



TOWN OF NORTHBOROUGH Zoning Board of Appeals

Town Hall Offices • 63 Main Street • Northborough, MA 01532 • 508-393-5019 • 508-393-6996 Fax

Approved 2-23-10

Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting Minutes November 24, 2009

Members Present: Dick Rand, Dick Kane, Mark Rutan, Chan Byun, Sandra Landau, Gerry Benson, Dan Ginsberg

Others Present: Kathy Joubert, Town Planner; Bill Farnsworth, Inspector of Buildings/Zoning Enforcement Officer; Attorney Joseph Antonellis, Rick Leif, George Pember, Attorney Jeff Leland, Cathy Staniunas, Dan Staniunas, Frank DiDonato, Rick Nieber, Marie Nieber, Robert Kelly, Normand Corbin, Attorney Peter Barbieri, Christopher Feeney, Susan Feeney

Chairman Rand opened the meeting at 7:00 pm.

- **Continued hearing to consider the petition of Whitney Street Holding Company for a Variance/Special Permit to allow the change of a pre-existing, non-conforming Senior Residential Community (SRC) use to a non-age-restricted use on the property located at Country Candle Lane and Holbrook Lane**

Attorney Joseph Antonellis, representing the applicant, was present. He stated he doesn't believe the change from one nonconforming use is more detrimental and he addressed that at the last meeting. A comment was made about children. The underlying use is single-family residential. This project allows for 2-bedroom units and the applicant will limit those remaining 25 town houses to be built to 2-bedrooms. The Town Planner has submitted statistics for Northborough that are not much different than what he submitted. This change in use would provide a positive impact to the town, and the bank has determined a SRC will not be successful at this time. Removing the age restriction will help.

In response to a question from Mr. Rand, Mr. Antonellis stated the SRC would not be more successful with less units. The more units there are the more likely they will earn more money. Both bedrooms will be on the same floor in the 3-bedroom units, so they are not designed for children. It will cause a substantial loss for the applicant if the age restriction is not lifted.

Ms. Landau asked about other concessions the Planning Board gave the applicant.

Rick Leif, Planning Board Chairman, stated he was not aware of any other specific concessions besides density. The number of units was expanded somewhat because of a projected positive tax benefit.

Mr. Farnsworth stated there was no dimensional relief given. The project met all dimensional setbacks.

Mr. Kane reminded the board that an easement was given for the project by an abutter.

Ms. Joubert stated there is nothing at the Registry of Deeds that says the easement is only for a Senior Residential Community.

Ms. Joubert and the board members reviewed her memo to the Zoning Board of Appeals dated November 21, 2009 regarding School Age Children in Multi-Family Developments, as follows:

“For the purpose of assisting your evaluation regarding the impact of lifting the age restriction at Laurence Place, I have prepared a spreadsheet summarizing the number of school age children in the existing multi-family developments in Northborough. Presently the number of students range from 0.1 to 1 per unit.

In Massachusetts, recent surveys indicate an average of 0.7 students per 4 bedroom single family home; 0.19 students per 2 bedroom multi-family development; and 0.88 students per 3 bedroom multi-family development.

School Age Children in Multi-Family Developments

Project/Street	# of Units	# of Units Occupied	# of Bedrooms	# of Students	# of Students Per Unit
Pond View Way	12	12	2	5	0.41
Corey Way	20	20	2	2	0.1
The Pines @ 27 Solomon Pond Road	5	5	2	5	1
Patty Lane	4	4	2	4	1
Residence at the Falls @ 200 Hudson Street	40	34	1	0	0
		6	2	0	0
Northborough Manor @ 30 Pleasant Street	57	57	2	11	0.19
Northborough Village @ 82 Church Street	29	29	2	0	0
Hitching Post Lane	24	24	2	0	0
Church Street Village @ Autumn Lane & Fall Drive	40	27 of 32	2	6	0.22
		0 of 8	3		
59 School Street	56	4	3	13	0.23
		52	2		
Sunnyside Estates @ Brookside Lane	16	16	3	5	0.31
Dunia Lane	28	3	3	1	0.33

Ms. Joubert explained she worked in conjunction with the School Department to get the per-pupil number for each development, and then compared Northborough’s numbers to the numbers used across the state of Massachusetts. For 2-bedroom multi-family units the average is 1.9 students and .88 students per 3-bedroom units. The majority of multi-families are 2-bedroom units. The most recently built was a 40B project on Hudson Street, which are 3-bedroom units. Only three of the structures are built and there is only one student. The range is from .1 child up to 1 child per development, which tracks closely with what’s happening across the state.

