



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

[Zoning Board of Appeals] Meeting Minutes

**Date / Time / Location of
Meeting**

Thursday, May 16, 2019/7:00 p.m./Selectmen's Meeting Room – OPEN
SESSION

Members Present

Chris Olson (Chair), Barur Rajeshkumar (Vice-Chair), Nathaniel Orciani (Clerk), John Benson, David Femia, and Secretary Toby Goldstein

Members NOT Present

Andrew Feland, Charles Witkus, and Mark Wyatt (Associate Members)

Invited Guests

Welcome – Call to Order

Time: 7:04 p.m. (by Mr. Olson)

Approval of Previous Minutes 1/17/19 (Executive Session and Open Session) and 2/21/19

Motion Originator 1/17/19: Mr. Femia (approved as written, both sets)

2/21/19: Mr. Femia (approved as written, with amendments)

Motion Seconded 1/17/19: Mr. Rajeshkumar (seconded both sets)

2/21/19: Mr. Rajeshkumar seconded, with amendments

NOTE: MR. BENSON ABSTAINED FROM ALL (3) SETS OF MINUTES AS HE WAS NOT PRESENT AT THE MEETINGS; MR. ORCIANI ABSTAINED FROM 2/21/19 MINUTES VOTE AS HE WAS NOT PRESENT).

Treasurer – Financial Report Mr. Olson reviewed the latest financial statement, dated 4/30/19

Motion to Accept N/A

Seconded N/A

At 7:04 pm, Mr. Olson called the meeting to order.

Minutes of January, 2019 and February, 2019:

Mr. Femia first motioned to approve the regular session minutes of 1/17/19 as written. Mr. Rajeshkumar seconded. The vote was 4 “yes”, 0 “no”, and Mr. Benson abstained.

Mr. Femia then motioned to approve the Executive Session minutes of 1/17/19 as written. Mr. Rajeshkumar seconded. The vote was 4 “yes”, 0 “no”, and Mr. Benson abstained.

Mr. Femia then motioned to approve the minutes of 2/21/19 as written, with amendments (Mr. Olson discussed a few corrections that were needed). Mr. Rajeshkumar seconded. The vote was 3 “yes”, 0 “no”, and Mr. Orciani and Mr. Benson abstained.

Public Hearing, Cynthia Sparks, Petition for Special Permit, 14 May Street:

(Tim Fitzgerald and Cynthia Sparks represented). (Mr. Femia read aloud the legal notice). Mr. Olson then explained to the applicant the public hearing procedure; they would be able to present their information and discuss what they are asking from the board, then the board would ask their questions, then the hearing would be open to public comment.

Mr. Fitzgerald began by explaining that they were seeking relief under Section 1.4.B of the zoning bylaws, for construction of a two-car garage attached to the existing house. The applicant will be removing a shed, portico and covered garage to construct the new garage. Mr. Fitzgerald asserted that this would lessen the nonconformity of the house as it sits on the lot now, and by taking away the shed, the garage will be within the setback requirements. He also asserted that this is a unique situation in the Town, as the property is surrounded by three streets. He explained that the reasons for this special permit request are stated in part B, and Question 6 is answered in a separate attachment, in the petition application packet. In response to Mr. Benson, Mr. Fitzgerald replied that the barn on the property will remain. He added that the shed will be removed, and it is currently 1’6” from the side lot line. He explained to Mr. Benson the distances of the garage from the rear and side of the lot. In response to Mr. Femia, Mr. Fitzgerald and Ms. Sparks replied that the front is on May Street. They replied to Mr. Benson that the driveway is on Green Street. They also explained to Mr. Benson that there are setbacks, one foot from Pearson Street, and they explained that all three streets may not have been in existence originally (the house was built in 1810).

(Mr. Femia opined that the submitted plans were probably among the best that he had seen in his years on the ZBA, and thanked Mr. Fitzgerald for submitting them like that). In response to a question from Mr. Femia, Mr. Fitzgerald replied that he assumed May Street was the main street when the house was built and then Pearson and Green Streets were constructed. Mr. Femia then asked about the other streets that come up to May Street; Ms. Sparks responded that they are not private and the Town plows those streets. Mr. Femia asked if there are no required setbacks that are met? Mr. Fitzgerald replied that the house will still be nonconforming but the new garage will meet the required setbacks. Next, in response to Mr. Rajeshkumar, Mr. Fitzgerald discussed the sizes of the proposed garage and of the existing covered porch and shed. In response to Mr. Femia, Mr. Fitzgerald replied that the deck is the covered walk way to the shed and the portico will come down and he did not have exact sizes of them; he explained that all the existing structures are on the plot plan but the dimensions are not there. He added that the portico and covered porch are 21’ x 4’, and the shed is about 20’ x 8’ (according to the Assessor’s information).

