



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

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

MINUTES

On Thursday evening, September 27, 2018 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*. Also Present: Mike Mena, *Zoning Enforcement Officer*; Andrea Adams, *Senior Planner*, Louise Civetti, *Zoning Assistant*.

Chair SantucciRozzi opened the meeting at 7:00 pm; introduced the Staff and Members; reviewed the agenda and announced that 101-103 Morse Street has been continued to October. The audience was sworn in.

The minutes from August have been read and a motion made: Member Heep motioned to approve the minutes of the August meeting, as amended. Member Donato seconded. Voted 4-0, with Members Heep, Donato, SantucciRozzi and Gannon voting in the affirmative. Member Ferris abstained due to absence.

Member Ferris read the legal notice for the first case: **11 Mason Road**

"Boris Kozorez and Nonna Khachiyani, 11 Mason Road, Watertown, MA 02472, herein requests the Zoning Board of Appeals grant a Special Permit in accordance with Watertown Zoning Ordinance §5.05(r), FAR, so as to construct a front entry mudroom addition, increasing FAR from .54% to .56%. T (Two-Family) Zoning District. ZBA-2018-24"

Mr. Kozorez stated that this addition would help with storage, heating, improve curb appeal and allow for dirt and mud not to be tracked into the house.

No one spoke from the audience.

Member Ferris appreciated that the drawings were very thorough. He questioned the MDL plywood as the exterior finish. Mr. Kozorez said because of the brick exterior, this finish could be painted and would be better than siding. Member Ferris said that there will be seams in this wall and suggested there is usually flashing that is not customarily on residential homes. Mr. Kozorez said he expects it to look flat with a painted surface. Member Ferris suggested that the exterior of the plywood be covered with another material like clapboard or fiber cement. Chair SantucciRozzi commented that painting the plywood to contrast the brick may be better than trying to match the brick. Member Ferris said he is not so concerned with the color but more the flat material.

Chair SantucciRozzi concluded that there were no further questions from the Board; reviewed the requirements for the increase in the FAR, noting that the request is not to the maximum allowed. She read from both the Staff report and Planning Board report, where both recommended approval. She reviewed the 'Boiler-plate' conditions and noted the addition of #7, for a smooth exterior painted surface or an additional exterior treatment.

Member Ferris motioned to accept the request for Special Permit for the increase in FAR. Member Heep seconded. Voted 5-0, with Members Ferris, Heep, SantucciRozzi, Gannon and Donato voting in the affirmative.

Documents reviewed: Plan Set, Gallagher Remodeling, Inc., Belmont, 14 sheets, revised as of 6/19/18, received 8/22/18; AS Elliott and Associates, 6/19/18; Sheets A1-A13; E1.

Chair SantucciRozzi announced the next case and requested the legal notice be read for 80 Elm Street:

"80 Elm Street

Gary Bloch, 80 Elm Partners LLC, 26 Elm Street, Quincy, MA 02469, herein requests the Zoning Board of Appeals grant a **Special Permit** in accordance with Watertown Zoning Ordinance §5.01.5(i), New Construction Over 4,000 s.f.; §5.05(d), Reduction in Side Yard Setback; and §5.05(i), FAR greater than 1%, to construct a 4-story, 56,475 s.f. self-storage facility and separate 2,650 s. f. commercial R&D or community space. I-1 (Industrial) Zoning District. ZBA-2018-22"

Attorney William York introduced the principals and supporting team members for this project. He noted the relief in terms of Special Permit, Site Plan Review stating that self-storage does not have a large volume of traffic but is a growing need. This is an attractive building and not like the old type of self-storage. There have been recommendations from the Planning Staff and from the Planning Board as well as four letters in support from neighbors.

Hans Straught, ADA Architecture, Cambridge presented the project as he designed this with the help of David Gamble, so it would not appear as a typical self-storage building. The front of the building design is of an R&D-type building. He described the details of the building and noted they are attempting to be a net-zero building with a solar-array on the roof. Hans assistant, Mike added that it is a 4-story building with corrugated metal paneling at the rear, a transparent section surrounding the building in front with wooden slats on top of the glass. New landscaping will be added with an outdoor terrace at the front. The building is highly visible from all elevations so they broke the rear mass with windows to let in more natural light and added a vertical trellis. Hans then showed floor plans for the building and the roof plan with the solar array and mechanical units. They did shadow studies that show minimal impact to surrounding properties. The lighting analysis complies with Zoning. He reviewed the lighting plan with four exterior lights, 14' high with zero cutoff and a few building fixtures. Andrea Adams stated that the zoning ordinance does not request a level of foot-candle lighting but their plan does comply with the ordinance. Chair SantucciRozzi asked what the middle of the parking lot lighting would be. Ms. Adams stated that it is at a level of 8, 9, and 10 as you get closer to the boundaries of the lot, it tapers off except Wheeler Court as they are looking up at an angle to the fully shielded lighting.