Mr. Leif noted Northborough’s ratio for 2-bedroom units was close to the State’s figures. Since there are very few 3-bedroom units in town, Northborough’s current number is less than the State’s.

Ms. Joubert stated a second memo was sent to the Zoning Board of Appeals from the Planning Board, dated November 17, 2009, and reads as follows:

Subject: Financial Analysis of Development Options for Laurence Place

Subsequent to the discussion held at the October 27 ZBA meeting about Laurence Place and the wish of the applicant to have the age restriction provision on the property removed, the Planning Board, through the Town Planner, has completed a financial analysis of different development options at the property. The attached spreadsheet outlines the assumptions used in the analysis and shows the financial impact to the town of each option. Town budget information was provided by the Town Accountant, cost per student was calculated from this budget information and compared to data provided by the school department from the Mass. Department of Education website, the number of school aged children per unit was provided by the Town Planner through an analysis of current Northboro data and compared to information provided by other towns, and the selling price per unit was determined by reviewing current sale prices in Northboro for 2 and 3 bedroom condominium style residences.

The analysis shows that the most favorable financial outcome for the town, a yearly gain of \$160,580 is Option 2, leaving the property to be developed as a thirty unit 3 bedroom age restricted Senior Residential Community as approved at a prior town meeting. The least favorable financial outcome, a yearly loss \$82,339, is Option 3, allowing the property to be developed as 30 non-age restricted 3 bedroom units.

During the meeting on October 27 the attorney representing the applicant offered that the applicant would accept a condition that the balance of the units to be constructed could be limited to no more than 2 bedrooms. This situation is shown as Option 4 in the analysis and shows a financial outcome of a yearly gain of \$66,820. While not as favorable as Option 2, this approach would allow for the completion of the project in a manner that would remain within the spirit of the original approval, i.e. that a positive financial outcome would be achieved.

Although the Planning Board continues to believe that the town should stay its course on this property, wait for market conditions to improve, and receive the full financial benefit that the original proposal, approved at Town Meeting, will provide, we understand that there are benefits to the town in allowing for an earlier completion to the project. For this reason, the Planning Board would support the lifting of the age restriction on the property if the applicant agrees to a condition that the balance of the units to be constructed (25 additional units) contain no more than 2 bedrooms.

Members of the Planning Board will be at the Nov 24 ZBA meeting to discuss this information in more detail.”

Mr. Leif stated the Planning Board considered four options for the development, which were 1) to do nothing; 2) to develop it as a 30-unit Senior Residential Community; 3) to develop it as a 30-unit multi-family development with no age restriction; or 4) to develop it as planned with five 3-bedroom units and twenty-five 2-bedroom units with no age restriction. When all the statistics were put together, the non-age restricted development with 5 3-bedroom units and 25 2-bedroom units is not as big a tax gain for the town as the SRC would be, but it's still a positive gain.

Ms. Landau stated the figures assume the students will be new to town, but they may not be.

Ms. Joubert stated the 25 units could bring 5 students into the school system based on the statistics presented.

Mr. Leif stated the figures are for planning and are not necessarily realistic. Going with the in between options will be somewhat positive. The Planning Board supports option 4, but would not object if the Zoning Board of Appeals wanted to keep it as is.

Mr. Ginsberg stated waiting for the opportunity for the senior residential community market to start up again could take forever.

Mr. Leif stated eventually the economy will straighten out and the SRC will work. The question is how long that will take and how long we will want to wait. It's not a dead concept and some day will be viable.

Ms. Joubert noted if the board chose to keep it an SRC, the assessed value may go down and the applicant may apply for a tax abatement, so the tax revenue assumption presented may not be the case. She state the board has negotiated a cost-per-unit with other developments when the density issue is involved.

Mr. Kane asked what the possibility was of changing the property to a single-family home subdivision.

Ms. Joubert stated they did an analysis with the square footage and frontage required and a development of 12 single-family house lots, with a 500-foot cul-de-sac could be done. Using the state average for single-family homes, this development would average .7 children per house. To do this the applicant would have to go through the subdivision process with the Planning Board.