Next, to summarize, Mr. Olson noted that, on plan A4, is the existing footprint, which contains the shed, which is nonconforming; he reiterated that the applicant proposes to get rid of the shed, portico, and deck, and install a two-car attached garage that does comply with zoning regarding location and dimensions. He continued that, in Section 1.4, the Building Inspector has the leeway to grant a building permit in a residential lot with a couple of factors to consider: the structure does not intensify the existing nonconformities and the applicant is actually decreasing nonconformity, or removing it altogether (except for the house, which will have no proposed changes), and second, that the applicant retains the existing footprint and will not be increasing the envelope of that structure.

Mr. Rajeshkumar noted that the applicant is proposing a new garage, 24’ x 30’, but the shed and porch are 20’ x 8’ and 21’ x 4’. Mr. Olson responded that the bylaw wording is “or”-the applicant does not have to meet both criteria. Mr. Fitzgerald added that, given the question if the proposal would be more detrimental to the neighborhood, they do not think so.

In response to Mr. Femia, Mr. Olson replied that, because it is a residential nonconforming structure, the Building Inspector can allow a building permit without ZBA relief if it meets one of the two criteria, and he said that the board opined that it meets the first criterion. Mr. Olson thought that the Building Inspector chose not to do that, and opined that the special permit was more appropriate. (Mr. Femia thought that the Building Inspector should have been there to answer questions).

With no further questions or comments by the applicant or the board, Mr. Olson announced that the public hearing would be open to public comment, and instructed those present to raise their hands and clearly state their names and addresses if they wish to speak.

First to speak was Howard Mariotti, 18 May Street. He wanted everyone to keep in mind that the area was a historic district, and said that it was important to him that the historic architectural style be maintained. He said that he would like to see what the plans look like, and asserted that his house and one next to it are on the national historic register. Mr. Femia asked Mr. Olson if the Historical Commission should be involved? Mr. Olson replied that this would not be ZBA business. Mr. Rajeshkumar asserted that this house in question is not a historic building. Mr. Mariotti explained that houses are listed by number in the National Register of Historic Places, and added that he had no objection to the applicant's proposal, but just wanted to see what it would look like from an architectural standpoint, given the historic nature of the neighborhood. (Mr. Femia asked Mr. Fitzgerald to give the plan to Mr. Mariotti to look at). Mr. Fitzgerald said for the record that he made an inquiry with the Town offices early on as to whether or not there were any historic issues with this building, and asserted that Sheryl Keddy in the Building Dept. went through her files and said that this home was not on the historic register and he said that otherwise they would have gone before the Historical Commission. In response to Mr. Benson's question about the applicant's position regarding remodeling with respect to changes in architecture, Mr. Fitzgerald replied that their architect made suggestions in keeping with the nature of the property and the adjacent barn, and the garage, which will be attached to the house, will be the same color as the house and in keeping with the aesthetics of the age of the building. Ms. Sparks added that it was important to her to maintain the same historical look, and noted that she upgraded the windows before to continue to look similar, and that, regarding the new garage, she insists that the windows have the same look. Mr. Mariotti commented to Mr. Benson that he was satisfied with the plans that he just looked at, and opined that Harvey Remodeling did good work in the area before. (The board members then discussed wanting to verify whether or not the property was on the historic register). Mr. Olson suggested that they had two options: to consider approval with conditions, or continue the public hearing so that the board could look into this.

Mr. Fitzgerald reiterated that Ms. Keddy unequivocally stated that they were not on the historic register; Ms. Sparks added that when she replaced her windows, she was told by the Building Inspector each time she did replacements and requested a building permit that she was not under historical restrictions. In response to Mr. Rajeshkumar, Mr. Femia replied that Ms. Keddy said that she looked it up, but to be safe, he thought maybe the hearing should be continued so that the Chair would have a chance to contact the Building Dept. or Historical Commission.