Attorney York stated that the 2,600 s.f. space will be a combination of community space (Hatch, for example) and Research and Development.

Brad McKenzie, Civil Engineer, stated that this site always had an industrial use. The building was razed several years ago (former home of Atlantic Battery), where an environmental clean-up was done. The topography shows the property slopes from Elm Street and the other half slopes towards the Mall property. There are no storm water controls right now and all of the storm water runs towards Elm Street. He spoke of the parking and bicycle parking and turning radius for trucks and a fire-ladder truck being in compliance with the by-laws. A vehicle up to 39' in length will be able to maneuver this site; most

vehicles will be passenger vehicles, cargo vans and 24' box trucks. The utility plan indicated that they would maintain the drainage systems to the extent practicable and the runoff from the impervious surfaces at the site is all directed toward a subsurface infiltration system in the northwesterly part of the site, including runoff from the parking lot, renovates it prior to infiltration in to the ground, the overflow connection is to an infiltration system along the back to the mall property. 43.21 They have fully retained the storm water up to a 100 year event on the site from all of the previous surfaces. There will be no discharge to the town's closed drainage system on Elm Street. They are fully complying with the States storm water requirements. DPW requested curb to curb restoration on the frontage of the site and full reconstruction of the sidewalk. There are substantial site improvements.

Robert Michaud, MDM Transportation – reviewed the parking and traffic requirements. The use of these self-storage sites is very passive. There is 13 parking space for the self-storage and 12 parking for the R&D. There isn't likely to be more than 6 parked cars – country-wide about 8 and no more than 10 at one time in the day per industry standards. The traffic measures about 5 trips, where the area has about 150. They have exceeded their point totals for the area and the applicant has taken strides to be certain they have. They have joined the Watertown TMA; improved walking conditions by providing sidewalks; offered on-site bicycle storage and a repair facility and is approximate to the greenway multimodal path.

Lorraine Black, Landscape Architect – said she wanted to design a plan to compliment the architecture. She chose plant materials that are evergreen, flowering shrubs, grasses and perennials. They have a seating area in the front surrounded by plantings. Some deciduous trees are tall and narrow; the drain area will be seeded; native evergreens along the back. The parking side will have honey locust for shade; a flame maple at the entrance; hydrangea in the sunny spots and dogwoods. There is a climbing vine at the rear of the building.

Chair SantucciRozzi asked Attorney York about the staffing at the self-storage site and the total number of units. Attorney York stated the building will open from 6 a.m. – 10 p.m. but he will have Mr. Bloch provide the detail.

Gary Bloch, Managing Partner, stated the access hours are 6am - 10pm, and then the doors lock and the alarms are set. The office hours are Monday – Friday 9–6; Saturday 8-5, Sunday 11-3. Usually one person in the office. There may be a secondary person on the site and three people only if one of the owners is on site determining something. There will be around 400 units with a mix of small, medium and large for residential and commercial. There are four floors with approximately 100 units each floor and the final design is not done yet. Security – you will need a code to enter the building; cameras in and around the property and an array of monitors in the office. A signed lease is required. You cannot enter the building unless you have a code. He is not certain if their system will record those coming in and going out. If someone is in the building after hours, they will set off the alarms and the police will be notified. They haven't had issues in their other facilities (now sold) of people living in the facility. This system will be monitored on site and if there is a problem, they can review the recording. The units inside are not monitored. There is one door to enter in and they are on camera. They will either use a code or a fob to get into the building. They want security. They will do what is best for them and Watertown.

Member Gannon is not familiar with the industry and asked what type of vehicle are people driving to this facility. Mr. Bloch explained that the majority is a car; SUV and some rented U-Haul or Budget cargo van or truck. Not usually 18 wheeled vehicles. Fire apparatus 40-44' long; Articulated vehicle would be a wb40 vehicles 45' – the largest unit size is 200-250 s.f. Most vehicle types are small pick-up trucks, etc. The average trip is 1x per month. The most intense use would be 10 spaces and there are 13. The 10 facilities in the area that they looked at have 1 space per 10,000 s.f. There will not be any spillover parking in the Target parking area or on the street. They expect a lot of business for storage by the retailers in the area, as well. They are not a warehouse. The term is care, custody and control that is used when a warehouse stores items. They will not be taking inventory of any item being stored at their facility.