Mr. Leif stated single-family homes are tax negative.

Mr. Antonellis stated the applicant would consider converting the 3-bedroom units into 2-bedroom units by eliminating a closet in a bedroom and using the room as a study. The applicant would accept that as another restriction.

Mr. Farnsworth stated the plans identify all the rooms. The applicant can call the 3-bedroom units whatever they want, but by state building code they're 3-bedroom units.

Regarding the easement, Attorney Jeff Leland, Leland Law Associates, stated it is true the agreement does not stipulate the project has to be a SRC, but the agreement states part of the reason for granting the easement was because the project was a SRC. That makes it a substantial difference than what was approved.

Mr. Leif asked what the fair market value of units was.

Mr. Antonellis stated it is \$389,000 for the 3-bedroom units and \$365,000 for the 2-bedrom units.

Ms. Joubert stated that's an average of what's selling now.

Mr. Leland stated Mr. Antonellis had said \$450,000 and \$475,000 for the area.

Mr. Antonellis agreed.

Mr. Leland stated condos are selling right now. Currently there are 31 units for sale and 7 of those are over \$400,000 (over 55), 12 under \$300,000 and the rest under \$200,000.

Kathy Staniunas, 14 Mill Street, stated she hopes the board doesn't lift the age limit. Residents of senior residential communities are more considerate and don't make big messes in their yards.

Frank DiDonato, 56 Whitney Street, stated one consideration is that when this was passed at Town Meeting there was a discussion on it not being a detriment to the community. The reason it was left as an over 55 community was due to its proximity to the center of town. He stated he hopes the board doesn't forget those were major considerations.

Rick Nieber, 62 Whitney Street, stated he and his wife were paid for the easement and they granted it because the development was for 55 and over. It's written in the agreement and is on record with the state. It's the only reason they granted the easement. He believes many of the neighbors don't want the change in use. He asked the board to take that into consideration.

Marie Nieber, 62 Whitney Street, stated that, economically, the best win is to leave it as is. There won't be any services for school children.

Paul DiTullio, 47 Whitney Street, asked if the property was located in a new district that's zoned for town houses.

Ms. Joubert responded it is not.

Mr. DiTullio asked if the board can override the zoning.

Ms. Joubert explained the ZBA has the authority to do so by state statute.

Robert Kelly, 58 Whitney Street, stated he is an abutter to the property and objects to the change, as do other neighbors.

Ms. Staniunas stated the applicant should stay the course with the SRC and wait a few years.

Ms. Nieber suggested that if the age restriction is lifted and things don't work out and the units just sit there, they might apply for a 40B permit to get people in there.

Mr. Rand stated the town has met the State's 10% quota for affordable units.

Mr. Rutan stated the bank is in this to make money and they lose money if they setup and build houses and no one moves in. The bank believes they can sell this with the age restriction lifted and would not build if they think it will be unoccupied.

Mr. Ginsberg stated if the agreement were to be made, the owner and the developer would have to start the project.

Mr. DiTullio stated it's a bad mortgage already and questioned why the bank would think that 30 multifamily units would make a difference.

Ms. Nieber stated the bank will get the profit from the developer.

Mr. Antonellis stated if the bank was going to flip the project, he would tell them. The bank is committed to the property, has done a market analysis, believes the units will sell in a reasonable and timely fashion and will provide a tax basis in a way that will not be more detrimental. It's the kind of

development what will attract residents over 55. The project will be costly for the bank so they do not intend for the units to sit vacant. They will be built and sold in an orderly and consistent fashion.

Ms. Staniunas stated most people over 55 are financially all right. She suggested some people will buy them but then may lose them to foreclosure.

Norman Corbin, 35 Whitney Street, stated he is most uncomfortable with the change from one nonconforming use to another. He recognizes the way the system works, but it doesn't sit well with him that the board can do this.

Mr. Kane moved to close the hearing.

Ms. Joubert requested the hearing not be closed. She suggested the board consider discussing mitigation with a project this size and it must be done as part of the public hearing process.

Mr. Rand stated AvalonBay gave the town \$10,000 per unit in mitigation.

