



Georgetown Zoning Board of Appeals
Memorial Town Hall ♦ One Library Street ♦ Georgetown, MA 01833
Phone (978) 352-5742 ♦ Fax (978) 352-5725

MINUTES OF A PUBLIC HEARING
ZBA File #15-06
34 East Main Street – Alan Aulson, Owner
Special Permit & Variance
February 3, 2015 @ 7:30pm

Board Members Present:

Gina Thibeault, Chairman, regular member
Paul Shilhan, regular member
Sharon Freeman, regular member
Jeff Moore, regular member
Dave Kapnis, regular member
Shawn Deane, associate member

Zoning Clerk: Patty Pitari
Applicant present: Alan Aulson
Attorney; Shaunna R. Jammal, Esq.

G. Thibeault opened the Hearing at 7:50pm, and read the Rules of Procedure paragraph.

P. Shilhan read legal ad; *A Public hearing will be held on February 3, 2015 at 7:30pm at the Georgetown Town Hall 3rd Fl. Meeting Room at for an application filed by Applicant/Petitioner Alan P. Aulson & Maureen Aulson of 201 Pond St., Georgetown MA, (owners) for the property located at 34 East Main Street, Georgetown, MA, Assessor's Map 11A, Lot 118 in the RA zone, to convert the existing structure at 34 E. Main Street into an Apartment House.*

The Applicant/Petitioner require a Use Variance under M.G.L. 40A §10 and the Georgetown Zoning Bylaw Chapter 165-84, as the proposal exceeds the required 10,000 square feet in lot area per dwelling unit (any number of dwellings in excess of 2 requires a Variance from footnote # 1 of the Georgetown Table A.4 Intensity of Use Schedule, the footnote states 10,000 sq. feet per unit for first two units; 10,000 sq. ft. per unit thereafter, All the required area shall consist of continuous building area as defined in Chapter 165-7.

The Applicant/Petitioner requires a Variance as the proposal includes a change to the existing non-conforming lot, the lot is non-conforming with respect to lot frontage, any change in lot configuration further reducing the existing frontage requires a Variance from Footnote #1 of the Table A.4 Intensity of Use and pursuant to M.G.L. 40 A §10 of the State Zoning Code, and the Georgetown Zoning Bylaw Chapter 165-84.

The Applicant/Petitioner also requires a Special Permit pursuant to M.G.L. 40A, Sections 6 & 9 and Georgetown Zoning Bylaws, Chapter 165, Sections 9, 78, 79, 89 and 94, as the proposed Apartment House is only allowed by Special Permit from the ZBA as outlined in Table A.3 Use Regulation Schedule of the Georgetown Zoning Bylaws. ZBA File #15-06

Chairman Gina Thibeault introduced the Board members.

Gina noted that Shawn Deane is an associate member so only the five regular members will be voting.

Applicants Presentation:

Aulson – I want to introduce Shawna Jammal my in house attorney. I want to thank you for your time and patience, with all the letters I have submitted I just wanted to get the feedback and I sent letters out to the abutters on the abutters list, and had people sign at the open house.

One thing in the zoning is 10,000 sq. ft. per residence. I know the 10 units I am requested doesn't meet this. I purchased this property to make money and I love older properties, it was run down and purchased it, and this is what I have come up with. The barn is the most historic part as well as the entire property is historic. I am asking that you approve the use of 10 one bedroom apartments also we have a small pocket park that will be a donation to the town.

Shawna Jammal - We are increasing the frontage with that park and it can only be in that one area, it doesn't provide the amount of frontage that's necessary; however we are increasing the frontage with it, and can only put it there.

With regard to the special permit we don't think it will take away from the area, which is labeled as single family it will increase the area, which is on the verge of being torn down. The intensity of use, with the 10,000 sq. ft. per unit, case law allows you can grant a use variance when it is cost prohibitive to do anything else, if we were to renovate this building to make it a single family it would cost millions of dollar, no one would buy it, the only way is to make it into condo's or apartments, and save the historic value.

S. Freeman – I don't know how that park increases the frontage.

Alan – The building inspector said it.

Jammal – Because the park will be a public way.

Patty I spoke to the Building Inspector and the town administration and the park is a donation and would go to the selectmen and town meeting.

J. Moore – The variance still applies with or without the park.

Jammal - I submitted a separate page in the application with principal points.

