



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

[Zoning Board of Appeals] Meeting Minutes

Date / Time / Location of Meeting	Thursday, March 18, 2021/7:00 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	Christopher 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	N/A

Welcome – Call to Order **Time: 7:00 p.m. (by Mr.Olson)**

Approval of Previous Minutes **Minutes of February 18, 2021**

Motion Originator: **Mr. Femia**

Motion Seconded: **Mr. Rajeshkumar**

Treasurer – Financial Report **N/A**

Motion to Accept **N/A**

Seconded **N/A**

At 7:00 p.m., Mr. Olson called the meeting to order. He read aloud Governor Baker's order regarding remote meetings and the Open Meeting Law (given on the meeting agenda), noting that on the agenda are the instructions for joining the Zoom meeting. He also asked those who were present other than the board members to give their names to be recorded on the sign-in sheet, if they had not done so already.

Minutes of February 18, 2021 Meeting:

After review of the draft minutes by the board, Mr. Femia made a motion to accept the minutes as written. Mr. Rajeshkumar seconded. Mr. Olson took a roll call vote:

Mr. Rajeshkumar – "yes"

Mr. Orciani – "yes"

Mr. Femia – "yes"

Mr. Benson – "yes"

Mr. Olson – "yes"

The vote was 5 "yes", 0 "no" and 0 "abstain", therefore the minutes were approved as written.

Continued Public Hearing, Glenn Sciarro, 24 Sterling Place, for a Special Permit to convert an apartment into a fourth unit with the property constituting a nonconforming use within the meaning of Section 1.4.B of the West Boylston Zoning Bylaws:

(Theodore Barone, David Dye and Glenn Sciarro represented; Mr. Olson noted that George Tignor, Building Inspector, was also attending the meeting). Mr. Olson explained that the first hearing for this petition was in October of 2020 (October 15, 2020), and he noted that they all left off with a few questions by the board for the petitioner on which his team needed to follow up. Mr. Olson mentioned that the board received some information from Mr. Barone on March 8, 2021 (which included building plans for the first and second floors of the house, alternative parking plans, and methods of ingress and egress in the front and back of the building, shown on photos and plans), and another email was received from him today (a one-page description of the property and residence). Mr. Barone thanked the board and Ms. Goldstein for their help, and began addressing several issues that the board wanted them to look into. First Mr. Barone discussed parking and explained that they had thought of potentially utilizing parking down the driveway, and noted that they submitted to the board photos of the driveway and of the back of the building. He explained that Mr. Dye and Mr. Sciarro walked the property, took measurements and came up with different possibilities of arranging the eight parking spaces that they would need with four units; he said that Mr. Dye would explain this further so he could give the board an understanding of what he did. He also mentioned diagrams sent to the board relative to the parking issue on March 8, attachments 3 and 4. He asked Mr. Dye to explain what he did, how he came up with the drawings and footage and what constituted the work he did to show the board where the parking spaces would be and the footage between the lines. Mr. Dye explained that he went with Mr. Sciarro to do this. He mentioned the concrete wall with four-foot fence in front of the area where the vehicles would stop, except for the handicapped area and the spaces on the other end. Referring to the drawings, he described that they physically measured the spaces, drew the measurements in there to scale and put cars in to scale. Mr. Dye noted that the vehicles fit in nine-foot wide spots. Mr. Benson asked how they knew that they were nine-foot spots? (Mr. Barone added that these were filed on his behalf by Mr. Dye a few days later). Referring to the aforementioned parking plans, he explained that they knew the distance was 9 feet between the green lines indicating parking spaces (except 18 feet for the handicapped space, which Mr. Barone said acts as two spaces) because he backed the cars up (Mr. Barone instructed Mr. Olson