Ms. Joubert stated she is not comfortable with the discussion as a condition because the town does not have impact fees. It's not a condition to place on the project, but through negotiation with the developer during deliberation. There are other impacts involved besides that to the schools, including library, fire, police and DPW impacts. Starting with highest impact, looking at the cost per student, it's \$11,266 per year. The developer could provide that cost to the community. AvalonBay wanted to build 350 units more than the cap allowed by the state and the town negotiated with them. There was no financial negotiation with Dunia Gardens on Hudson Street, but the developer agreed to do some off-site work in Hudson Street and built a basketball court for the kids.

Mr. Kane asked Mr. Antonellis if he had an estimate as to the condo fees.

Mr. Antonellis stated he did not .

Mr. Antonellis stated he is somewhat familiar with AvalonBay. It's a higher number than he's seen and this project doesn't have the size to get into that kind of mitigation, but the bank recognizes there will be impacts. He stated he would like to see the hearing closed. The bank is looking for relief and something around \$50,000 would be justified.

Ms. Joubert agreed that AvalonBay was a unique development. Half the amount of educating a child is \$5633 per year. Another way to look at it would be to take the assumed number of children, in the development, which is 10, and multiply it by the cost of their education for one year and that would be \$112,660.

Mr. Ginsberg stated that before discussing mitigation, he would like to get a sense from the board members as to whether or not they are in favor of the proposed change.

Mr. Kane stated he thinks the board would be remiss in changing the desires of the people who voted at town meeting to make this a senior residential community. Mr. Kane stated they should listen to the people abutting the project.

Mr. Benson stated he respects anything done at Town Meeting, but the board doesn't know whether or not the people would have voted to deny the project at Town Meeting if it wasn't a senior residential community. The choice wasn't given.

Mr. Pember stated the density bonus was the be all and end all. The Planning Board created the Senior Residential Community bylaw for that project.

Mr. Benson asked what the factors were that caused it to pass.

Mr. Pember stated it was cost effective and none of the neighbors had a problem with it.

Mr. Benson stated now it's something that's not cost effective.

Mr. Pember stated it's a stalled project but it will raise taxes for the town. It's cost effective to leave it like it is.

Mr. Kane stated 7 years have passed and it's hardly gotten off the ground.

Ms. Joubert stated the Pheasant Hill senior residential community hasn't been able to sell their units. Developer Tony Abu has talked about asking to have the age restricted lifted from his Bigelow Farms senior residential community because his units aren't selling.

Mr. Rutan asked if the developments are renting to people under 55.

Ms. Joubert stated they are not.

Mr. Leland stated some units have sold this year.

Ms. Landau stated no one knows how Town Meeting would have turned out. She stated she has been on the board for ten years. Whenever anything different is proposed, neighbors don't want it, due to the NIMBY (not in my back yard) factor to some extent and fears. But nothing bad happens and people are frightened of change. Invariably it works out. She stated she keeps hearing NIMBY and finds it offensive. People have to open their minds to the possibility of what could happen. There was an unattractive factory – ugly, dirty and noisy – and a child was killed climbing on one of the structures. There are dangers for children everywhere. Children can't be allowed to roam free. It's a different economic situation now than then. Not everyone over 55 wants to live with only seniors. It's nice to live in a mixed neighborhood. It adds vibrancy to life to have all different people in a neighborhood. It's been bad to drive by that factory and see the half-finished project sitting there with the jersey curbs and torn-up grounds and she would like to have it built.

Mr. Kane asked Mr. Antonellis if there is a time schedule for when the project would be started.

Mr. Antonellis stated they are looking at occupancy in Fall 2010.

Ms. Landau stated she doesn't believe the bank would be so blind as to have inflated prices in this economy. As long as the country is in a recession, institutions will have to accept the reality and adapt to it and they won't make money until the units are sold. If it means having an option and lowering the price to half what it is, they'll do it.

Mr. Farnsworth stated that, in regard to the infrastructure, it's not a requirement that it has to be completed. This is typical of all projects. They're done in phases. They do the infrastructures as they go along, before the final certificate of occupancy, as-built plan, etc., has to be submitted.

Mr. Antonellis stated all offsite work has been done.

Mr. Kane stated when the original developer, Bob Moss, presented the project, he and the Board agreed all infrastructure work would be done.

Mr. Farnsworth stated it's not practical and has never been a condition in any project or subdivision.

Mr. Nieber stated there could not have been any other choice for use of the land at Town Meeting because he would not have agreed to the easement, which was his land.

Ms. Nieber stated she hopes the board isn't overstepping or ignoring what people really want.