Jammal – I have case law for the use variance to footnote 1 to Table A.4 Intensity of Use should also be granted because given the structure in question to comply with the footnote is prohibitively costly, Case law Kirkwood v Board of Appeals of Rockport. The petitioners aim to preserve a historical part of town; however the cost to do so is extremely high. Therefore, the structure must be converted into an apartment building, as a single family dwelling is prohibitively costly.

Shilhan – How many units per building and parking.

Alan – I don't have an elaborate presentation I think Shawna can answer any questions.

Alan – It's 10 one bedroom units.

G. Thibeault – Roughly how many sq. ft. is each of the units?

Alan – About 750 sq. ft. each unit, with one bedroom, they vary.

Gina and the loft in the barn.

Alan forget the loft for a second, there are small lofts up there now its part of the room.
There would be 4 units in the barn.

New Correspondence – (see all attached to these minutes)

1. Letter from Affordable housing Task Force in support (see attached) read by J. Moore.
2. Email dated 12/22/14 from Highway Surveyor Pete Durkee (see attached)
- P. Shilhan read into record an email asking why does there have to be a second driveway? Where the second driveway would go you would have to remove a town tree.
3. Letter from Park & Rec. regarding the pocket park dated 1/7/15 in support of this park.
4. Letter from New England Landmarks dated 1/15/15 read into the record by D. Kapnis.
5. A petition read into the record by J. Moore, signed by citizens stating to “Please ask favorably on the re-use of this property to help preserve this historic home. (the address of 34 E. Main St. is written in).
6. Letter from Georgetown Historical Commission to Mr. Alan Aulson dated 1/12/15 the ZBA was copied and received 1/20/15 re: Historical Status, read into record by Shawn Deane.
7. Letter from Georgetown Historical Commission to Mr. Aulson, re: GHC position on rehab of project, dated 1/9/15, the ZBA was copied and received 1/20/15 read into record by P. Shilhan.

The below letters #8 – 11 items , all stated the same and the cover letter was read into the record by J. Moore. See attached.

Also J. Moore read the one of the explanation letters sent to the Fiasconaro’s which explains the project for 10 units. (see attached).

8. Letters received via email of a total of 11 people on abutters list the letter all state the same wording, not dated received by ZBA clerk on 1/20/15. 2 Letters received via email stating same as the 5 on 1/20, in support from Adam Savio, of 6 Park St., and Kathleen Crocker of 31, E. Main St.
9. Cover letter received 2/3/15 – from all 11 people above on abutters list.
10. A cover Letter received 2/3/14 in response to a request from chairman about the letters from the abutters as the letters did not state what they were supporting. The letter lists the 11 abutters in the above mentioned # 8 & 9 stating the purpose of this letter is to state that Alan Aulson requested using the abutters list to send out letters requesting support for this project, those letters were mailed on 1/9/14 listed below are the names of abutters in support, Bob Balleto, Thomas Wentworth, Harold Roeder, Philip Zocco, Adam Savio, George & Elaine Fiasconaro, Amy & Myron Ricker, James and Joan Askby, Kathleen Crocker, Howard Hill and Charles & Emi Rollins.
11. Also received with the above cover letter was a letter to George & Elaine Fiasconaro of 5Union St. explaining his project?
12. Letter read into the record by Shawn Deane, received 2/3/14 from Mr. James Bussing of 160 W. Main in support. (see all correspondence attached).

D. Kapnis – How many abutters are there?

Patty stated there are 43 on the abutters list.

Audience

Mary Hubbard, 30 E. Main St. (direct abutter) – I am in the condo next door, I think restoring the building is a lovely idea, but this would have a direct impact on my quality of life, my bedroom would abut it would be close, but 10 units is a lot. There was a letter send to us asking “Do you want to preserve the building” Of course we do, but 10 units? Is there information on how many cars and traffic there will be? I think it’s wonderful they want to restore it, but just because someone needs to make money, or wants to make money on it doesn’t mean it needs to be this.

G. Thibeault – Can you show us the parking.

Alan – The town says you can have 2 parking spaces per unit, so 20 cars. He shows on the plan where the septic is, and said it was approved by the Board of Health. This is just a conceptual plan.

Patty puts up the plot plan that shows the parking.

Mary Hubbard – Where the people shown the plans?

Alan – The planning board would do that at Site Review.

G. Thibeault – But the abutters are saying they didn't see the plans?

Mary Hubbard – The parking lot would directly impact me. I did not see the plans.