to put up attachment 3 from March 8) and he and Mr. Dye pointed out where the handicapped space was (they all looked at where Sterling Place was (at the bottom of the figure), and Mr. Dye pointed out the front of the building, noting that the driveway goes down the side of the house and parking spaces can fit there and behind the building). Mr. Dye also explained that a green line indicated a parking barrier. Mr. Femia expressed concern about the last two vehicles on the left, which Mr. Dye responded would be in the back of the building; Mr. Dye said that the last parking spot would be about 8 feet from the property line, but Mr. Femia noted that, according to the bylaws, the side setback must be 10 feet from the property line. Mr. Olson verified that the side and rear setbacks must be 10 feet from the property line in this district, according to Sec. 4.2 in the bylaws. In response to Mr. Orciani, Mr. Barone replied that there would be no setback issue in the back as that is Mr. Sciarro's property, and he suggested that removal of one handicapped space should alleviate the side setback issue. He pointed out on the diagrams an empty space where they could place a vehicle, and the extreme left parking space vehicle would go into the second handicapped space, but that they can handle this however the board wants. Mr. Dye responded to Mr. Femia that if they put the last vehicle on the left into that empty spot, the setback would be almost 17 feet. Mr. Barone responded to Mr. Benson, reiterating that the rear setback would not be an issue because Mr. Sciarro's property is there and verified that the parking would be greater than 10 feet from the property line, clarifying that it is still Mr. Sciarro's property beyond the retaining wall; but he also clarified that the parking would not be greater than 10 feet from the retaining wall but from the property line. Mr. Orciani asked if a car is parked in the aforementioned empty space, how close to the house would it be if a vehicle makes a right turn? Mr. Barone replied that it would depend on the size of the car, and Mr. Dye said that he used full-sized cars for the spaces on the diagrams. Mr. Femia asked if a car backs out and turns right to go out, would it hit the house? Mr. Dye asserted that there would be plenty of room for it to pass. Mr. Benson asked about the fourth parking spot from the left, which would be to the right of the empty space, and how close the rear bumper of the car would be to the building? He commented that, in the drawing, it looks as though the vehicles will be "crammed" in there. Mr. Barone asserted that Mr. Dye measured it and there would be adequate space to back up, turn to the right, then left, then out of the driveway. Mr. Dye replied to Mr. Orciani that he could not see the measurements on the screen from the back wall to the house, but Mr. Barone asserted that there would be adequate room based on the walk of the property. Mr. Femia also asked how far the retaining wall would be to the corner of the house? Mr. Dye replied that he did not have the measurements with him, and Mr. Femia responded that he could understand what Mr. Benson and Mr. Orciani were concerned about, because if a car backs out it would have to go left and not right. (Mr. Rajeshkumar then asked Mr. Olson to put up the photos of the property, and ask the Building Inspector for comments). (Mr. Barone and Mr. Dye then asked to step away from the proceedings for a moment).

After they returned, Mr. Tignor asserted that there were some errors on the drawings that he wanted to point out to the board. (Photos were held up of the side and backyard of the property). Mr. Femia opined that the last parking spot looked "tight". Mr. Barone responded that there would be no issue if they take the two last spots on the left and change the handicapped spot. Mr. Barone commented that he heard the board's concerns, but said that he did not think there is an issue because of Mr. Dye's measurements. Mr. Femia asked, regarding the telephone pole, if that is the last spot (pointing this out on the photo) and two more cars are parked after that, can all three cars back out and turn right without hitting the corner of the stairwell? Mr. Dye replied "no". Mr. Barone reiterated that replacing that handicapped spot with regular parking would be a solution, and that, even though Mr. Dye said that is room, the photo is a depiction, not necessarily a true scale one, as opposed to walking the property. Mr. Rajeshkumar commented that they should have had the dimensions from the retaining wall to the

building. Mr. Orciani opined that, from the corner of the deck to the telephone pole looked close. (The petitioners put up the diagram again and pointed out the telephone pole to Mr. Femia, and he thought they could eliminate a car and the empty parking spot; he opined that, without the measurements, they could not tell. Mr. Dye responded that they have the measurements but they're very small on the screen), and he asked Mr. Tignor for his thoughts as he has walked the property). Mr. Tignor responded, opining that the drawing was inadequate, and explained that the spaces were given 9-foot diagonal dimensions, but the law looks for perpendicular dimensions to the lines, not at an angle, and he asserted that there would only be 8.3 feet between the lines. Mr. Barone asserted that the actual parking space is 9 feet, but Mr. Tignor asserted that it cannot be that with diagonal lines and that it does not show that the actual space is 9 feet between the lines. He also asserted that the distance from the telephone pole to the stairs in the back is 19 feet, but the bylaw requires the spaces to be 9' x 18', so there would be only a one-foot space behind the longest car in the space and the driver could not get out.