Mr. Rand stated the board is listening to all sides presented.

Mr. Ginsberg stated all members have commented. The board members are citizens and are charged with making the best decision for the town and doesn't want to open the town up to litigation. The board is taking this very seriously. It sounds like mitigation is something on the table.

Mr. Benson stated Town Meeting approved the project and now it's in bankruptcy. Tax revenue now may be short-term and the issue to face is what is long-term sustainable use of the property. He questioned where the baby-boomers will go on a fixed income. He stated he doesn't think they'll be here. The demographics are changing. When people retire they leave here. The project needs to provide something that has value to the town and is part of the community. The board needs to be concerned about marketability and future use, as the bank is. If the restriction is not lifted, it's possible it will be bought by a developer at auction, who may put in residential homes, which is a negative. He stated he does not think anybody wants that. It would mean single-family homes with a lot of kids. It goes against the reason it was passed at Town Meeting. The situation is bad, nobody wants it and the board has to figure out the best way to go forward with consideration of the neighbors, Town Meeting and long-term viability for the property.

Mr. Ginsberg stated if the board is going to vote, he would like to know if \$120,000 in mitigation is something to which the applicant would be agreeable.

Mr. Antonellis stated 5 bedrooms were given up and if the figure is going up, those bedrooms would need to be given back. After a brief discussion with his client, Mr. Antonellis stated the bank would agree to \$3,000 per unit and \$90,000 over the course of the project. He stated the bank will be a good neighbor and the project will be handled properly.

An unidentified neighbor stated it was suggested the neighborhood didn't want the added children, but it's really the number of people living in the small area. She asked if each condo will be smaller with the 2-bedroom units or the same size as the 3-bedroom unit condos. She also asked what would stop people from using the 2-bedroom unit as a 3-bedroom unit.

Mr. Farnsworth stated if the plans are marked as 2-bedroom units, regardless of how many are in the building, the Certificate of Occupancy will reflect them as 2-bedrooms. All other rooms will be labeled and will be stipulated as not to be used as a sleeping area. If people use it as a 3-bedroom, they'll be creating their own violation.

Mr. Rand said anyone can do it.

Mr. Rutan moved to close the hearing, Mr. Kane seconded the motion and the vote was unanimously in favor.

- **To consider the petition of Genzyme Corporation for a Variance to allow the installation of an 8-foot high fence within the front and rear setbacks of the property located at 11 Forbes Road.**

Attorney Peter Barbieri, representing Genzyme Corporation, presented the project, explaining they want to install an 8-foot high security fence which will encroach on one side setback and the rear setback. The property is located in the Industrial zone. Mr. Barbieri noted a fence over 6 feet in height is considered a structure per the zoning bylaw. The proposed fence will run along the perimeter line. Along the back, the fence will be within the rear setback in an area that is barren, with a little section of trees, which makes it difficult to keep the fence out of the 25-foot setback. The fence in this area and around the sides of the property will be 8-foot high chain-link fencing. Genzyme Corporation is proposing to upgrade the property with a landscaping plan, which includes a redesign of the front yard and an ornamental 8-foot high fence across the front that will be located one-foot into the required front setback of 40 feet.

To accommodate the security fence, one of the three existing driveways will be removed, as well as some of the existing parking spaces. The parking spaces to be removed are not needed and will reduce the amount of impervious cover on the site, which is helpful. The location of the fence within the rear setback is for the maintenance and security of two catch basins that are 5 feet from the rear property line. The 237 remaining parking spaces will be sufficient.

Variances issued in 1987 by the Zoning Board of Appeals recognize some of the site issues, including the wetland area on the site, the location of part of the property in a Groundwater Protection Overlay District, and the drainage structure constructed for the fire protection of the building. Due to these topographical factors, the building was relocated and a driveway was created.

Mr. Barbieri explained the security fence is crucial because of the nature of Genzyme Corporation's products and security requirements. The use of an ornamental fence along the front of the property will not be detrimental, as it will allow a view of the proposed landscaping. This satisfies the purpose and intent of the bylaw. In the rear of the property, the fence will help with maintenance of the catch basins and will be done in a way that will not be detrimental to the neighboring area.

In response to questions from Mr. Ginsberg, Attorney Barbieri stated there are no security cameras on the building and the security requirements governing the operations and shipping related to the products are those of federal agencies, including Homeland Security, the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) and customs.