Member Ferris asked if the lease excludes certain materials. No contraband, explosives, etc. They have to show a driver's license. There is cooling and heating in the building and sprinklers. There are no

electrical outlets in the units. The fob will get you into the building and the unit is locked by the renters own lock.

Member Donato asked about suspicion of a unit. The police would have to be notified and they would have to have a warrant to enter the unit.

Member Gannon asked about the show 'Storage Wars'. Mr. Bloch said there are state laws about the length of time they must go unpaid, the noticing we have to give them and the advertising in the paper. His suspicion is that these units on TV are all staged. They owned 5 facilities over 20 years and the auctioned off 100's of rooms and less than 5 had valuable items in it. Something of real value would not be stored in a \$100 per month unit. In Watertown, there would be less than 30 units a year out of 400 that would be auctioned.

Member Ferris asked about the setback issue and the retaining wall detail regarding height and maintenance. Attorney York said the setback in the front is required to have 10' and there is 20'; the rear, 20' required, 30 is provided; side 25' to 30-100'. The southerly side yard setback (next to the mall), they are seeking relief at 12' where 25' is required. Mr. McKenzie said the walls on the southern side are remnants of an existing foundation that will stay – they range from 3' to 8' from the street towards the back. The westerly side starts at 3' and goes down to 1' near the basin. Ms. Black said the trees that are shown off-site exist. She said they can look at adjusting the trees, if the planting will impact the wall now or in the future. Mr. Ferris asked about the solar panels and if there is a plan for a parapet. Mr. Straught said there isn't a plan for a parapet but there may be a small piece. Mr. Ferris asked if the air handlers and the elevator override will have screening as there are some residences near this property. Mr. Straught said they are set back from the edge. Ms. SantucciRozzi said the ordinance states that all of the mechanicals are to be screened. Mr. Ferris noted it is a proposed condition. There will be shared bathroom facilities.

Member Donato said the building design and landscaping look really sharp. The transformer is not shown on the plans. Mr. Straught said they are still in discussion with the utility company regarding the final location and they will screen the transformer with the appropriate planting material. Attorney York said it will be as close to the most accessible location and will be screened. Chair SantucciRozzi said there really aren't many places it could go – perhaps in front of the ADA spaces.

Member Donato asked how frequently the trash and recycles will be collected as it will be stored interior to the building. Mr. Bloch said there will be a small dumpster interior to the building. They keep it locked as they do not want their clients abandoning things into the dumpster. The worst would be a weekly pick up. They prefer to have their clients "carry-in; carry-out".

Member Donato asked about the snow removal plan. Mr. Bloch said they discussed it with the Planning Department and if they have a winter like three years ago, they will have their snow plowing people truck it off site.

Member Gannon commended the plan for solar panels and asked what percent would be generated for on-site and what would be sent back to the grid. Mr. Straught does not know the details of this – they are LEED certifiable, air tight building, low lighting, mechanical will be held at a low degree, they want to take it to a silver level. Mr. Bloch added that if there isn't anyone in the hallway, the lights go off.

Chair SantucciRozzi asked for an update on the contamination on the site. Bill Dillon, Agent, stated that the property was remediated in 2014 – the soil was removed. There is an AUL on the property and that clarifies the use – no childcare, etc. There was lead in the soil; the water was clean. Soil cannot be taken off this site.

Chair SantucciRozzi asked what the reason for the change in curbing around the back corner is (from granite to Cape Cod berm). Mr. McKenzie said it is probably due to economics - the truck tires will not come near the wall.

Chair SantucciRozzi gave kudos to the design team. She asked if there is a chance to add a landscape trellis or a design element on the north side. Mr. Straught said it is a view that will hardly be seen but they can look into it again.

Chair SantucciRozzi thanked the town's engineer for addressing issues in advance.

Randy Barrenson, a resident and business owner in the East End of Watertown. He commends the design team and everyone in the room for presenting this kind of project (finally) in the east end.