Mr. Femia then opined that the retaining wall is the biggest problem but did not think it can be eliminated, and asked what was behind it? Mr. Tignor responded that there is a drop behind it, and added that the rear entrance stairs are not in the diagram. Mr. Femia added that the telephone pole is not in the diagram either. Mr. Tignor reiterated that there are supposed to be 9-feet between perpendicular lines between parking spaces and that diagonal lines should not have been shown. Mr. Barone then commented that, at the last meeting, the board asked for issues to be solved and he asserted that Mr. Dye and Mr. Sciarro tried to solve them, but thought it was unfair to "throw" this issue at them now. He opined that the age of the house (built in 1900) caused limitations in the layout. (Mr. Barone and Mr. Dye then asked for a moment again away from the proceedings to confer). (Mr. Olson then told Mr. Femia that bylaw Sec. 5.3B, page 65 was what they were referring to).

After returning to the proceedings, Mr. Barone asked Mr. Olson to put up the original diagram with all the parking spaces. He suggested that one possibility would be taking the two parked cars on the left and one parked car to the right of the empty space and replacing it to a position on the side of the building. He said that Mr. Dye asserted that they would still have room for the 10-foot setback. Or, another possibility would be that at least one of those can be parked to the extreme right, down from the handicapped space. He suggested that if the board is concerned with the telephone pole or room in the back of the building, either thing would work for four cars to back out and three other cars either to be on the side of the building or at least one on the driveway side of the building or on the non-driveway side. Mr. Olson responded, where at this point they were talking about possibly a different parking configuration, he suggested moving to another issue at that time which he considered a more threshold issue before making a decision on the parking; that would be the dimensional requirements for multifamily buildings, according to Sec. 4.3A (density requirements for multifamily use), which they had talked about at the October meeting. In response to Mr. Olson, Mr. Barone replied that the property does have sewer and commented that Board of Health opined that they had no issues with the proposed work. Mr. Olson then responded that Sec. 4.3 requires each unit on the lot to have 10,000 square feet of area, so a minimum of 40,000 square feet in total would be required. He noted that the lot contains less than half of that. Mr. Olson said that the board was aware of the age of the house, the nonconforming nature of the lot and that the other three units have legal nonconforming use, but in this proposal the petitioner is considering a fourth unit. Mr. Barone opined that this will not be a change, asserting that there had always been four units there. He reiterated some of the history of ownership of the property given by Mr. Dye and Doreen McCormack, which stated that there have always been four units occupied by the Bouchers (1963 to 2008) and another family before Mr. Sciarro. He noted that the inside of the building never changed from a structural standpoint. He also noted that, according to the listing report which he gave the board today, there are twenty total rooms with four heating zones, which he

asserted suggest there were always four units. Mr. Barone opined that there will be no substantial detriment to the neighborhood, just activation of the fourth unit and that things will essentially remain the same because it remains the same structurally. Mr. Barone continued, that from a standpoint of square footage, citing the Town of West Boylston video of the ZBA meeting of 10/15/2020, Mr. Olson had brought up the age of the house being before the zoning bylaws were in force, so the house was a legal nonconforming structure, and Mr. Barone opined that the fourth unit is only being activated and that it is also legally nonconforming as are the other three units and that activation of it will cause no substantial detriment to the neighborhood.

Mr. Olson responded that he was struggling with this, because according to all other sources this structure is recognized as a three-unit multifamily structure, and noted that even though the petitioner is not asking to change the physical structure he is looking to extend the nonconforming nature with respect to legal use by having a fourth independent unit. Mr. Barone asserted that the ZBA can allow this so long as there is no additional detriment to the neighborhood by activation of the fourth unit. Mr. Olson continued that for a special permit to be granted, according to Sec. 6.2E, it requires that all other provisions shall be complied with, and the petitioner is not complying with the density requirement. (Mr. Olson read aloud Sec. 4.3A.1 for Mr. Barone, which stated that for a multifamily dwelling a minimum of 10,000 square feet of lot area is required for each dwelling unit where sewer service is allowed and permitted, therefore in this situation the petitioner is only entitled to one unit at his total area but was allowed three legal nonconforming units; now he is asking to add a fourth unit where the total lot is less than one-half of what it would ordinarily be required to have. Mr. Barone asserted that he is saying the standard becomes if extending the nonconformity causes substantial detriment to the neighborhood, and he insists that it will not do that; he reiterated that it has always been nonconforming and that they would only be turning on the fourth unit. Mr. Olson responded that, in order to grant the special permit, the petitioner has a number of things to prove. One is the detriment issue, the other is that the board cannot extend the nonconformity to allow the fourth unit if it violates another part of the bylaw. Mr. Barone asserted that the nonconformity still exists with the fourth unit and that they are just looking for an extension of that situation. Mr. Olson said that he realized that this building was built before zoning, but according to Town records it has three units, and even if there was extra room for the fourth structure, he opined that it will extend impact on the neighborhood regarding parking and number of cars and it will intensify the multifamily nature of the lot in a mainly single-residence district.

