



TOWN OF WATERTOWN
Zoning Board of Appeals
Administration Building
149 Main Street
WATERTOWN, MASSACHUSETTS 02472

Melissa M. SantucciRozzi, Chairperson
David Ferris, Clerk
Christopher H. Heep, Member
John G. Gannon, Member
Kelly Donato, Member
Michael E. Brangwynne, Alternate

Telephone (617) 972-6427
Facsimile (617) 926-7778
www.watertown-ma.gov
Louise Civetti, Zoning

MINUTES

On Wednesday evening, April 24, 2019, at 7:00 p.m. in the Town Council Chamber of the Administration Building, the Zoning Board of Appeals held a public hearing. In attendance: Melissa SantucciRozzi, Chair; David Ferris, *Clerk*; Christopher Heep, *Member*; Kelly Donato, *Member*; John Gannon, *Member*. Absent: Michael Brangwynne, *Alternate Member*. Also Present: Mike Mena, Zoning Enforcement Officer; Gideon Schreiber, *Senior Planner*; Louise Civetti, *Zoning, Clerk to the Board of Appeals*.

Chair SantucciRozzi opened the meeting, introduced the staff and members; swore in the audience; reviewed the agenda; and asked for a motion on the minutes of last month.

Member Ferris motioned to accept the minutes from March 27, 2019. Member Donato seconded. Members Ferris, Donato, SantucciRozzi, Heep, Donato and Gannon voted in the affirmative, 5-0. The minutes of March 27, 2019 have been approved.

Chair SantucciRozzi announced the only case on the agenda is 195 Mt. Auburn Street, which has had a petition before the board in the past, was not heard and was withdrawn.

Member Ferris read the legal notice:

"195 Mt. Auburn Street

Clark Elefteriadis, 456 Belmont Street, Watertown, MA 02472 herein requests the Zoning Board of Appeals grant a **Special Permit for the property located at 195 Mt. Auburn Street, Watertown**, in accordance with Watertown Zoning Ordinance §5.01.1(b&c), §9.04 and §9.05, to allow the conversion of commercial space on the lower and first floor to a residential unit with the existing residential unit on the second and third floor and the previously permitted commercial space on the first floor to remain, for a total of two residential units. Located in the SC (Single Family Conversion) Zoning District. ZBA-2019-06"

Attorney Michael Brodigan, representing the petitioner, described the property as being located in an SC zoning district, containing a home built circa 1893, currently being used as a mixed use with three commercial and one residential unit. He added that the residential space is on the second and third floors with the commercial space being on the basement and first floors. He then described the petition as preserving one of the commercial spaces and replacing two of the commercial spaces with one residential unit. The house would consist of one commercial and two residential spaces. The new

residential space would be on the basement and ground floors and the retained residential space would remain on the 2nd and 3rd floors with the retained commercial space on the ground floor, as well. He provided history of the use: the single family home was used until 1957 then a portion converted to a funeral home. In 1996, Mr. Younger sought and obtained a special permit for two commercial uses while retaining the residential use on the 2nd & 3rd floors. There was an amendment in 1998 to allow for the present three commercial uses and one residential use. In 2016, his client appeared before this board for an amendment or a special permit finding to permit two commercial spaces to a Pilates studio. That petition was allowed and then appealed by an abutter and is still pending in land court. The petition tonight is to allow a second residential unit to take the place of two commercial units. Parking would consist of 4 stacked spaces in the existing garage and two tandem spaces in the driveway and one shadow space. Section 9.05 of the WZO, requests that this be an appropriate use for location and structure – this is in a residential district. His client has heard from the neighbors to forgo his Pilates Studio and he has listened to that with this proposal. The use would not be a detriment; it would provide additional housing to the area and be beneficial in reducing the traffic in the site; no nuisance or serious hazard to pedestrians by nature of it being residential vs. commercial. The number of vehicle trips would be less and there would be less activity in the driveway. Appropriate facilities would be provided as there is little exterior work being done. The interior would be remodeled to accommodate the residential unit on the Mt. Auburn side. There were plans submitted for parking and the Planning Board recommended putting a buffer between the parking spaces and Franklin Street. They have suggested pipe bollards be put in front so cars are not pulling directly onto Franklin Street but pulling into a lane of travel which is the driveway to avoid any type of conflict with pedestrian or vehicle traffic.