Dennis Duff, 33 Spruce St., is curious about the number of units on the plan and the verbiage of 400. He counted roughly 60 on the first floor and he is curious if the number on the plan must match the number that they actually build. Mr. Straught said they know where the exits are and beyond that, they can configure the space many different ways. Chair SantucciRozzi suggested we limit the number to 400 units. Mr. Straught agreed.

Member Ferris counted 375-380 units. Chair SantucciRozzi said an exact number isn't necessary. Mr. Duff said if a developer says A and they do B, would it be okay – like the height. Chair said the height is an exact number.

Chair SantucciRozzi thanked Staff for the draft conditions and wondered about the snow. It is usually a given that if there is any snow accumulation, it will need to be taken off site as with the basin, there isn't a location to push it to. Chair asked if the lighting will be automatically shut off at a certain hour. Mr. Bloch said they close at 10 and the lights will go off at 11. They open at 6 am and the lights will go on at 5 am. Chair said she wouldn't mind if the lights on the building stayed on but the parking lot lights must be shut off. Mr. Bloch suggested shutting them off ½ hour after closing instead of one hour. Chair agreed ½ hour is reasonable. Mike Mena, Zoning Enforcement Officer asked if the other tenant space were to have someone there at a late hour...Ms. Adams added that the ordinance states all luminaries, except walkways and emergency egress have to deactivate not more than 2 hours after the stated closing time and all daytime hours.

Chair reviewed the other conditions: All interior access units for the tenants; she prefers a fob vs. code or a card so that one person has access at a time or have the location manned when open. Mr. Bloch said it creates an operational issue. Mr. Ferris said the code would be able to be given to 20 people. Mr. Bloch said someone could just hold the door open. Chair said if it will not be manned, something more than a code would be a better comfort level from a security standpoint.

Member Gannon asked Staff what the maximum allowable uses would be for a future owner. Mr. Mena said the Table of Uses allows many businesses from software to widget making – anything that would fit within the R&D definition. Mr. Gannon asked if Life Sciences would be allowed. Mr. Mena said laboratory would be allowed. He knows that there is a lot of discussion with the Town Council and the Health Department regarding the Life Sciences and regulating those uses but this ordinance does not have restrictions. Mr. Gannon wants to know if this Board can request that they come back in front of them if the use changes to Life Sciences. Mr. Mena said restricting a use would typically be a directive from the Town Council.

Ms. Adams went into detail about what R&D levels are for use including life sciences and labs with biologics. Member Gannon asked if Staff is suggesting that the size of the space would limit the use. Ms. Civetti added that there is not an ordinance specifying the detailed use of an R&D space and there cannot be further restrictions placed up on it. Ms. Adams said her knowledge regarding lab spaces would state that this space would not be large enough although she understands his concern. There may be other regulations from other departments in the future. Attorney York stated that they do not have any plans for life sciences and they do not believe it is big enough. He does not know if in 10 years that the market would change and there would be restrictions in place by then. It would depend on the future of the town and the comprehensive plan.

Member Ferris stated that another condition would be a single window treatment be provided at the vestibule. He also commended the petitioner and team on their presentation.

Member Donato asked if there would be sound attenuation for the mechanicals on the roof. Attorney York said there is a condition for it. Ms. Adams clarified that the condition is for screening only but most HVAC equipment is sound attenuated and on the roof most are vibration attenuated.

Chair SantucciRozzi reviewed the request for side setback relief and floor area ratio. The Staff Report and Planning Board provided conditional approval. They have received four letters of support: Pat Stetson, Watertown Mall, Moynihan, Sterritt Lumber, and AA Auto Repair, which all state that they were not in support of the last proposal and are now in support of this proposal. The neighbors agree that this type of development is suitable for the area. She thanked the team for the presentation and the materials and she is looking forward to this building and the appearance to Elm Street.

Member Ferris motioned to approve the petition for special permit with site plan review and the conditions discussed. Member Gannon seconded. Voted 5-0 with Members Ferris, Gannon, SantucciRozzi, Heep and Donato voting in the affirmative.