Mr. Barone responded, trying to break down the situation. Regarding parking, he said that they suggested alternatives to make it better and eliminate concerns of backing up into the building. Regarding number of cars, he said that there are now two vehicles allowed per unit (6), and they want to add two more for the fourth unit; they do not think that this will be a substantial detriment, and they may not even have that number of vehicles there. Regarding intensity, Mr. Olson explained to him that the multifamily use is for three units and the petitioner wants to increase the intensity by 33% with the fourth unit. Mr. Barone responded that he did not see substantial detriment in activation of the fourth unit and suggested that the board's reasons were just speculation. Mr. Olson opined that he was just looking at the facts; he reiterated that this is a lot that is mainly in the single-residence district, the petitioner's property is next to entirely single-residence properties, and he wants to increase the intensity that he has now. Mr. Barone said that he understood what Mr. Olson was saying but did not see how this would be substantially negative and asked how the potential for two more cars and more people would create a substantial detriment to the neighborhood if they have hopefully solved the parking situation? Mr. Orciani suggested that there could be even more cars if there are visitors. Mr. Barone opined again that this is only speculation.

In response to Mr. Femia, Mr. Barone replied that three units are being used right now, and the fourth is empty (referring to the March 8 attachment). In response to Mr. Femia, Mr. Olson agreed that the two issues are

parking and the addition of the fourth unit where ordinarily the petitioner would need 40,000 square feet of lot area. Mr. Olson said that he understood that the three units were legally nonconforming with respect to the bylaw, but now the petitioner is requesting to add a fourth unit, and reiterated that it would significantly increase the intensity and violate that section of the bylaw; he was not convinced that the board could grant the special permit.

In response to Mr. Femia, Mr. Barone replied that each of the three active apartments has one bedroom and one bathroom. Mr. Dye verified with Mr. Femia that apartments 1 and 2 are on the left, and the third is on the right. Mr. Dye explained that the fourth apartment is on the bottom floor, on the left as one enters. Mr. Femia commented that, when the last Building Inspector looked at the building a couple of years ago, the bottom floor right was used and both the bottom left and top left apartments, and the top right, which was not used, Mr. Sciarro was supposedly trying to make into the fourth apartment; Mr. Dye was now saying that the bottom left is for the fourth apartment. Mr. Barone responded, asking what Mr. Femia's specific concerns were regarding detriment to the neighborhood? (Mr. Barone and Mr. Femia disagreed that the house was built as a three-family originally; Mr. Olson instructed them to direct questions to him). Mr. Femia explained that, when the former Building Inspector investigated the situation due to work being done in the house without a building permit, he explained to the board that the top right apartment was empty, and when the house was built, there were two left-side apartments and a bottom right unit with stairs; they thought the top right was to be the fourth apartment. Mr. Femia then asked how residents would park cars on the driveway side? Mr. Dye replied that they would park parallel to that, and that from the property line to the building would be greater than 10 feet. Mr. Femia asked for the specific distance, as the bylaws state that it cannot be less than 10 feet. Mr. Barone responded that Mr. Dye measured between the corner of the building and the fence, and the distance is 28.6 feet; with a nine-foot car, there would be a distance to the fence remaining of 19 feet; he asserted that the petitioner could park three parallel cars which would alleviate the parking problem and there would be no substantial detriment to the neighborhood with respect to parking. In response to Mr. Barone, Mr. Tignor replied that it was his understanding from the files that the two apartments to the left were two separate units and the right-hand one was one unit with a first and second floor, and noted that if one looks at the side of the building, there are only three electric meters, indicating three apartments. Mr. Barone asserted that Mr. Dye went to Town Hall and made copies of the petitioner's file, and claimed that there were no notes about that in the file. Mr. Tignor responded that his predecessor went into the building and noted that construction was going on to make two apartments out of one. Mr. Barone responded, asserting that it had never been that way and reiterating that they went to the Building Dept. office and copied the file. (Mr. Rajeshkumar opined that this was irrelevant as it was years ago and the board needs to decide on the real issue now, that of there being three apartments and the petitioner wanting one more). Mr. Barone responded that he did not think this was an issue before but that it is now being made an issue and that, if the board is satisfied that it is not an issue any more, he was ready to move on. Mr. Olson responded that the board has the following information on the recent history of this building: the previous Zoning Interpretation Form from 1/28/2018 (by Bentley Herget)(on file), which stated that the building was a three-family, with in-law to four-family, and in "Comments" he mentioned that work was done without permit, he gave them a stop-work order, and the petitioner wanted to convert to four-family. He also acknowledged that this was in a single-residence zone. Mr. Olson said that this was the only decision issued that they have on the former Building Inspector's understanding of what was going on inside this structure. Mr. Barone opined that this information did not shed light either way on the issue, as "convert" can have many meanings. Mr. Olson referred to the map dated 10/15/2020 of the layout of the land, pointing to the fork in the road on Route 12 off to the right to Sterling Place, and noted the area zoned "general residence", where multifamily residences are permitted by right, and the white area which is all single residence, where multifamily residences are prohibited. Referring to the petitioner's property, Mr. Olson pointed out that the size of the lot is 15,000-16,000 square feet, and is on the line between general residence and single residence so it is a split lot, with the front in one district

