not granted.

Next, Mr. Olson asked for a motion to grant Variance #2, under Section 4.2, to reduce the lot frontage at 3 Evans Rd. from 118.4 ft. to 100 ft. Mr. Benson made the motion, Mr. Rajeshkumar seconded. The roll call vote was taken:

Mr. Femia – “no”

Mr. Orciani – “yes”

Mr. Benson – “no”

Mr. Rajeshkumar – “no”

Mr. Olson – “no”

The vote was (1) “yes” to (4) “no”, therefore the variance was not granted. Mr. Olson stated that this concluded the public hearing.

Reorganization of ZBA:

Mr. Olson noted that this process takes place every year after Town elections. Mr. Olson asked for preferences for the various offices. Mr. Benson nominated Mr. Olson to be re-elected as Chair. Mr. Femia seconded. All in favor. (Mr. Olson then asked the board if he agrees to be Chair again this year, would someone else consider it? Mr. Femia replied that he would if no one else offered).

Mr. Olson then asked for suggestions for Vice-Chair? Mr. Benson nominated Mr. Rajeshkumar to be re-elected as Vice-Chair. Mr. Orciani seconded. All in favor.

Mr. Olson then asked for suggestion for Clerk? Mr. Rajeshkumar nominated Mr. Femia to be re-elected as Clerk. Mr. Orciani seconded. All in favor.

Mr. Olson then asked for a motion for each of the officeholders' terms to be one year at most. Mr. Femia made the motion, Mr. Orciani seconded. Roll call vote was taken:

Mr. Femia – "yes"

Mr. Orciani – "yes"

Mr. Benson – "yes"

Mr. Rajeshkumar – "yes"

Mr. Olson – "yes"

The vote was (5) "yes", (0) "no", therefore the motion passed.

Other Business:

Mr. Femia asked if the board had any thoughts about adding the topic of re-doing the ZBA filing forms to an upcoming agenda? Mr. Olson responded that he would do that, and asked if one or two members want to take the lead on this, perhaps looking at other towns for examples? Mr. Femia offered to look into it.

Treasurer's/Financial Report:

This was not discussed this evening.

Next Scheduled ZBA Meeting – THURSDAY, AUGUST 20, 2020

Miscellaneous Mail and Paperwork Needing Signatures/Future Agenda Items/ZBA Reports:

This was not discussed this evening.

With no further discussion taking place, Mr. Femia made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:08 p.m. Mr. Rajeshkumar seconded. Roll call was taken:

Mr. Rajeshkumar – "yes"

Mr. Orciani – "yes"

Mr. Olson – "yes"

Mr. Benson – "yes"

Mr. Femia – "yes"

Meeting was adjourned.

Submitted by: _____

Date submitted: _____

Approved by: _____