Andy Rojas, Rojas Design Architecture, reviewed the floor plans – the basement plan has two bedrooms and a den with windows (and the number of windows) that were approved informally by the Building Commissioner for Code Compliance with light, air and egress. The first floor has a side entrance which is the main entrance with a large kitchen, dining area, living area and bath. The windows in the front will be replaced with the same (type) and they are meeting with the Historical Commission tomorrow to have the windows approved.

Rena Baskin, 15 Franklin Street, is pleased with the return to residential use and likes the idea of using bollards at the end of the driveway to prevent the two parking spaces on the side of the driveway from backing directly out onto Franklin Street. She confirmed that each of the two residential units has two parking spaces and asked how many the commercial space needs. Chair SantucciRozzi replied that the commercial has two parking spaces. Ms. Baskin said the shadow parking space is not allowed in the front of the house and she would like to see no shadow parking there – it is not safe and it will not look well and she doesn't want to lose the beautiful tree that is there. She added, years ago there was unpermitted paving of the sidewalk – it was widened and cars park there now as there isn't a sign that says, 'no parking here to corner'. She said if this is approved, this board should have the town take out the pavement and put a planting strip there. It is too dangerous as there are toddlers and little children in the neighborhood. There should be protection between the sidewalk and the street with a planting strip. There will be 6 cars going in and out of the driveway and the people going to the businesses – this is a public safety issue.

Clyde Younger, 188 Acton Street, former owner, stated that he brought to the board an email from Urit, Mr. Bloch's wife, owner of 9 Franklin Street (he added that he used to own their property and he is the one that sold it to them), offering to buy his property for residential use, which is consistent with the request tonight. He is glad that they agree that this is an improved use to the building. He asks that the board act favorably with the petitioner as this has gone on too long.

Jonathan Bloch, 9 Franklin Street, said this is a step into the right direction and is pleased there is more residential and less commercial use. He had some reservations, which some have been addressed and appreciates the bollards at the end of the driveway, which avoids a hazard. He said it is important for a special permit to not increase hazards to vehicles and pedestrians. He added that the shadow parking is unsightly, unnecessary, removes a tree and allows parking on the front lawn. He said once it is in there, it becomes a matter of right instead of the petitioner having to come back to the board to say he needs more parking. He believes a new special permit or an amendment would be the correct way to handle additional parking needs. He said the other issue is the planting strip as other approved decisions conditioned that this would be restored. His research with DPW determined that the homeowner must request it. The sidewalk stretches to the pavement. Drivers find it attractive to pull up onto it to park. He hopes this is a condition. The drawing (Proposed Planting Plan) has the bollards and the garage with cars in it and there are slight inconsistencies between the Parking Plan and this one. He said since this is a Special Permit, the plans need to be cleared up. He said prior permits have had erroneous plans. It would be legal grounds to send this back to do it again and he does not want to have to do this again. The Parking Plan, stamped, dated April 5th (he requested the parking plan be submitted at the Planning Board). Chair SantucciRozzi asked what his concern was. Mr. Bloch said the plans that are on-line whether or not they have been updated are not clear to him but they are different and inconsistent. There should be one set for the control documents. He said he asked at the Planning Board which plan was correct and was met with a lot of hostility from the audience but they corrected the plans. He said the parking plan has spots 1,2,3,4 in reference to the outlines of the building – it is a very small error but should be corrected. Mr. Schreiber added that there is a wall in the garage where the door was and Jonathan Bloch is pointing out the outlines of the parking spots on the plot plan, number 2 & 4, would be up against the sidewalls of the front face of the garage and the landscape plan shows them defined within the space. He said we know that scale-wise, the spaces fit there but the plot plan is showing them laid on top of the garage layout. Mr. Rojas said the existing garage door opening is 15' and to accommodate two parking spaces, it will be 18' (wide). The parking spaces are 8.6x18 and they fit perfectly fine in the concrete block garage – it is a simple cut and not all the way to the body of the building. He added that plan A-04, Proposed Elevation on Franklin Street shows the garage door opening at 18', which accommodates those cars. The spots are 8.6 and a car is not 8.6 – the landscape plan shows what an actual car would look like. The garage will work fine. Mr. Bloch said he knows the cars fit, that is not the question. Mr. Schreiber said the landscape version is showing the ordinance requirement of 8.6x18. Mr. Bloch said he would like to have them show the Historic Commission that they are opening the garage door width. Chair SantucciRozzi confirmed with the architect and the petitioner that they are meeting with the Historic Commission tomorrow night. Mr. Bloch said with a special permit it is not right to defer something like this and he hopes it is approved. Chair SantucciRozzi stated that each permit is approved separately and if it is not approved, that is the applicants' responsibility. She added our (the Zoning Board)'s approval is not predicated on another board's permit. Mr. Bloch said it is required in the Historic District and deferred to Mr. Schreiber that it is required. Mr. Schreiber clarified that a condition on this approval that any changes to the exterior that require the Preservation Agents' review needs to be approved prior to moving forward with the Building Permit. Mr. Schreiber said that going through this process first is the proper order. He added that if they do not receive the change of use, then the exterior changes would not be relevant. Mr. Bloch said that a case for a special permit approval of the exterior changes subject to the Historic Commission's approval should be made first. He said he has photos from August of 2016 where changes were made to the house that were not consistent with the Historical Commissions' approval as the prior approval called for the removal of those areas. He said Chris Hayward had approved those changes and said it was okay and now the petitioner is not removing that area and the windows are to remain but those are the ones (windows) that were changed. Mr. Schreiber said this is a Historic District Commission approval and if