and the back in the more restrictive district; he noted that next door to that lot, the property is almost entirely in the single residence zone and a house behind the petitioner is in single residence. Mr. Olson concluded that substantial detriment is one of the standards of granting the special permit, but not the only one. Mr. Olson said that his point was that it was worth addressing how an additional unit with two more cars might adversely impact the neighbors. Mr. Barone reiterated his opinion that the board was talking speculation, not based on fact, and opined that there would be little if any negative impact, given the age of the building and that half of the building is in a multifamily district. He continued, asserting that they can alleviate the problem at the rear of the building by moving the cars, and that they do not know if there will be visitors' vehicles or how many, and asked what other intensity issues are there to deal with? Mr. Olson responded, reiterating that this is a split lot, right up to the single-residence zone, and the entire back of the property is single residence, which prohibits multifamily use, and also opined that the small nature of the lot size relative to the number of units will be made worse if the board approves the request. Mr. Barone responded that they have given parking alternatives and he asked Mr. Olson to clarify the negative factor that would be exacerbated? He added that visitors would be minimal and brought up the fact that the previous owners, the Bouchers, had more than one person in each apartment. Mr. Dye explained who was in the apartments at that time. Mr. Barone added that this has always been the case for the occupants of that house, noting that there were 7 to 10 people living in the house in total between 1963 and 2008 without any real detriment. Mr. Dye noted that there are separate accesses for each apartment, and all are separately locked.

At this point, Mr. Benson opined that there were no other issues to discuss and that the board should allow Mr. Barone to sum up; Mr. Olson agreed. (Mr. Olson then asked for any public comment, of which there was none). Mr. Tignor commented that his predecessors saw illegal work being done to make a fourth apartment. He is concerned with building code violations, and also egresses out of the building. He said that, if the board wants to approve this, he will not give a building permit as he asserted that a lot of different updates will be required. Mr. Barone responded, regarding ingresses and egresses, he referred to the photos and diagrams and pointed out two entrances/exits in the back and the front ingress and egress. Mr. Tignor opined that the drawings were inaccurate and amateurish. Mr. Barone reacted angrily to this statement, and opined that it was amateurish not to have records of one to two apartments, and noted that if the board approves, the client knows that he will have to do the work according to code. Mr. Tignor responded that it is part of his job to evaluate drawings according to building code. (Mr. Barone complained about Mr. Tignor starting this type of dialogue and claimed that he started this provocative discussion)(Mr. Olson responded that the participants will continue with decorum).