Documents Reviewed: Updated Application (4 pages), stamped Clerk's 7/16/18; Special Permit Statement – Section 9.05(b) – Included with the Application; HDS Architecture – Site Plan Review Checklist, dated 7/9/18; LEED Preconstruction Checklist, dated 6/1/18; MDM Transportation Consultants, Memorandum, dated 6/7/18, Traffic Impact Assessment, Robert J. Michaud, PE; Letter, from J. Gerson Bloch, Kendall Square Associates, to Seven Magoon, dated 6/8/18. Describes the proposed project; Letter, from J. Gerson Bloch, Kendall Square Associates, to Bradley C. McKenzie, dated 6/28/18; Describes types of vehicles that visit the site, particularly trucks; Email, 6/29/18, Bradley C. McKenzie to Matthew Shuman, DPW, discusses turning movement templates and includes template diagrams; Letter, 7/31/18, Bradley C. McKenzie to Matthew Shuman, DPW, response to Site Plan Review/Developers' Conference comments from DPW; Drainage Calculations and Storm water Management Plan, by McKenzie Engineering Group (MEG), dated 6/8/18, stamped and signed by Bradley C. McKenzie, Civil Engineer (Summary); Drainage Calculations and Storm water Management Plan, by MEG, dated 7/9/18 stamped and signed by Bradley C. McKenzie, Civil Engineer; Site Layout Plan, C-1, dated 7/9/18 by MEG, stamped and signed by Bradley C. McKenzie, Civil Engineer, Received ZBA 7/17/18; Grading and Utility Plan, C-2, dated 7/9/18, by MEG, stamped and signed by Bradley C. McKenzie, Civil Engineer, Received ZBA 7/17/18; Sediment Control Plan, C-3, dated 7/9/18, by MEG, stamped and signed by Bradley C. McKenzie, Civil Engineer, Received ZBA 7/17/18; Construction Detail Plans, C-4, C-5 and C-6, dated 7/9/18, by MEG, stamped and signed by Bradley C. McKenzie, Civil Engineer, Received ZBA 7/17/18; Property Line Elevations/Sections, EX-1, dated 7/9/18, by MEG, stamped and signed by Bradley C. McKenzie, Civil Engineer, Received ZBA 7/17/18; Rendering – View from Elm Street, A0, dated 7/9/18 by HDS Architecture, stamped and signed by Hans Strauch, Registered Architect, Received 7/17/18; Landscape Plan, L1, dated 7/9/18, by stamped and signed Lorayne Black, Registered Landscape Architect, Received 7/17/18; Aerial Site Plan, A1, by Hans Strauch, dated 7/9/18, Received 7/17/18; Elm Street East Elevation and Rear/West Elevation, A2, dated 7/9/18 by HDS Architecture, stamped and signed by Hans Strauch, Registered Architect, Received 7/18/18; South Elevation and North Elevation, A3, dated 7/9/18 by HDS Architecture, stamped and signed by Hans Strauch, Registered Architect, Received 7/17/18; First Floor Plan (interior), A4, dated 7/9/18 by HDS Architecture, stamped and signed by Hans Strauch, Registered Architect, Received 7/17/18; Floors 2, 3, 4 Plans (interior) and Roof Plan, A5, dated 7/9/18 by HDS Architecture, stamped and signed by Hans Strauch, Registered Architect, Received 7/17/18; Exterior Lighting information, received by Email to DCDP staff on 8/6/18. 19 pages showing a point-to-point diagram, pole types and fixture heads for wall and pole-mounts; Shadow Study, 1 page, by HDS Architecture, received by DCDP staff on 8/6/18. Shows the site as it would be on March 20 (Equinox).

Chair SantucciRozzi announced the next case is a continued case: **71 Bradford Road** and Member Ferris is recused. She thanked these Petitioners for their patience.

Norman Kerlopf, Architect said there were three items that they had to revisit: the landscaping and open space; defining the entrance at the side of the building and the two car spaces being accommodated. The Landscaping plan shows more grass area than before as the existing driveway is cut back as well as the back area and added open space. Some of the parking is now beneath the existing building. The open carport was treated as a garage and that is why they come before the board. There was nothing specific in the by-laws on how a carport should be built. He showed the plan with 18' plus 5' setback and the stairs at the back are not being interfered with. The grade elevations show how the parking is working from the street into the parking bay. The structural design is shown and the existing concrete wall at the front is used as a structural element and a steel column will be added with its own footing which will support the rest of the beams. The existing floor joists are being maintained to carry the floor above. New beams will replace the concrete block wall. There are side elevations showing the new retaining wall. The 3 steps are being turned around to face the other direction.