there is an issue to be cleaned up, he will address it tomorrow night. Mr. Bloch said all of the improvements are going in the right direction. He would like for there to be a condition that states something about the occupancy, which if increased would lead to increased use and more parking requirements as they are big units. He doesn't want to see them being used with three separate people renting three separate bedrooms and having three cars. He wants to make sure they are used as two bedroom units and a condition stating that they would be used as two bedrooms would be fantastic. Chair SantucciRozzi confirmed that he is asking to add a condition that they are two bedroom units but she added, that is what the plans show and the plans govern. Mr. Bloch said different language at different times and calling it residential units doesn't state how many bedrooms can be used at any time. He added that the prior permits are unclear with unclear language. Chair SantucciRozzi asked staff how many bedrooms can there be with two parking spaces. Mr. Schreiber said 4 bedrooms require 2 parking spaces and 5 bedrooms require 3 parking spaces. Mr. Bloch said the condition should be that they don't increase the usage – whether or not they have the parking is not the question. Mr. Schreiber said the control plans show 2 bedroom units and it would be fine to add a condition that states two, two bedroom units are there, if the board chooses to add that each unit is a two bedroom unit.

Mr. Younger said that he is an interested member of the community, as well. What happens is often when a person speaks (comes to a meeting to speak); there is innuendo rather than fact. When words are thrown out without clarity, it is incumbent upon anyone as a witness, they bring specificity not innuendo. We need to deal with fact. It needs to be documented.

Mr. Rojas said the unit being proposed is a two bedroom unit and the other unit they have taken great pains to not make the other rooms bedrooms. The client doesn't want larger than two bedrooms. It was specifically designed as two bedrooms and the plans show that.

Mr. Bloch asked if anyone would like copies of the prior appeal or his depositions which are all fact based and not in dispute with the court.

Ms. Baskin added that she would like the shadow parking to go away and if indeed these are only two bedrooms then it makes it a lot harder for it to be used in any other way. She added there won't be any other parking 2, 2, and 2.

Mr. Schreiber said that the shadow parking was recommended by the Planning Board to be removed and one of the board members (Jason Cohen) asked Mr. Bloch about the removal of that space putting them into a situation where the on-site parking vs. on-street parking may happen. Mr. Bloch felt that with the existing conditions, it would be preferred to use the on-street parking so it would be better to not have the shadow space on site.

Clark Elefteriadis said he needs to speak tonight. The board and staff have put up with a lot and this has been a nightmare for him and his wife. They just want peace. He will take all the good, grow as a person and be a good neighbor. He bought this place for their dream to have a Pilate's studio and that is still in land court. The only reason they are doing an apartment is because that is what the neighbors want. The only reason he isn't doing three apartments is because the neighbors would complain about it. He said the first plan had three bedrooms and his architect argued that he cannot do less than three but Clark told him his neighbors do not want more than two bedroom units. So the path of least resistance was to make it two bedrooms to get this over with. He doesn't want to continue to hurt themselves financially and make things difficult for them just to make one person happy (the neighbor). He brought his tenant here tonight and that has been the only good thing happening with this. His