Casandra White, 30 E. Main St. unit #1, (direct abutter). I am unit 1 on the first floor, my bedroom and living room looks out on the building, on the condo association our parking faces businesses, and businesses and a block behind it, some units have one slot and some have two slots, we have a total of 12 units and 14 slots, and 2 visitor slots, so my concerns is 20 cars in a lot that's half the size of what we have, it sounds like it would be one big parking lot, I think 10 units for that space is too much, I understand you need to make money. My bedroom looks right out on that lot, I am glad you want to restore it but how can we lessen the impact on us.

J. Moore – You are at 30 E. Main with individual units. Ms. White – Yes.

Mary Hubbard, 30 E. Main – 20 cars is a lot of traffic it's a quality of life thing, nothing was presented to us we didn't see these plans, and I wonder if the people that sent back those letters in support have seen the plans.

Alan – I don't think they should interject what they think the letters of support may mean.

D. Kapnis asks if the direct abutter is on the petition list.

Mary Hubbard – No, I got a letter with a self-addressed stamped envelope just asking to support to restore the property.

S. Freeman – The bylaw says two spaces per units, is it the 10 units you think is the issue?

Casandra White – Yes it's the number of units, I would put the parking on the other side where the bank is.

Mary Hubbard – I agree.

Alan – Did Casandra come to the open house ask any questions, she did sign it?

Casandra White – I did sign it, Mary Hubbard said she didn't sign it, but there it was to preserve the historic site.

G. Thibeault – I was at the open house, and there was no direction on what it was going to be.

Discussion on apartment house (apartments and condo). Patty read definition in bylaw of Apartment House, that is what the Building Inspector put on the denial.

Mike DeBois, 37 E. Main St. – I also received a letter asking for support but it was so vague, it didn't say what they were doing, that's why I didn't sign it. It's the parking and the amount of congestion there is now, now if there is 10 units, with 20 more cars, plus what about the visitor's to them, where will they park, and there is a two hour limit on E. Main. Now with the snow, just getting out of our building is dangerous, yes it's nice they want to renovate but this is a large impact particularly with the parking, but the letter sent out asking for support, was so vague we did not sign it.

J. Moore – We received this information over the last couple of weeks, so just to let you know, we know that we understand that you maybe didn't see the plans.

Ed Desjardins, Historical Commission member & Society – I want to compliment Alan on the fantastic job he has done to keep this history in town alive and it's been vacant and steadily gone downhill, we commend him for trying to restore this, if the building were to come down it would be a shame, and we would have the 6 month demolition delay on it. When he did come before the commission, Alan was still a little bit in flux; it was a couple of months ago, in terms of what the interior might consist of, how many units and that sort of thing. I know he would like to maximize, I can't blame him for that, the number 10 startles me a little bit, we are talking about 750 sq. ft. units. I would like to see a few less than the 10 units that would help along with the parking issue, the other question I have is the septic system, even though it's been reviewed, its 10 additional toilets and 10 kitchenette units, so your producing more waste and adding to the system substantially, I assume he will work that out with the folks that handle that. Other than that I think he's done a fine job and have to compliment him on that.

J. Moore to Ed Desjardins, are you familiar with the use I know way back when it was a tavern, but the more recent history, do you have any information on how this particular lot was used?

Ed Desjardins - I remember CB Hills when they were there the furniture maker and they had the barn, I didn't realize the barn would be units in this as well, I think there would a couple of units, but I don't think it's ever been used to be something like 10 units.

Shilhan – As a historic property, are there any requirements like color etc...?

Ed – No, not now. It would be nice we could bring the number of units down.

Shilhan – What about the exterior, if there is less units in the long term, will there be a list of rules.

Ed – It's on the state database. But not we have no rules.

D. Kapnis – That's if it's in a historic district. Ed – We don't have that yet.

George Perkins, Chairman, Historical Commission member – I want to thank Mr. Aulson for starting the restoration on the property, however I was very surprised when I heard about the 10 unit proposal, I had something in my mind like perhaps 4-6 high end units. I think you would still come out with enough money if they were more luxury units. I am glad it's being restored, and how may units on each floor, I am thinking more in terms of what has happened in the past, we have had terrible fires in town in the past, we have to have access to fire engines that have to get in there, and the more units you have the more likelihood that there might be a hazard developing, that is something that has to be considered.

Casandra White, 30 – So these gentlemen are from the Historical Commission who wrote a letter in favor and didn't know about the 10 units.