Mr. Olson then continued to discuss other questions. One was, according to Section 6.2 which discusses factors to consider for a special permit, regarding the proposed garage; he asked if the driveway entrance would stay on Green Street with the new garage being built? Mr. Fitzgerald replied that it would, but responded to Mr. Benson that the width would change from the garage to Green Street, and there would be no curb cut as Ms. Sparks' property extends onto the pavement. He responded to Mr. Benson that the driveway is a driveway now to the barn, which is about 10' x 10'. He responded to Mr. Femia that, with the new garage, the width will be 24 feet. He then responded to Mr. Benson that the paving reaches the barn, but there is no paving where the proposed garage will be. Mr. Fitzgerald agreed with Mr. Benson that there will be two paved driveways, one from the garage to the street and the other from the barn to the street.

Ms. Sparks responded to Mr. Femia, that she has lived in the house for nine years, and all three streets had been there. She said that she did not know that the house was one foot from the property line. Mr. Femia said that, on plan A-5, it looked like the front of the house is on Pearson Street, and Ms. Sparks and Mr. Fitzgerald commented that, on the plan, the front door (where the inner porch is located) faces May Street (Mr. Benson showed this to Mr. Femia on the plan). Ms. Sparks added that the barn side is the front door.

Mr. Olson then discussed feedback from other Town boards. He summarized that Planning Board believed that the proposed work would be consistent with the neighborhood and will not increase nonconformity. He said that Board of Health had no concerns, as the property was on sewer. And, he said that the Conservation

Commission stated that the proposed work would have no impact on their jurisdiction. Mr. Olson asked Mr. Fitzgerald if the garage would have any plumbing? He replied that there would be plumbing for a washing machine in the garage.

Mr. Olson then suggested that the board propose to vote, such that this special permit is conditioned upon confirming that there will be no encumbrance by the building on the historical district. Mr. Fitzgerald responded that he would prefer the board votes this evening, and asserted that he and the applicant had done their due diligence with respect to the historical district, but he also said that they understand the board's position. In response to Mr. Rajeshkumar, Mr. Fitzgerald replied that he would rather not continue the public hearing to next month. Mr. Rajeshkumar said that he was comfortable with a vote with conditions.

With no further comments or questions, Mr. Femia made a motion to close the public hearing. Mr. Orciani seconded. All in favor. The vote was 5 "yes", 0 "no". The board then discussed what needed to be done. They said that the petitioner needs to provide documentation to the board that the property is not in the historical district. Mr. Fitzgerald did not understand why the burden of proof was on the petitioner to get this information, and he asserted that the Town would have this information. The board responded that this is the first that they heard about this issue and, if it is in the historical district, they need to know if the property can be altered. Mr. Fitzgerald responded that they applied for the special permit a while ago, and opined that someone would've complained to the board by now; he added that this was one of the first questions that he asked Ms. Keddy. Mr. Olson opined that this was fair, and noteworthy that the person who asked about it in the first place (Mr. Mariotti) seems content with the proposal. He added that, even if there are some limitations as to what they are allowed to do, they do not know if that exists, and he sees nothing in the bylaws relating to this. Mr. Benson suggested, rather than wording it as a condition, they should say that they approve but that does not extend to any restrictions that may arise regarding historic preservation, and asserted that, if the Historical Commission has an issue, it would be their responsibility to take action. Mr. Olson added, that according to Section 6.2, which states that all provisions in the bylaws must be adhered to, the ZBA could decide to approve, even if there is a historical issue. Mr. Benson opined that the Town had ample opportunity to comment, but the board's vote will not impede any ability to act by the Historical Commission, and if the Historical Commission did not step forward, it should be their responsibility; he suggested sending the Historical Commission a copy of whatever decision the board makes.

With no further comments or questions, Mr. Benson made a motion to approve the special permit, but with appropriate phrasing. Mr. Olson seconded, with the wording that the approval is with respect to all provisions of the West Boylston Zoning Bylaws, and decision does not extend to independent approvals that might be required due to the historic nature of the building or district. The vote was four "yes", 0 "no", and Mr. Femia abstained.

Mr. Olson stated that the special permit was granted, he will issue a written decision within 14 days with the Town Clerk, of which the applicant will obtain a copy, and there will then be a 20-day appeal period.