tenant is upset about the bollards as they are going to be so difficult. The neighbors are concerned with the cars parking on Franklin Street and then they want to block the driveway to make sure that they park on Franklin Street. He has been trying to work with everyone but enough now. He wants to be done. He wishes he never bought the house. The neighbors laughed when the original owner broke down in tears here. It has been a horrible experience. He doesn't know how many years it is going to take him and his wife to get over this. He has tried everything possible to extend the olive branch to the neighbor. He knows the neighbor is going to appeal this decision anyway so, he asks that the board do not put a thousand conditions on this. This is an apartment with two bedrooms. There is an ulterior motive to why the neighbors do not want shadow parking – something that they can appeal down the line. He wants to keep the shadow parking so the neighbors cannot say he doesn't have enough parking. He doesn't plan on using it. The curb is with the Town and he cannot fix that. It was there when he bought the house. He barely has money to do what he needs to do now. The money he spent fighting for this project the past three years, he could have built a castle there. He said the house is falling apart and he has to take care of it. He added that this doesn't make any sense to the neighborhood or to Watertown. There was a brothel there and he kicked them out. He asked the board to do the right thing for him and his wife. He bought a property and leveraged everything to do it and this person (the neighbor) is trying to bury him. He added that the neighbor's plantings (Bamboo) go all along the side of his property and into his (Clark's) driveway. It overhangs into his property and the leaves are all over his property and he doesn't say a word. He has sat here tonight listening without saying a word and now he isn't shown the same respect. His (Mr. Bloch's) hedges go all the way to the edge of the property and if he is so concerned, he should cut back his hedge and his bamboo as that would make the (driveway) a lot safer. He said the neighbor blames him for the parking on the street yet when there is a party by one of the private clubs in the area Mr. Bloch is out there writing down license plate numbers and wasting tax payers' money. He hopes he was respectful but he had to say something. It just isn't right. The place (his house) is going to look beautiful.

Tal Kittel is the sole resident and he is here to support Clark and Zena. He said the house is in need of repair. He asks the board to grant this so they can improve the house. He has been there over two years now and they want to see the house move forward. He is concerned with the blocking at the end of the driveway as it is counter-intuitive to the argument about parking on the street. This is an obstruction and a safety issue – he is the person that backs out in the morning. He has a visibility issue – the shrubbery blocks the view. If they are that concerned with the safety of the in and out of the driveway, the shrubbery should be cut back.

No one else spoke from the audience.

Chair SantucciRozzi asked Staff how they arrived at two bedrooms when the parking is in compliance with 3 or 4 bedrooms. Mr. Schreiber said public comment regarding the prior request was heard by the Planning Board and then withdrawn as the relief requested was incorrect. However, the public testimony suggested two bedrooms. So when they were submitting plans, there were three bedrooms and the staff discussed the pros and cons of two vs. three (there is no zoning difference) but since the abutter requested it, they went with two. Just the abutter made that suggestion. So, staff made the suggestion. Chair SantucciRozzi said the number of bedrooms does not always correlate with the number of cars – there are children, etc. She said if he can have more bedrooms and it meets the by-law... Mr. Schreiber said this petition is about changing the commercial space that was previously approved. The site requires 7 spaces, with two units and a commercial space and 25% can be reduced with shadow parking. They have 7 spaces with shadow parking. He wants to be clear that the shadow parking space is required to make the 7 spaces and the area where the shadow space is located is the

side yard – there cannot be two front yards and the front yard is on Mt. Auburn Street. The parking space indicated as a shadow space is in the side yard and meets the requirements. The sidewalk is town-owned and is concrete all the way out (to the street), probably because it was formally a funeral home. Any changes or signs to be added would affect the bus stop and would need to be coordinated with the DPW and the Traffic Commission and this was identified at the Planning Board meeting two weeks ago.

Chair SantucciRozzi reiterated that in order to be in compliance with the by-law, they laid out 6 spaces and have one shadow space, as allowed, so why would they reduce it to 6, if they can comply. Mr. Schreiber said that they could remove the shadow space and have four cars stacked or have an asphalt area that is permitted during the day but he thinks that would be more awkward than the shadow space. He thinks there are other scenarios where 7 spaces could work but the plans are drawn with 6 and a shadow space. Chair SantucciRozzi asked if the intent is to meet the requirements of zoning and be less impactful. Mr. Schreiber said that they could only get the (shadow) space if they could prove they needed it or if the staff said they needed to comply. Chair reiterated that she would want to work towards as much compliance as possible. Member Ferris said that the shadow space on plan L-1 would not be built day one but the plan shows if it needed, would be built as shown. Mr. Schreiber said the ordinance defines a shadow space. Mr. Rojas said it is a paper space only now. They will not do anything today to pave that area.