Ed – We send the letter to the ZBA about the exterior. He hadn't developed his plan inside when we saw him. We were very explicit in our letter and said the exterior of the building, and he's done a wonderful job on that.

D. Kapnis to Mr. George Perkins, Chairman of Historical Commission & Society – The architect is a member of the Historical Society and he is aware of 10 units and as I understand there is another plan out there with 8 units also you were not made aware of that.

George – Not at the time. Ed – At the time Mr. Aulson had not defined the interior.

S. Freeman – I hear what everyone is saying, but it seems if someone purchases a property, it very well could be that it was not clear that he may not have known what he wanted to do yet, so if we can let that part be.

D. Kapnis – I am not sure I could agree on that, because I don't believe that plans were drawn up overnight for these 10 units, it takes months to do plans like these.

Alan – The plans have been an ongoing process all the way through, I am surprised some people said they may have not seen them, I think every board in town I have given them to but I stayed away from you and planning, you received the set of plans at the appropriate time.

Shawna Jammal – The letter sent out to the abutters on January 9th did say 10 units. So the abutters knew.

G. Thibeault – But I think the point is, I know myself I wouldn't agree if I didn't see the plans and I am an engineer by trade. These plans are not even complete as what I would want to see as an abutter, but what Sharon said, I think we just let this go, its water under the bridge; we have both letters in support and people here who don't support.

Mary Hubbard, abutter– The letter did mention the 10 units, and keeping with the neighborhood, would the historical commission be in favor of additional construction.

G. Thibeault – Right now we need to move forward with what they are requesting.

Casandra White – That's why I am here I got the letter but wanted to see plans.

Ed Desjardins to Mr. Aulson – When you talked to us we didn't talk about any units at all we just talked about the exterior as far as I recall.

Questions from the Board

G. Thibeault – Its condo's as you stated, not rental units, I think the affordable task force said that they wanted to buy some of the units, I just want to clarify its condo's the bylaw says it's an apartment house.

Alan – I would not sell them if they were apartments.

J. Moore – Do you have an agreement with them? If you read their letter.....and your application says nothing about any affordable units.

Alan – One affordable unit is required by the town, it would be one for every ten. The issue of them buying additional units, I mean they are for sale.

D. Kapnis – What's the future hold, what if condo down the road didn't sell then they supplement someone as a rental. We just don't know.

Jammal – They would be condos. D. Kapnis – They can still be rented.

J. Moore – I am thrilled that you purchased it to restore it and not have it demolished. The reason you're here for a Use variance, the character of the building has very little to do with the justification of a use variance, and frankly I have not heard any justification for a use variance yet, it's an extremely difficult threshold to meet, it has to be related to the soil, shape and typography of the lot or land, not the size of the lot or the historical significance of the building, your application really doesn't touch on any of those things, and your presentation has not either, I have not heard anything from you on that. Use variances especially are extremely difficult for us to justify. We don't create the bylaws in town, the bylaws are created at town meeting, we do not have the authority to grant something because it's a nice idea, if everybody thinks it is, you go and change the bylaw, that's not the case here, we can't turn a blind eye and just do it, it will probably be appealed in a minute and it will win. Your allowed by the bylaw 10,000 sq. ft. per unit, you don't even have 20, technically you don't even have enough for a two family, and you're asking for 10 units, I have to figure out how to get beyond

that, so I appreciate all of this, not only that, the use has to be granted without derogating from the use and purpose of the bylaw, had got to be related to the lot, not personal hardship not financial hardship associated with you because maybe you don't have the financial means to complete this on your own, it has to be related to the soil conditions, shape or topography of the lot, or what I was asking Ed about, I would like to know what this unit has been used for in the past or recent history, because if it's an existing nonconforming dwelling it would allow for certain similar uses without having to go down the road of a variance, but I don't think it's ever been used as a 10 unit condo use. So I would like to hear more about how this structure has been used in the past.

Alan – We have the variances and the special permit, one for the pocket park.

J. Moore – If we are not going to consider that park, then you're not changing the frontage, it would be part of the special permit for the use. Jon says he needs a variance because they are reducing the frontage. It's a nonconforming lot because of the frontage; you're required to have 125 ft. of frontage in the RA. But the big one is the Use Variance; I want to know the justification of the use variance along with the Special Permit.