Public Hearing, J H Energy USA, LLC, Repetitive Petition for Variance, Northeasterly Portion of Hartwell Street (across from American Legion Post):

(Mr. Femia read aloud the legal notice). (Representatives were Jess Oyer and Patrick McCarty). Mr. Olson called up the representatives, and he explained the public hearing format to them. Mr. Oyer explained that the applicant first filed for variance 1/25/19, and it was denied by a three "yes" to two "no" vote; a second petition was filed on 3/15/19 with changes from the first one, and he explained that, on 3/22/19, Planning Board found specific and material changes between this filing and the first one, and they sent a letter to the ZBA stating this. He asserted that the procedure this evening will be to determine if the board agrees with Planning Board that there are specific and material changes between the two variance filings, and if so, they will then consider the variance.

Mr. Olson noted that this is a repetitive petition, and asked Mr. Oyer to describe the differences between the two petitions to see if there are specific and material changes. Mr. Oyer replied that, in the first application, the variance was requested to reduce frontage with respect to Lot 2 (he point that out on a large map posted to a board). In the revised variance, it is with respect to Lot 1. Mr. Benson asked if Lot 2 originally had decreased frontage? Mr. Oyer replied that this was the case, but now Lot 1 has reduced frontage. Mr. Olson asked if the lot line was shifted, and if there was anything special in that small shifted area to discuss? Mr. Oyer pointed out the proposed Stormwater Management area which falls between the boundary of the two lots, and said that the

wetlands were all in Lot 2 and that the proposal will better account for the needs of the wetlands and of drainage because they are proposing to add a small amount of area.

Mr. Femia then mentioned that the Conservation Commission issued an opinion on the variance (Mr. Oyer said that he did not see it), and he read the opinion, which stated that the applicant will need to file a Notice of Intent with the Commission. Mr. McCarty explained that they had not appeared before the Concomm for the back lots, but filed for the front lots, and said that they were aware that they had to file with Concomm and Planning Board. (Mr. McCarty pointed out the area on the mapboard, and showed everyone where the railroad company and Rob Fuller own property, and the easement, and opined that there were strange lot configurations there). Mr. McCarty asserted that they cannot gain frontage from the railroad company, DCR took property for watershed protection and established a lot line, and due to these two entities they have fixed points and an irregular shape, and cannot gain land back. He said that the substantive difference between the two petitions was that the frontage was nonconforming on Lot 2 before, now on Lot 1. Mr. Benson asserted that they had the same boundary line now as before basically, but moved it slightly north. Mr. Oyer responded that this did happen but, for the first petition, it was essentially a straight line, and this time they are not just moving the boundary line. Mr. Benson responded to Mr. Oyer that they are fixed on two points and do not have an option except to move the line north or south.

Mr. McCarty added that they could put a cul-de-sac type of bulge in the right-of-way of Hartwell Street through a subdivision process to create more frontage, but he did not think that would benefit the Town or change the outcome. Rob Fuller, the property owner (who was also present), explained that, because they own the property on both sides of the railroad track, the easement would be continuous in between and when this happens, it counts as frontage.

Mr. Oyer then cited case law (*Ranney vs Board of Appeals of Nantucket*, 1981), and asserted that, if there is a great change, the process is not required. Mr. Olsen responded that this is a repetitive petition procedure; he noted that Planning Board voted 4 to 1 that the second petition was a specific and material change from the first one, and also that the ZBA needs a supermajority vote to decide this. Mr. Femia opined that there was not much change between the two petitions. (Mr. Benson then asked to see where the lines were drawn previously versus now; Mr. McCarty showed him). Mr. Olson then verified that the remaining lines between Lots 1 and 2 and the proposed placement of the buildings had not changed. Mr. McCarty explained that this was mainly a frontage variance application, and that they just needed to show the lot lines and preliminary layout, and that they had not gone through detailed engineering design or stormwater details, but only the probable layout of what the lots will look like. Mr. Benson asked about the dividing lines, and he and Mr. McCarty looked at and discussed the angle of the lines. Mr. Fuller suggested that they can move the lot lines around, and said they are just trying to maximize the use of the 17 acres. He explained that, if the variance is approved or not approved, they will know what they need to do, but he opined that it was a large parcel to only have one lot allocated to it. Mr. McCarty responded that they need to have it surveyed and go to Planning Board, and noted that, other than the lot line that needs the variance, everything else was subject to change. Mr. Fuller explained that he did not know that he would be 10 feet shy of being able to sell two lots.