Member Gannon asked if it would be pervious pavers or grass in the shadow space. Mr. Rojas said the detail the pavers are designed for vehicular use with grass growing in between.

Member Gannon asked about the status of the existing permit – there shouldn't be two permits dangling. Mr. Schreiber said the permit history was discussed but there isn't a condition to strike the previous approval. It is complicated as there is still one in effect. The Pilates studio would be replaced with this request.

Member Heep stated that he has never seen bollards on a residential request and asked Mr. Schreiber if this has ever been requested before. Mr. Schreiber said he suggested a physical barrier and they did not specify anything. Member Heep asked what the basis is for requiring this. Mr. Schreiber said that this is to define the drive isle. Without it, it provides direct access for the commercial spaces to come in and out; it exists and it is compliant. With the narrower opening, it creates a more defined pedestrian interaction zone. It would make it so that if there were issues with the landscaping of the abutter, this would be an option. They didn't suggest the bollards, they thought 6" curb or small fencing and they have to be careful as it has to go to Historical. This would be adequate for the drive isle and it is more awkward for the parking.

Member Ferris asked what the buffer area would be in the same area where the bollards are proposed. Mr. Rojas said it is pavement with stipes. He added that they were requested to be a physical barrier. They thought about planters but thought what Historic would not object to. Member Ferris asked what the hatched pattern is at the new opening. Mr. Rojas explained that this is a small area of pavement for the gate.

Member Ferris asked if bollards would be an issue with snow removal and asked if there is any other example of narrowing down an area where zoning would typically require it be open. Mr. Schreiber said they could work around the bollards for snow removal and the 'necking down' of the driveway is usual for new projects within the 5' buffer instead of having a 20' opening the entire width of the

driveway.

Member Ferris asked if there are any ordinances or requirements for the fencing or hedging on the neighboring property in proximity to the street. Mr. Mena said when adjacent to a driveway, a fence or a hedge is limited to 36" and often a sensible rule is used if they are meeting the intended safety, which is that a car backing out can see a pedestrian and a pedestrian can see a car backing out. In his opinion, the driveway entrance relieves that since the driveway opening is now 8' over. Member Ferris clarified that he is asking if the safety concern should be there on the abutting property. Mr. Mena said that because the driveway is now 8' away from the neighbor's property line that is not a requirement. Member Ferris said that because the 'drive aisle' was added, the fencing or planting is compliant. Mr. Mena said if the bollards and striping were not there, the cars would pull in and out, yes, there would be an issue. Chair stated that there is an issue there today. Mr. Mena said he has not driven out there to see the vegetation height. Mr. Bloch said the bamboo is not relevant and the rhododendrons are more than 4', maybe 5', and the rule is 15' in from the front and there isn't any bamboo within that 15', only rhododendron - he has measured it many times. He repeated that 15' in, the vegetation is 4-5' high and the driveway is not allowed to be used today as it is out of compliance (Chair said we are talking about his property) he continued to say he is talking about the edge of his property not on their driveway because legally there is no driveway next door to it.

Member Ferris asked staff if there are two parking spaces, how many bedrooms would be allowed in a dwelling unit. Mr. Schreiber said 4 bedrooms. Member Ferris said he is uncomfortable limiting the number of bedrooms. He assumes that the other houses on the street have more than two bedrooms and he doesn't believe in an excessive restriction on this property since it is within zoning requirements.

Member Donato clarified that the sidewalk is town-owned and it would be a cost to the town to (remove the concrete). Mr. Schreiber said it is and it is not in their prevue to decide if the sidewalk should be narrower. It would have to go through a process with the town to decide if it should be narrow with a planting strip. This board should not be conditioning the town to do something in the right of way. It can be suggested and he has it noted within the Mt. Auburn Street Corridor project and this area would be addressed as part of that.

Member Donato asked if the notation on plan A.05 regarding an existing door which is being relocated to a new exterior location could be explained. Mr. Rojas stated that the area is being reconfigured and pushed in so it doesn't interfere with the driveway. They are reusing that door in a new location.

Member Donato thought there was an agreement within the real estate office lease that they had four parking spaces. Mr. Elefteriadis stated that they have two parking spaces.