Shawn Jammal – It has to do with the structure, there is case law that states if a structure that it is costly prohibitive to renovate the structure because the nature of the structure and the current state of the structure right now, that goes to the structure, because it is costly prohibitive to fix it.

J. Moore – So you can't make this a two family.

Jammal – You can't make it a two family.

J. Moore – I don't know that I agree with that.

Alan – We have spent 150,000 so far.

J. Moore – Do you have any idea what the high end market is for 2, two family 3 bedroom units weather you have septic for it, I have no idea.

Shawna – I would base it on case law that I found, that based on the structure it is costly prohibitive to renovate that is allowed for a variance.

Alan – That building is a hardship to that lot.

D. Kapnis – As far as hardship, costly prohibitive, you're saying it's creating a financial hardship, which was created by yourself, not by any other criteria that you need to meet. It is overloading and detrimental in my opinion, the cars and visitors. There are certain conditions we have to abide by.

Jammal – It is costly prohibitive to make it a single or two family, given the structure and given the fact of the maintenance that's needed over time, you need a condo associates to pay for that. What was the hardship the next door got?

Kapnis – I can't speak to that.

Shilhan – So you're saying there is precedence for the renovation of a historic building?

Jammal – For a structure.

Shilhan – Where is that case law?

J. Moore- It's Kirkwood? Jammal – Yes Kirkwood

J. Moore – Kirkwood vs. Rockport that had to do with the land.

Jammal – Yes it was costly prohibitive for the land or structure.

J. Moore – The Kirkwood case, I have it, they are saving the lot not the structure, they wanted to use the lot for something other in which it was zoned.

Shawna- I am using the structure. It was the topography. I am using the structure as the shape in order to renovate that.

Shilhan – So your saying that the property to go 3 dimensional upward.

J. Moore – Well, I would need to be convinced that though some economic analysis that it is cost prohibitive to renovate this into one or two units, we have a house down the street that is the same size as this, and single family, you're telling me this couldn't sell.

Gina – I agree.

Sharon – You can't even do two, it's still a use variance.

Shilhan – Yes, anything but a single family.

George Perkins, Historical – There were newspapers in the library, they can go and do research, in the library to see what was there, maybe they would find something, but the information is there.

Casandra White – Just as an example I bought my unit, it's a one bedroom one bath almost the same size and I paid \$100,000 for it so if he sells 10 it's a million dollars.

Gina – I still don't see how you're making the structure part of the land and you need to show me that wording that says the structure can be part of the land because everything that I have looked at a structure is a structure and land is land.

Shawna Jammal – On the second page of the application, it states: she reads the criteria for variances, unique circumstances, soil, shape, topography. Reading from the application.

J. Moore – I have never heard of a structure affecting the use.

Gina – Conditions, shape or topography which specifically affects the land or the structure, it's not affecting the structure, the structure is affecting the structure I don't see it.

Shilhan – If you were denied this variance you may be able to appeal it, because there must be a lot of old beautiful New England buildings that are going to have to be turned into condos someday just to maintain them as buildings, that's what I am thinking. I understand but it needs to be proven to the board.

Jammal – We can make new case law right now.

Alan – We ask the historical commission to deem it a historic structure it's problematic to the land.

G. Thibeault – You have my sympathy I wanted to buy it but what had to be do it, I wish you would re-think your strategy, because I wouldn't even agree with the special permit I think it's a detriment with the two driveways.

Jammal – We still have to get over the hurdle of the use variance.

G. Thibeault – The hurdle is lower with the lower number of units.

Jammal – So you would consider a use variance with lower number of units?

J. Moore – I am not buying that 10 units is the only way. You would have to provide specific case law that says the structure can be used the way you're saying, I want to see some analysis from some appraisals or whatever it takes to determine what the current sale value is per square foot of living space that says 10 units is cost prohibited you need to prove it.

Jammal – So it's the number of units, so if I lower the number.

Kapnis – It's also detrimental.

Jammal – Detrimental has to do with the special permit.

J. Moore – And variance as well, you can't derogate from the intent and purpose of the bylaw.

Sharon – I do want to see case law. Also I am not sure we are saying yes provided it's fewer units.

Jammal – My use variance would be the same.

Gina – It's going to be detrimental to the neighborhood, parking, traffic the integrity of the neighborhood.

Shilhan – The number is a lot, 10 is probably too many.

Alan – 10 came from the Board of Health. There are 10 units allowed by the board of health, with our septic design, its designed for 15 units, the board of health deemed that 8 units are just a repair.