Member Gannon stated that he had requested photos of examples of this structure and since there were no photos submitted, he is concerned. Mr. Kerlopf said he mentions the four condos on Church Street. This was treated as a garage not a carport and there are many down sloping situations in Watertown. He asked Member Gannon how that is related to the Zoning By-Law. Member Gannon explained that the Board provides Zoning relief and a carport under a house is unique. He has not seen any carports. He wanted evidence that this does not appear off from other houses. Mr. Kerlopf said they do not have an identical situation but there are similar situations. The Petitioner has photos of similar situations in her cell phone, if he would like to see them.

Chair SantucciRozzi said she is glad they asked the petitioner to come back as the stairs needed to be reversed and the other elements addressed. She asked what goes on in the basement – as this is an unusually large window for a basement and there is exposed foundation. The window will be blocked by a vehicle. Mr. Kerlopf said it is finished living space with mechanical. He said there is a bedroom further back in the building, there is a bathroom as part of the first floor and not a separate unit. Chair SantucciRozzi tried to clarify that it is NOT a bedroom near that window as the egress would be difficult. If it is a bedroom the vehicle would block the window and if someone were sleeping in there, there would be a concern.

Member Gannon said he has never seen the concept before and he did ask for photos and there is a four-member board. He has discomfort with blasting through a house to jam parking spaces underneath and he wanted photographs to show that it will fit into the neighborhood.

Mark Strangio said that he is buying one of the units at 71 Bradford Road and the house is nicely done. He likes the idea of the carport. In 1998, he lived down the street. He thinks the architectural design is nicely done and this is not inconsistent with how things look in the neighborhood. He said another property on the street has an awful garage. The slope is the same as another property on the street and he will not be sleeping in the room that she questioned.

Dennis Duff asked if there are rules about front yard parking because this is front yard parking. Mr. Mena said the code states that a two-family with a garage below requires a special permit. The carport is going to the left of the house. There is another driveway on the other side. Mr. Mena saw the landscaping going in and were assured that the patio would not be parked on. There will be 5' of landscaping. There is a lot of different surface treatment at this property.

Member Gannon asked the architect if he designed anything like this before. Mr. Kerlopf said he has designed garages but not an open carport. He has done many that go down to the garage. He designed the one on 35 Church Street; one in Newton and one in Brookline. He added that it is a carport due to the garage doors not being able to be open and other physical restraints.

Chair SantucciRozzi reviewed the additional materials saying they covered her questions from before as well as other members' questions. She closed the public hearing and read from the Staff and Planning Board report that they are in favor of the request.

Member Heep motioned to approve the petition with the conditions. Member Donato seconded. Voted 4-0 with Members Heep, Donato, SantucciRozzi and Gannon voting in the affirmative. Member Ferris was refused.

Documents Reviewed: Proposed Plot Plan, 69-71 Bradford Road, Rober Survey, dated 6/12/18, signed Clifford Rober, Professional Land Surveyor, 9/20/18. Received by ZBA Office 9/21/18; Proposed Driveway & Carport Plan, #69-71 Bradford Road, H.W. Moore Associates, Inc. Civil Engineering/Land Planning, dated 9/20/18, signed James M. White, Professional Civil Engineer. Received by ZBA Office 9/21/18, Existing and Proposed Conditions (sheet 1 of 3); Proposed Driveway & Carport enlargement, #69-71 Bradford Road, H.W. Moore Associates, Inc. Civil Engineering/Land Planning, dated 9/20/18, signed James M. White, Professional Civil Engineer. Received by ZBA Office 9/21/18 (sheet 2 of 3); Proposed Driveway & Carport enlargement, #69-71 Bradford Road, H.W. Moore Associates, Inc. Civil Engineering/Land Planning, dated 9/20/18, signed James M. White, Professional Civil Engineer; received by ZBA Office 9/21/18, Design Vehicle and Building Clearance Profile (sheet 3 of 3); Carport Details, 71 Bradford Street (sic), Nordesign & Build LLC Architects, dated 9/17/18 (Sk-01); Existing South Elevation, Sheet A101, by TD Architecture, dated 7/13/18; Existing East & West Elevation, Sheet A101, TD Architecture, dated 7/13/18; Proposed South Elevation, Sheet A101; Proposed East & West Elevation, Sheet A102; Proposed Basement Plan, Sheet A103; 2 pages of black and white photos of Garage/Parking on Bradford Street and Standish Street [sic]; Proposed Driveway and Carport Plan, WH Moore Associates, James M. White, Civil Engineer, stamped and signed, dated 7/18/18

Member Heep motioned to adjourn. Member Gannon seconded. Voted 4-0 - the meeting ended at 9:35 pm.