Attorney Brodigan said that from a procedural standpoint in regards to the existing permit, if the board were to approve this request, they would not want to have the existing permit to go away until the appeal rights for this application were expired. Member Heep advised that he would want to hold on to the existing permit until the building permit was issued on the new approval. Chair SantucciRozzi added that once you exercise one or the other, the other becomes null and void. If the board acts favorably this evening, and they prevail in the land court, that permit will be good to go, unless he has acted on this one.

Chair SantucciRozzi stated that there was an additional correspondence in support of the petitioner from John Airasin, 43 Bailey Road (owns house across the street).

Chair SantucciRozzi said she was reviewing her notes and remembering other petitions on this property and they are all regarding the same theme – access, parking, etc. she is having a difficult time with the bollards and understanding what they are going to accomplish. They will impede snow removal and someone coming around from Franklin Street trying to swing into the driveway without a radius plan showing it will not impede access, she would not be in favor of it. The bollards would make it more difficult for circulation on and off of the site – the board would want to have circulation and have cars flow on and off the site safely. Backing up out of that area would be restrictive without any true benefit. She summarized that (the bollards) prohibit snow removal, access and there is no benefit for them.

Chair SantucciRozzi agrees with Member Ferris on the number of bedrooms. If the owner wants to comply with the number of bedrooms and units that comply with zoning, she does not see how or why they would restrict that.

Chair SantucciRozzi stated that the shadow parking on the plan is a demonstration to this board that this is something that can work and be sustained on this property and asked why the board would not allow them to comply with the zoning requirement for the number of parking spots. This board does the opposite – they want more parking, good access, circulation and turning radius.

Member Heep agrees with all three subjects – the number of bedrooms should not be restricted, the bollards should not be used and is a departure from prior board practice for residential driveways. He also agrees with the shadow parking space and hopes it never needs to be built but it should remain on the plan.

Member Ferris is in agreement with both members. He added that he works for a living with the quantity of bedrooms and 2,000 square foot units with two bedrooms do not exist except in homes with very large rooms and restricting it puts a threat to the viability of this unit. He is not in favor of restricting the bedrooms when it complies with zoning.

Member Donato is in agreement with all points stated.

Member Gannon also concurs.

Not hearing any further testimony from the attorney representing the petitioner, the chair closed the public hearing. She reviewed the comment received in favor from Mr. Airasian. She read from the Staff and the Planning Board report noting the discussion regarding the bollards and the shadow space and interestingly, a former member of the ZBA pointed out the viability of the shadow space. She reviewed the draft conditions:

#5 the shadow space was deleted by the Planning Board and after discussion tonight, they want to reinstitute the shadow space with notations that it can only be constructed if required by the town and through documentation that a situation or a third car by a tenant was parking in the street.

The second one states after completion and submission by the petitioner of a parking study and it is submitted to an analysis by the Town. She commented that a parking study is pushing it. She said the 7 spots are compliant with zoning but if the 7th spot would make a difference, the dialog would then be had with Staff and bring it back to the board. It should state, 'sufficient documentation by the property owner'. A parking study is not necessary and is used for much

larger projects.

Condition #6 will be removed based on the discussion this evening – no buffer located there; no bollards located there. They will not be located there to allow for adequate circulation and access and egress to the property which has been in existence since the 1950's.

They talked about the bedrooms and it is implied that they have to comply but if they have to draft a condition, it would state that each of the units would comply with the parking (Mr. Schreiber said that the control plans show two bedrooms) and they would have Mr. Mena review a request to add bedrooms to be certain it is compliant. No variances are required. Mr. Schreiber said that the spaces can be redesigned to show that the interior can be updated and the number of bedrooms shall meet the requirements of the parking. Member Ferris added that if additional bedrooms are requested, sufficient light and air shall go along with it and that would be determined at the building permit stage.

Member Heep motioned to approve the Special Permit with the conditions discussed. Member Gannon seconded. Members Heep, Gannon, SantucciRozzi, Ferris and Donato voted in the affirmative, 5-0. The petition is granted.

Documents reviewed: Supporting Statement, Code Review, Plan of Land, Plan Set, Cover Sheet, Sheet G-01, Sheet L-01, Sheet L-02, Sheet E-01, Sheet A-01, Sheet A-1.1, Sheet EX-02, Sheet A-02, Sheet A-2.1, Sheet EX-03, Sheet A-03, Sheet EX-04, Sheet A-04, Sheet EX-05, Sheet A-05, Sheet EX-06, Sheet A-06.

Member Heep motioned to adjourn. Member Donato seconded. Voted 5-0.
The meeting ended at 8:33pm.