Mr. Farnsworth noted not all plans and documentation associated with this facility are public documents. They have to be submitted to Town Counsel for review of certain areas of the building.

Mr. Rutan stated he appreciated the presentation and the security required for this business.

Mr. Rutan moved to close the hearing, Mr. Kane seconded the motion and the vote was unanimously in favor of closing the hearing.

- **To consider the petition of Christopher J. and Susan C. Feeney for a Special Permit to allow the addition of a two-car garage with a family room above which will exceed 50% of the gross floor area of the existing single-family home on the parcel located at 9 Alcott Drive.**

The applicants, Christopher and Susan Feeney, presented the project. They are seeking a special permit to add a 2-car garage with a family room above to their single-family home. Ms. Feeney stated many of their neighbors have added to their homes in the same way as they are proposing. They need it to be this size in order to fit 2 vehicles in the garage. Ms. Feeney stated they have a document signed by neighbors in support of the project. She stated they worked closely with the building inspector, Bill Farnsworth, when doing the calculations. She presented a plan to the board.

Mr. Farnsworth noted the existing single-family home is nonconforming because in Groundwater Protection Overlay District Area 1 the required lot size is 80,000 square feet and the subject lot is 20,024 square feet. The existing building meets all dimensional setbacks and the building as proposed meets all dimensional setbacks as well. The only nonconformity is the lot size.

Ms. Feeney stated a building permit for the foundation has already been issued. They are asking for an increase in 756 square feet, which makes it a 67% increase over the existing gross floor area, or 340 square feet over what is allowed. Also, the addition will be going over the area of the existing driveway so there will be no increase in impervious cover.

Mr. Rutan stated he doesn't see this increase as substantially changing the character of the neighborhood since most of the neighbors have done the same thing. In fact, it might bring the house into conformance with the neighbor's homes.

Mr. Rutan moved to close the hearing, Mr. Kane seconded and the vote was unanimously in favor of closing the hearing.

Mr. Farnsworth noted if the applicant wants to proceed with the project before the end of the twenty-day appeal period, they would be doing so at their own risk.

Decisions

9 Alcott Drive

Mr. Kane moved to grant the special permit to allow the addition of a two-car garage with a family room above to an existing nonconforming single-family home which will exceed the existing gross floor area by more than fifty (50) percent on the property located at 9 Alcott Drive, as the project does not derogate from the purpose and intent of the bylaw. Mr. Rutan seconded the motion and the vote was unanimously in favor.

11 Forbes Road

Mr. Rutan stated he had worried about the black vinyl fence, but the property is surrounded on all sides by industrial uses. He stated he was educated as to their security requirements for the site and the 8-foot high fence is part of the documented requirements.

Ms. Landau noted it benefits the town to have increased security at the site.

Mr. Byun stated the landscaping in the front makes the fence seem less than 8-feet high.

Mr. Kane noted the site is in an industrial zone.

Mr. Ginsberg noted there was a problem in one of their other facilities with security and with this kind of facility in town, the security is necessary.

Mr. Rutan moved to grant the variance due to the topography of the lot which creates a hardship because it restricts where they can put the fence. Mr. Kane seconded the motion and the vote was unanimously in favor.

Laurence Place – Whitney Street

Ms. Landau stated she is in favor of lifting age restriction. Board must consider what is best for the town, not just for the abutters.

Mr. Byun stated he is in favor of lifting age restriction.

Mr. Ginsberg stated the mitigation agreement should be for \$100,000 as a one time donation to the town and payable at the granting of the 10th occupancy permit.

Mr. Rutan agreed with that figure and stated all units should be reduced to 2 bedrooms.

Mr. Benson stated there is no detriment to the immediate neighbors if the age restriction is lifted. The applicant needs the flexibility to develop this site.

Mr. Rutan moved to lift the age restriction condition and the condition limiting the units to 3 adults. All units shall be 2 bedroom units including the 5 units that have been constructed. The developer will donate \$100,000 at the issuance of the 10th occupancy permit. Second by Mr. Byun. Four members in favor, one opposed. Motion carries.

Old/New Business

Revised application forms were reviewed and approved by the Board. Mr. Rutan motioned to approve the forms, second by Mr. Byun. All in favor.

Meeting adjourned at 10:30pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Debbie Grampietro
ZBA Secretary