After this interaction, Mr. Olson asked the board to entertain a motion. Mr. Rajeshkumar made a motion to close the public hearing. Mr. Femia seconded. Mr. Barone then asked to give a closing. After collecting his thoughts, Mr. Barone summarized several issues. Regarding parking, he suggested that the problems were solved; he noted that the driveway side of the property had room for three cars, and only 4 to 5 in back, and to negate backup concerns, he summarized that they could park two or three parallel next to the building, leaving 18 feet from the property line, or put two on the driveway side and one on the other. Regarding egress/ingress, he asserted that the photos show two in the back and one on the front side (street side), which he opined was more than adequate. Regarding code, he said that it is up to the client to do that. And with respect to lot size, frontage and impact, he brought up several points. First, the question of more cars, which they opined was speculation only. Second, Mr. Dye mentioned that the Bouchers told him that there were 7 to 10 people living there when the Bouchers owned the property, and he asserted that there was no documentation that they knew of showing any substantial detriment to the neighborhood. He also reiterated his opinion that intensity issues were based on speculation, not proof. Next he referred to Mr. Femia's assertion of Mr. Sciarro trying to convert one apartment to two and Mr. Tignor's assertion that the previous Building Inspector found violations; he claimed that there is no proof of that except for vague recollections, but he opined that even if there was there would be no guarantee of substantial detriment. His last comment was regarding these proceedings, and he commented that certain words are triggers, and he referred to the fact that the board knows who sold this property to Mr. Sciarro and that he

wants the board to act with fairness and decide that the fourth apartment should be grandfathered. He asked the board to allow the fourth apartment to be activated, and reiterated that the client will do what he has to do to build according to code. He thanked the board and apologized that the discussion became heated, and reiterated again that for all of these years there had been no substantial detriment to the neighborhood.

With no further comment, Mr. Olson again asked the board for a motion to close the public hearing. Mr. Rajeshkumar made the motion; Mr. Femia seconded. Mr. Olson took a roll call vote:

Mr. Rajeshkumar – “yes”

Mr. Orciani – “yes”

Mr. Femia – “yes”

Mr. Benson – “yes”

Mr. Olson – “yes”

The vote was 5 “yes”, 0 “no” and 0 “abstain”, therefore the public hearing was closed.

(Mr. Olson then asked for the board to deliberate). Mr. Femia suggested that, in the future, they should consider site visits by the board to help regarding parking issues so that they can visualize the situation as the plans do not always show what is needed. Mr. Benson commented that he was familiar with the area, and noted that the front is in the multifamily zone but has residential character. He opined that the side parking would be “out of character”, giving the property a feel of an apartment complex. He had density concerns also, and thought that these issues have the element of detriment, especially if the parking spaces are moved. He also opined that the neighbors’ homes look like single family homes, not a series of multifamily homes.

With no further comments by the board members, Mr. Olson noted that a supermajority of 4 “yes” votes would be needed to grant the special permit. He then asked for a motion. Mr. Femia made a motion to approve the special permit for a fourth unit at 24 Sterling Place, with the condition that it meets all requirements of the Building Inspector and that he will inspect it upon completion. Mr. Rajeshkumar seconded. Mr. Olson took a roll call vote:

Mr. Rajeshkumar – “no”

Mr. Orciani – “no”

Mr. Femia – “no”

Mr. Benson – “no”

Mr. Olson – “no”

The vote was 0 “yes”, 5 “no” and 0 “abstain”, therefore the request was denied. Mr. Olson thanked Mr. Barone for his presentation. Mr. Femia noted to Mr. Barone and the petitioner that the board has 14 days to issue a decision, and there is a 20-day appeal period.

Other Business:

1. Mr. Olson wanted to make it a matter of record that, regarding the appeal of the ZBA decision for 241 Woodland St., the court affirmed the ZBA’s decision.
2. Ms. Goldstein informed the board that there was an invoice, a Declaration of Covenant form and vote sheets needing signatures, in the dropbox outside of Town Hall.
3. Mr. Olson informed the board that the next meeting for the ZBA would be on **Thursday, April 15, 2021.**

With no further discussion taking place, Mr. Femia made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:52 p.m. Mr. Rajeshkumar seconded. Mr. Olson took a roll call vote:

Mr. Rajeshkumar – “yes”

Mr. Orciani – “yes”

Mr. Femia – “yes”

Mr. Benson – “yes”

Mr. Olson – “yes”

The vote was 5 “yes”, 0 “no” and 0 “abstain”, therefore the meeting was adjourned at 8:52 p.m.

Submitted by: _____

Date submitted: _____

Approved by: _____