Mr. Olson reminded everyone that the question was if the second petition was a material change from the first one. Mr. Oyer responded that they are not just shifting lines, and asserted that there are no hard and fast criteria and it is up to the board's discretion. Mr. Olson responded that he did not want to allow a seemingly minor detail change and then have other people think that they can do it also. Mr. Benson continued that the applicant could come back next week proposing to move the lot lines a few more feet. Mr. Oyer asserted that Planning Board would not keep approving new petitions, but Mr. Benson opined that Planning Board did not seem to have a problem with it, and if ZBA kept denying the petition would Planning Board change their opinion about these being substantial changes? Mr. Fuller responded that they will not come back if the ZBA denies the second petition now, and he opined that the issue was about utilizing 17 acres. Mr. Oyer added that there are checks and balances in place between the Town boards. Mr. McCarty noted that they could come back in two years if they are denied now. (Mr. Benson gave an example in Town where this happened). Mr. Oyer asserted that they could have gotten around it but they wanted to protect the abutters such as VFW.

(Mr. Olson then opened the hearing to public comment). First to speak was Kurt Devillers, 211 Hartwell Street, an abutter. He said that he had a problem with this project, and he opined that this project will move forward regardless of what happens this evening. A major issue to him from what was discussed at the January public hearing was the bridge. He said that the board suggested in January that Mr. McCarty meet with MA DOT

and find out the status of the bridge, and discuss such issues as the capacity of the bridge and how heavy equipment will be transported across the bridge. Mr. Devillers explained that the bridge is the only access to his property and all of his utilities run across the bridge as well, and asserted that the bridge must be addressed. He mentioned problems with the bridge such as a question of the bridge's capacity and the possibility of heavy equipment damaging the bridge. Mr. Fuller responded that he met with MA DOT on Monday of that week, and asserted that the Town had no record of that bridge, and the railroad company actually constructed the bridge because the one previously there was unsafe. He stated that State regulations are that the bridge must have a 100-ton capacity if it has two lanes; he asserted that this bridge has a 55-ton capacity, which is more than half of a two-lane bridge. He noted that, even without the variance, they will still build a building there, and it would not matter how many times a truck crosses the bridge as it will be the same weight. He reiterated that the issue was how many lots they would have. Mr. Fuller replied to Mr. Rajeshkumar that MA DOT is responsible for the bridge. Mr. McCarty added that there is a posted sign at the bridge with different truck types, and explained that, if someone causes damage with a vehicle, that person is responsible. Mr. Fuller opined that the Town did not know the bridge was there. Mr. Orciani opined that two-way traffic is tough there. Mr. Devillers commented that there is only a 30% capacity on certain beams of the bridge, so there is probably not a 50 ton capacity now.

Mr. Femia asked how often the bridge is inspected? Mr. Devillers replied that this is on the report (9/20/17), and asserted that this bridge is on the high priority list of MA DOT and in their list of top ten worst bridges. Mr. Devillers added that, at the January meeting, it was discussed that 500 to 1000 yards of dirt were on the property line, and he asked when it will be moved as he is in the process of selling a house? Mr. McCarty replied that they would do that next week if it stops raining.

Mr. Olson reiterated that the first issue was whether or not there is a specific and material change in the second petition. He also said again that case law suggests that a major change is not needed, but they also do not want to set a precedent for others. Mr. Orciani agreed. The board agreed that they would vote on this first. Mr. Olson reminded Mr. Oyer that they would need four votes in favor before they could move on to vote on the variance. Mr. Rajeshkumar verified that the only change being made was 16 feet (Mr. Olson corrected-14 feet). Mr. Femia noted that, at the Planning Board meeting, they did not agree on specific and material change. Mr. Oyer opined that this was a unique situation where they needed to move around lot lines, and wanted the board to keep in mind that colloquial definitions of specific and material changes are not necessarily what case law has established with respect to the language. He also opined again that this is a unique situation and the board should keep this in mind and get past the first question of the change.

With no more questions or comments, Mr. Rajeshkumar made a motion to vote to consider if there is a specific and material change in the second variance petition. Mr. Benson seconded. The vote was as follows:

Mr. Rajeshkumar – “no”

Mr. Orciani – “no”

Mr. Olson – “yes”

Mr. Femia – “no”

Mr. Benson – “no”

Mr. Orciani then made a motion to close the public hearing/ Mr. Benson seconded. All in favor (the vote was 5 “yes” to 0 “no”).