D. Kapnis – Would you consider taking a straw poll in case they want to come back with something else, if they want to withdraw?

Shilhan – They can also continue, but there is not enough information for even that.

Sharon – I don't have enough information.

Alan – Taking a structure like that even for a 3 family, it will look like crap. We didn't talk about the oldest room in the house about fire place down in the basement. I spent 150,000 just to clean it up. It would be a remodel job. I don't make my living doing this, I paint bridges and concrete repairs in Boston, I want to fix it up. Jeff you asked about cost, to do these 10 units, would be about 1 million 3. The housing task force wants one of course so now it's 9.

G. Thibeault – You mentioned you had an inquiry for a bed and breakfast at the open house.

Alan – It was just an inquiry.

J. Moore – I am not ready to vote, there is some zoning and legal issues I would like to get a better understanding and justification for use variance. Your options would be go back and continue the hearing and bring us what we are asking for or withdraw without prejudice, and come back with a different application, or vote now.

Alan – I don't see coming back if we can't get a variance.

J. Moore – Did you talk to the Town Planner at all did he give you any ideas.

Alan – I saw him, but I didn't get into that. J. Moore – He could guide you in a certain direction.

Jammal – There is really no other argument for a use variance, besides looking outside the box, that's why the law is so against use variances because it's so hard to prove, that's why everyone applauded me on what I came up with.

J. Moore – Then flush the argument our a little more, all you have is two sentences in here, you're going to have to flush it out and give us more detail. I just can't get passed the use variance. If you say it has to be 10 units, I don't think we can get beyond this point; I need to know this won't be a detriment.

Alan – We can go to town meeting and change the zoning.

J. Moore – You could do that.

Discussion followed on different number of units.

Jammal – If it's more than two it's still a use variance.

S. Freeman – If you're not willing to concede on the number of units. It's clear or my impression from the board is it's not going to fly. I am willing to think out of the box but the argument needs to be flushed out more clearly.

J. Moore – I would think an inexpensive option to withdraw the application for 10 units, re-think it a little bit, and then flush out a legal brief, justifying a variance based on a historical structure, but that doesn't have a lot to do with the shape, soil or topography of the lot, and your saying anything less than 10 units is economically unfeasible, you're going to have to rethink that; your saying anything other than 10 is cost prohibitive.

Alan – The land on the side is going to be used for a septic system and parking and it lends itself to it, the other side is 3 ft. from the lot line.

Discussion on downtown uses followed.

J. Moore – Certain things are allowed in RA, there are other things.

G. Thibeault – So what would you like to do?

Alan – I would like to withdraw without prejudice. Patty has him sign the withdrawal form which will be filed with the Town Clerk.

Motion - D. Kapnis/ J. Moore to allow the applicant to withdraw without prejudice, all in favor, yes. Motion carried.

Motion – J. Moore/S. Freeman to close the hearing for 34 E. Main St. at 9:55 pm. J. Moore/ D. Kapnis

Withdrew without Prejudice.

Motion to adjourn J. Moore/D. Kapnis, all in favor.

Plans submitted with applicaton:

*Existing Plot Plan certified by Jeffrey Hofmann, AIS Land Services of Amesbury dated 12/10/14

*Proposed Plot Plan certified by Jeffrey Hofmann, AIS Land Services of Amesbury dated 12/10/14

*Proposed Floor and Elevation Plans drawn by Frederic Detwiller, Architect, 302 Central St. Georgetown MA
Sheet AO – A10, Sheet A-O proposed Basement sheet dated 11/5/14.

Sheet A-1, Proposed First Floor dated 11/5/14

Sheet A-2, Proposed Second floor dated 11/5/14.

Sheet A-3, Proposed Third floor dated 10/31/14.

Sheet A-4, Elevation Long section S-N, dated 11/22/14.

Sheet A-5, Cross Section Elevation E-W dated 11/22/14.

Sheet A-6. East Elevation, dated 11/22/14.

Sheet A-7, West Elevation, dated 11/17/14.

Sheet A-8, South Elevation, dated 10/31/14

Sheet A-9, North Elevation, dated 11/22/14.

Sheet A-10, Doorway Detail, dated 11/5/14.

***Existing** Floor and Elevation plans Frederic Detwiller, Architect, 302 Central St, Georgetown, Sheets AO-A10 all dated 11/5/14.

Patty Pitari
Zoning Administrative Assistant

Approved 3/315