Sajda Gardens, 94 North Main Street-Discussion of Cost Certification Report; Signatures to be Taken for Correction of Amended Restated Comprehensive Permit (Votes may be taken):

Mr. Olson explained that the owner (Iqbal Ali) had amended the comprehensive permit, and the board found the changes to not be substantial; when the amended permit was recorded, it inadvertently included a previous incorrect condition, so it had to be updated and resubmitted (condition 8A). He wanted to make the board aware of this. For the record, the correct version of the amended comprehensive permit was recorded and filed with the Town Clerk. Mr. Olson said that this evening he wanted to acknowledge that this was done and make sure that everyone was aware of it (he discussed what the change was). (He explained to Mr. Femia that the board voted on it at the time). Mr. Benson then asked how they know that what the board votes on is what is submitted, and who keeps track of it? He noted that there had been many changes in the comprehensive permit, and assertions by people that what the developer agreed upon with the board was not being done. Mr.

Rajeshkumar replied that no one keeps track of that, and said that Mr. Ali should be registering all of the documents.

Next, Mr. Olson discussed the cost certification that was received for Sajda Gardens. He explained that the board had 30 days to review it and get back to MHP, and it was suggested that the board agree to have either Affordable Housing or the Town Administrator fund a CPA to review it and give the board feedback. Mr. Femia informed the board that, when a developer of a 40B has a cost certification, the State has a list of CPA's contracted by the State, so that, if the figures are wrong, it could be that the developer is giving false information. Marc Frieden of Planning Board and the Affordable Housing Trust noted that Affordable Housing Trust can vote as a board for their legal advisor to give advice about this, and he opined that funding can be pushed back to the developer, similar to the funding of a review engineer. Mr. Benson suggested that they reach out to Affordable Housing to give their input. Mr. Frieden said that Pat Halpin was given permission to do so. Mr. Olson noted that he spoke to Dan Hill. Mr. Benson opined that Affordable Housing can flag issues for the board. Mr. Femia then added that the developer cannot make greater than 200% profit. Mr. Olson agreed that there is a cap in the profit, and they must be sure the figures are correct. Mr. Frieden commented that their consultant did a good job with Afra Terrace's cost certification. Mr. Olson noted that they have sufficient funds for review in case that cannot be pushed back to the developer, and asked the board for a vote to look into a CPA (MHP should have a list), preferably one that works on the municipal side rather than one who works on the developer's side. Mr. Frieden suggested (and the board agreed) that Mr. Olson should ask for an extension of the date by which the review must be completed.

With no further comments or questions about this matter, Mr. Benson made a motion that the board vote to authorize the Chair to make any and all inquiries necessary to obtain expertise into the Cost Certification. Mr. Rajeshkumar seconded. All in favor (5 "yes" to 0 "no"). (The board replied to Ms. Goldstein that they did not need to sign a vote sheet for this vote).

Mr. Femia then mentioned that there was still no "as-built" plan for this project, and there was still money in the escrow account. He said that he would like Mr. Olson to send a letter to the developer, so that VHB can go out to the site, and once the board is satisfied with the report and VHB issues a bill for their services, there will be a release of funds to pay the bill for VHB and the developer would get back the remainder. Mr. Olson commented that the developer would be eager to finish the job so that he can get back leftover funds. Mr. Frieden commented that usually a Certificate of Occupancy is what the developer wants, as usually there is not a lot of money left in the inspection account and there is also no bond in this case. He added that lately there has been confusion about "as-built" plans; he explained that they need to have a site plan "as-built", and it must be stamped by the engineer approving it and a letter given that states that the "as-built" conforms with the approved plans, or if there are differences, they can discuss approval of them. (Mr. Femia then discussed with Mr. Frieden his reasons for wanting VHB to go out and see if the "as-built" agrees with what was actually done). Mr. Olson noted that the board recommended that he reach out to Mr. Ali's attorney for the "as-built".

Treasurer's/Financial Report:

Mr. Olson looked over the latest report, dated 4/30/19.

Next Scheduled ZBA Meeting – THURSDAY, JUNE 20, 2019, 7:00 P.M.

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

Mr. Olson looked over mail given to him by Ms. Goldstein; none of it was discussed with the board.

With no further discussion taking place, Mr. Femia made a motion to adjourn the Open Session at 9:19 p.m. Mr. Rajeshkumar seconded. All in favor.

(OPEN SESSION ADJOURNED AT 9:19 P.M.)

NEXT MEETING

Thursday, June 20, 2019, 7:00 p.m.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Motion Originator Mr. Femia

Motion Seconded Mr. Rajeshkumar

Time of Adjournment 9:19 p.m.

Signatures

Nathaniel Orciani

Submitted by: Toby S. Goldstein

Date Submitted:

