

**Zoning Board of Appeals  
City Council Chambers  
Woburn City Hall  
Wednesday, September 22, 2021 – 6:00 p.m.**

Present: Chairman Margaret M. Pinkham, Member John Ryan, Member Daniel Parrish, Member Edward Robertson, and Member Richard Clancy

Chairman Pinkham thanked former Member John Ray for his service to the board, and congratulated Member Clancy for his promotion from alternate member. She said the Board is going to miss former Member Ray's expertise, particularly reading plans.

- 1. Rajwinder Kaur, 1 Frank Street, Woburn, MA, 01801, Petitioner and Landowner, seeking a Variance from Section 5.3.2 of the 1985 Woburn Zoning Ordinances, as amended, for a retaining wall higher than 3 feet within the 25-foot front yard setback at 1 Frank Street, Woburn, MA (continued from meeting of August 18, 2021):** Chairman Pinkham said that since the last meeting the board received a sketch from the applicant's contractor. She said it is her understanding the wall at the intersection of Frank and Green streets is going to be 36 inches high for the first 6 feet and then there is a 4-foot section that tapers to 44 inches. She said the graphic indicates the remaining part of the wall will be 44 inches. She said she does not know what happens at the end of the wall. She asked if the wall is just going to stop at 44 inches or turn the corner. Ms. Kaur said the wall will be 44 inches high. Chairman Pinkham asked if she is in the driveway of 181 Montvale Avenue, will she be looking at a 44-inch wall. Ms. Kaur answered affirmatively. Chairman Pinkham said the board has been focused on the height of the wall on Frank Street, when the height of the wall at the Montvale Avenue end is equally important. She said she visited the site and asked what the visibility will be for 181 Montvale Avenue. Ms. Kaur said the wall is going to turn the corner. She said the wall on the far east end will be 44 inches and then it will decline and taper, according to her contractor. Chairman Pinkham asked if the original stone wall is still there. Ms. Kaur said there is currently no wall at all. Chairman Pinkham asked if the wall will taper to less than 36 inches. Ms. Kaur said the wall will decline to 12 inches eventually. Member Ryan said he has visited the property a couple of times. He said it looks to him like the wall at the driveway is at 44 inches. He said it also appears the wall has been built up by about 8 inches. Ms. Kaur said there is no wall on the easterly corner, just stones. Member Ryan said he is concerned about someone coming out of that driveway with a 44-inch-high wall. Chairman Pinkham read a portion of a letter submitted by Ms. Kaur's contractor, DD Elite Landscaping, as follows: "The plan is we will elevate the wall up from 36 inches to 44 inches. We will not start the elevation until we are 6 feet from the corner of Frank St. Once we started elevating at the 6-foot mark, we will go up 2 inches every 1 foot, it will take us 4 feet to complete 44 inches in height. The wall will then be a complete 44 inches in height after 10 feet from there on until the back corner of the lot adjacent to Green Street. This means the remaining 130 feet of wall (111 feet for existing wall and 19 feet of new wall) will be 44 inches in height. At the back corner of the lot that is adjacent to Green Street, we will build a 44-foot wall along the back of the property. This wall will be 44 inches tall at the corner of the lot adjacent

to Green Street and will do a slow taper down to 12 inches at the end of the 44 feet.” Member Ryan said the height of the wall will be 44 inches for a considerable distance. He said this is concerning. He said he was in a truck and could see over the wall, but he thinks someone who is in a car might have a problem. Member Clancy said he noticed there is a string along the wall and asked if that is the proposed height. Ms. Kaur answered affirmatively. Member Parrish said a lot of neighbors signed a letter saying they are in favor of the variance for the wall. He asked if the abutting neighbor signed. Ms. Kaur said she tried to reach out to the owner of the property but they never responded. Chairman Pinkham said the board asked Traffic Safety Officer Sgt. Charles Stokes to take a look at the site and there was a response via email as follows: “I did a site visit to 1 Frank Street to take a look at the proposed wall construction. I do not believe the wall will be an issue to vehicular traffic leaving or entering Frank Street. It seems to be a reasonable request.” She said she subsequently asked Sgt. Stokes if he had done an analysis based on Section 6.2.4 of the zoning code, which she said gives the Zoning Enforcement Officer that ability to take action with ledges and fences. She said it’s been many years since the board has had someone rely on this. She said Sgt. Stokes said he is not an engineer. She said she then reached out to the city’s Engineer Dept. She said the corner the board has been focused on is Frank and Green streets, and after she left the property she thought about the impact on Green Street and Montvale Avenue. She said the two intersections are at completely different angles. She said the intersection of Frank and Green streets is at a right angle. She said the other intersection has a much sharper angle. She said the zoning code indicates you have to go back 16 feet and draw a line and there is supposed to be visibility. She said she is having a hard time knowing what the visibility would be like if there was another 8 inches of solid material. She said she could still see traffic coming from Montvale Avenue, but she did not do what Member Ryan did because she did not look up Green Street. She said she agrees the property across Frank Street impairs visibility, but she does not know how much of an impairment there will be and it is too important to make a guess. She said she thinks it would be helpful for the board to conduct a site visit. She said people have done mockups in the past. She said she does not know if running a string at 44 inches will adequately give the board a sense of how much visibility there will be. She said maybe the applicant could build some sort of physical object at 44 inches, but she does not want the applicant to go to too much of an expense. She said the City Engineer suggested hiring a traffic engineer, which she said seems like it would be expensive. She said the City Engineer thinks the issue is complex. She said she still has questions. Member Robertson asked if the City Engineer’s office could do that analysis. He said he is not sure what would be resolved by a site visit. He said he would rather have an opinion from the City Engineer. Chairman Pinkham said has no problem asking them to do that. She said the other thing the Engineer Dept. informed her of is that subdivision rules require a clear line of sight of 54 inches, which is supposed to approximate a driver in a car. She said she was able to see on-coming traffic but the biggest impediment to her visibility was a telephone pole. She said her sense is the increase in elevation does not impede sight lines on Montvale Avenue, but she does not know what it will be like at the other end of the wall. Member Ryan said Frank Street is elevated, but the driveway is not. He said his primary concern are small children and that the neighbor’s driveway may have line of sight issues. He said he would like to see the wall taper down. Member Parrish referenced Section 6.4.2 and

asked if the Chairman is referring to Frank and Green streets or the driveway. Chairman Pinkham said she is referring to both. Member Parrish said the ordinance deals with intersections, not driveways. Chairman Pinkham said the whole point is to provide visibility. Chairman Pinkham asked if anyone in the audience wished to address the board in regard to the petition. There were no respondents. Member Ryan asked if the board wants to conduct a site visit. Member Robertson said he is hearing Member Ryan has issues with approving the variance. Member Ryan said he does. He said he cannot vote in favor of the petition in its current form. Member Robertson said he could vote tonight. Chairman Pinkham said she cannot vote in favor tonight. Member Ryan said the board would benefit from the site visit. Motion made by Member Ryan and seconded by Member Parrish to conduct a site visit at 1 Frank Street; approved, 5-0. Chairman Pinkham said the board can invite Sgt. Stokes. After discussion, the board settled on Monday, October 4, at 5 p.m. for the site visit. Chairman Pinkham said she would reach out to the City Engineer to conduct an analysis of the plot plan. She told Ms. Kaur that it would be helpful if the applicant can install some reasonable facsimile of what the retaining wall will be. Ms. Kaur asked if the board is suggesting the wall should taper at the corner. Chairman Pinkham said that is Member Ryan's position, and she would likely agree with it. Motion made by Member Ryan and seconded by Member Parrish to continue the hearing until the board's meeting on Wednesday, October 20.

2. **Jesse Needham and Meghan Haggerty Needham, 21 Indian Hill Road, Woburn, MA, 01801, Petitioners and Landowners, seeking a Special Permit from Section 7.3 of the 1985 Woburn Zoning Ordinances, as amended, for a second story addition to a pre-existing, non-conforming single-family home at 21 Indian Hill Road, Woburn, MA:** Ms. Needham said they are seeking a special permit for an addition to a home that was built in 1960 and is non-conforming based on the frontage, one of the side setbacks and the front yard setback. She said none of those dimensions is going to change. She said they are just going up. She said the renovated house will be consistent with neighboring properties. She said the renovated house will not be more detrimental than the existing dwelling. Chairman Pinkham asked if they are converting a Cape to a Colonial. Ms. Needham answered affirmatively. Member Robertson asked if the applicants are adding approximately 330 square feet. Ms. Needham answered affirmatively. Member Robertson asked if there are any other houses in the neighborhood that have a similar design. Mr. Needham said 10 Indian Hill Road is a Colonial. Ms. Needham said 31 Indian Hill Road is a Colonial. Member Clancy asked if the height of the structure is increasing. Ms. Needham answered affirmatively. Member Parrish asked if the addition is going straight up with no increase to the footprint. Mr. Needham answered affirmatively. Member Parrish asked if the height of the roof line will be 26.8 feet. Ms. Needham answered affirmatively. Chairman Pinkham asked if anyone in the audience wished to address the board in regard to the petition. There were no respondents. Motion made by Member Parrish and seconded by Member Ryan to grant the special permit; approved, 5-0.
3. **Patrick Jammal, 836 Main Street, Woburn, MA, 01801, Petitioner and Landowner, seeking a Variance from Section 5.3.2 of the 1985 Woburn Zoning Ordinances, as amended, for a fence higher than 3 feet within the 25-foot front yard setback at 836**

**Main Street, Woburn, MA:** Chairman Pinkham said the plot plan does not show the location of the fence. Mr. Jammal said the fence is almost finished. He said he received notice from the Building Dept. that the fence was in violation of the zoning ordinance. Chairman Pinkham asked about the height of the scalloped portion of the fence. Mr. Jammal said the scalloped portion is 4 feet high. Member Ryan asked Mr. Jammal if he installed the fence himself. Mr. Jammal said he hired an installer. Member Parrish asked if the installer did not advise Mr. Jammal of the zoning requirements. Mr. Jammal said his landscaper installed the fence. Chairman Pinkham said one of the challenges of Mr. Jammal's application is the plot plan does not show the location of the fence. She said if the board grants the variance, the Building Dept. would have no way of knowing what was approved. She said any action the board takes would have to be reflected in the plot plan. Chairman Pinkham asked if anyone in the audience wished to address the board in regard to the petition. Catino Masotta, 838 Main Street, said Mr. Jammal's fence does not impede anything. Member Robertson asked if the applicant could file a certified plot plan showing the dimensions of the fence when he applies for a building permit. Chairman Pinkham said the plot plan would have to show the length of the fence. She said the lot line is not indicated, and the board needs to know if the fence is installed on Mr. Jammal's property and not in the city's right of way. She said the board is not in a position to vote on this. He said the first thing that needs to be determined is whether the fence is on Mr. Jammal's property, and if it is, he should have a surveyor show the dimensions. She said hopefully Mr. Jammal can get that document to the board by October 20. She said in any event there is no guarantee the variance is going to be granted. Mr. Jammal asked if the variance is not going to be approved, why should he spend more money. He asked if there are any other issues. Member Ryan said one suggestion would be to talk with the fence installer to find out what his options are. Mr. Jammal said his option would have to take the fence down. Member Ryan said the variance won't be granted without a plot plan with measurements. Member Robertson asked what Mr. Jammal is citing as a hardship. Mr. Jammal said he has an autistic son. He said he is tired of people throwing their trash on the street and having it end up on his lawn. He said he wants to install a fence for his parents. He said he is trying to improve his house. He said there is a house down the street that has a similar fence. Chairman Pinkham said none of those things relates to the property. Mr. Jammal asks if he needs to lower the fence. Chairman Pinkham said if the board denies the request for a variance, Mr. Jammal will have to lower the fence to three feet. Motion made by Member Parrish and seconded by Member Clancy to continue the hearing until the board's meeting on October 20; approved, 5-0.

4. **Fatima Capelo-Alves and Luis Alves, 22 Ward Street, Woburn, MA, Petitioners and Landowners, pursuant to Section 7.3 of the 1985 Woburn Zoning Ordinance, as amended, to raze and rebuild a single-family home at 22 Ward Street, Woburn, MA:** Chairman Pinkham said she wants to make sure the board has all the documents that were submitted by the petitioners. She said a certified plot plan with a date of Sept. 7 was submitted, and there is another plan dated Sept. 22 that is not stamped. She said there is a draft of a plan dated May 20, and there is another graphic that shows two more lots on a cul-de-sac, with the applicants' house on the plan. She asked when the existing home was built. Ms. Capelo-Alves said her house was built in 1880. Chairman Pinkham said

the lot has 73.3 feet of frontage, which is a non-conformity. She said the existing structure also does not comply with the front yard setback requirement. She asked Ms. Capelo-Alves why the board was provided with the draft copy of the plot plan dated Sept. 22. Ms. Capelo-Alves said that is the most recent version of the plot plan. Chairman Pinkham said the Sept. 22 version is not stamped. She said the Sept. 7 plot plan satisfies the requirements for setbacks and lot coverage. She said the Sept. 7 plan could be eligible for special permit relief. She said the Sept. 22 version of the plan would require a special permit and a variance. She said different relief would be required and the plan is not stamped. Member Parrish asked why the Sept. 22 draft was composed. Ms. Capelo-Alves said she considered seeking a variance. She said if the cul-de-sac is built, she would have more room on the left side of her lot. Chairman Pinkham asked if the applicants contemplated moving the house to the south so the driveway could be more than 13 feet wide. Ms. Capelo-Alves answered affirmatively. Member Robertson said the address on the application is 22 Ward Street but asked if the petitioners' address is actually 22 Ward Street Rear. He asked if the street is maintained by the city. Ms. Capelo-Alves answered affirmatively. Member Ryan asked if the applicants have a signed and stamped plan for the version of the house reflected in the Sept. 22 plot plan. Ms. Capelo-Alves said they wanted to know what they needed to build the Sept. 22 version. Chairman Pinkham said the applicants would also need a variance, which requires them to establish a statutory hardship. She said the applicants would need a certified plot plan. Ms. Capelo-Alves asked what would happen if they went with the Sept. 7 version of the plot plan. Chairman Pinkham said the Sept. 7 version of the plot plan meets the standard of eligibility for a special permit. She said it is unlikely she would vote in favor of a variance. Ms. Capelo-Alves said she will go with the Sept. 7 version of the plot plan. Chairman Pinkham asked if anyone in the audience wished to address the board in regard to the petition. There were no respondents. Ms. Capelo-Alves said she wishes to submit a letter from Scott and Renee Langton, 16 Ward Street Rear, Woburn, MA, which reads as follows: "We completely supported the residential construction project proposal of our neighbors Luis and Fatima. We look forward to seeing them enjoy their new home when construction is complete." Member Ryan asked what the height of the structure will be since it is not depicted on the building plans. Chairman Pinkham said the height of the structure cannot exceed the maximum height in the zoning ordinance. Motion made by Member Parrish and seconded by Member Robertson that the special permit be granted with a condition that the structure cannot exceed the height stipulated in the zoning code; granted, 5-0.

- 5. 4 Belmont Street LLC, 1 Summit Street, Woburn, MA, 01801, Petitioner and Landowner, seeking a Variance from Section 5.3.2 of the 1985 Woburn Zoning Ordinances, as amended, for a retaining wall higher than 3 feet within the 25-foot front yard setback, and a Variance from Section 5.3.4 to allow for an increase in the height of a retaining wall to 6.7 feet at 4 Belmont Street, Woburn, MA:** Representing the petitioner were Attorney Joseph Tarby, Rubin Rudman LLC, 600 Unicorn Park, Woburn, MA; and George Gately, 4 Belmont Street LLC, 1 Summit Street, Woburn, MA. Attorney Tarby said he wishes to submit a topographical plan and 17 photographs. Attorney Tarby said the property is in an R-2 zoning district allows for a 2-family home, which he said is currently under construction. He said the Building Dept. determined a variance is required for a retaining wall within the front yard setback. He said the wall is

necessary due to the topography of the lot. He said the original wall on the premises extended onto the right-of-way. He said there is a large out-cropping of ledge to the left of the home that needs to be removed. He referred the board to a photo that shows the retaining wall starts at ground level and increased to 6 feet. He said the property slopes from the rear to front and from left to right. He said the original home had the same topography but there was no driveway because of the slope. He said photo #14 shows the ledge on the property. He said there are no other variances required. He said off-street parking will be provided at the new home. Chairman Pinkham asked how high the original retaining walls were. Mr. Gately said the original retaining walls were 3 feet high. Chairman Pinkham said it is interesting the old house had a 3-foot wall and the wall for the new house is higher. Mr. Gately said the yard on the right side was flattened and he built the new wall to hold up the backyard. Chairman Pinkham asked if photo #13 shows the backyard. Mr. Gately said photo #11 shows the whole backyard. Chairman Pinkham asked if Mr. Gately is seeking relief for both walls. Mr. Gately said he is. He said the wall in photo #6 is 7 inches higher than what is allowed in the zoning ordinance. Chairman Pinkham asked if it was graded that way. Mr. Gately said he tried to get the backyard so it wouldn't be higher than the neighbor's back yard. He said the next-door neighbor's yard runs right up to the wall. Member Parrish said the applicant mentioned there will be on-site parking and asked if there will be grass in the front yard. Mr. Gately said there will be a front yard. He said there is 5 feet of lawn in the front yard. He said photo #15 shows where pavement was replaced with grass. Member Clancy said there is a steep hill there. Mr. Gately said he feels like he made the line of sight a lot better. Chairman Pinkham asked if anyone in the audience wished to address the board in regard to the petition. Paul Tenney, 6 Belmont Street, said he is in favor of granting the variance. He said prior to the new home being built the line of sight was restricted. He said the old wall went onto city property and really restricted the line of sight. He said Mr. Gately removed a lot of ledge from the property. He said the new wall looks good and it is well-constructed. He said he has not had any water problems. He said it is a benefit to the neighborhood. Michelle Sullivan, 2 Belmont Street, said Mr. Gately has improved the property. She said there don't seem to be any problems coming up and down the hill. Dorothy Geary, 1 Belmont Street, said the house that has been constructed by Mr. Gately has enhanced the neighborhood. She said old wall went into the street. She said he did a good job and she hopes he gets the variance. Michael Dennis, 2 Belmont Street, said the new house is beautiful. He said it has made the neighborhood much better. Karen Ronan, 17 Arlington Street, said he agrees the old house was an eyesore. She said Mr. Gately has done a beautiful job. Member Ryan asked if there is a safety fence along the 6-foot section of the wall. Mr. Gately said there is a safety fence that is planned to go in there. He said the fence will be set back 18 inches in the back and front yards. Motion made by Member Ryan and seconded by Member Parrish to grant the variance; approved, 5-0.

6. **Linda Heimlich, 65 Burlington St., Woburn, MA, 01801, Petitioner and Landowner, seeking a Variance from Section 13.6.2.1 of the 1985 Woburn Zoning Ordinances, as amended, for a non-conforming identification sign at 69 Burlington St., Woburn, MA:** Representing the petitioner was Mark Gaffney, Gaffney Signs, 69 Pleasant St., Woburn, MA. Mr. Gaffney said his client is seeking a variance to install a 3-foot by 4-foot sign in an R-1 zoning district. He said he went to the Building Dept. and was advised

a variance is required for the sign. He said the sign will identify the business, which he said has been operational for 80 years. He said the sign will be set back 25 feet from the street. Chairman Pinkham asked if there are any dimensions on the plot plan. Mr. Gaffney said the version he submitted to the board is the best he could do. Chairman Pinkham said she has no confidence the sign will be 25 feet from the lot line, based on the depiction in the plot plan that was submitted. Mr. Gaffney said he measured the distance himself. Chairman Pinkham asked Mr. Gaffney how he knows where the lot line is. She said she has no confidence the red X on the plan is 25 feet from the lot line. Mr. Gaffney said that is the best he can do. Chairman Pinkham said earlier in the meeting they told a petitioner to have a proposed fence surveyed at 836 Main Street. Mr. Gaffney said Ms. Heimlich's property is 17 acres and having it surveyed would be a financial hardship. Chairman Pinkham said she is not sure if it's a hardship for an entity that has been in business for 80 years. Member Robertson asked what the cost of a survey would be. Chairman Pinkham estimated a survey would cost a couple thousand dollars. She said there is no way she is voting for this as presented, because she has no idea where the sign will be. Member Robertson asked if it is clear a certified plot plan is required with an application for variance. Chairman Pinkham said it is. Chairman Pinkham asked if there was a new driveway put in at the locus. Mr. Gaffney replied not that he is aware of. Member Robertson asked if there is already a sign there. Mr. Gaffney said there is a rock. He said there is a sign at Heimlich's nursery business, but the landscape and construction entity does not have a sign. Member Robertson asked if the rock has a sign that identifies the business. Chairman Pinkham said there are markings carved into the stone. Member Robertson asked if that would be grandfathered. Chairman Pinkham said that might be an argument. Mr. Gaffney said they could not find anything that cites a pre-existing, non-conforming use that wasn't covered by an agricultural designation. Chairman Pinkham asked what form of hardship is being cited. Mr. Gaffney replied the hardship is the expense of surveying a 17-acre lot. Member Robertson asked if the proposed sign will be near the engraved rock. Mr. Gaffney answered affirmatively. Chairman Pinkham asked if a tree was cut down. Mr. Gaffney said the tree was trimmed to accommodate the proposed sign. Member Robertson asked if the sign is going near the engraved rock, the site may be established as legally non-conforming. Chairman Pinkham asked if anyone in the audience wished to address the board in regard to the petition. Jeffrey Dillon, Ward 3 Alderman, 63 Sheridan Street, said Ms. Heimlich operates a long-standing business that has been in Woburn for more than 80 years. He said in many cases the city has businesses in residential zones. He said in this instance the residential neighborhood closed in around the business. He said he has heard no complaints about Ms. Heimlich's business, which he said has been good to the city over the years. He said the business employs a number of Woburn residents. He said the business has survived for 80 years, and if the board can give a little latitude and approve the sign, perhaps the business can continue for another 80 years. Chairman Pinkham asked how long the nursery business has been operational. Mr. Gaffney said the nursery has been in business at least as long as the landscape and construction business. Chairman Pinkham asked if Ms. Heimlich is also involved in the nursery. Mr. Gaffney said they are two separate companies. Chairman Pinkham asked if Mr. Gaffney has a document that indicates how long the businesses have been operating in the city. Mr. Gaffney said he does not. Chairman Pinkham said if the business dates back 80 years, she does not know what the zoning requirements were

then, Member Robertson asked if the sign will be illuminated. Mr. Gaffney said the sign will not be illuminated. Member Robertson said he does not think this is a major deal. Mr. Gaffney said the proposed sign will be 12 square feet. Member Robertson said this seems like a di minimis thing. Mr. Gaffney said the sign will be a work of art. Member Robertson asked if Mr. Gaffney's brother will make the sign. Mr. Gaffney answered affirmatively. Member Robertson said Mr. Gaffney's brother is an artist. Member Clancy said he has driven by the site a few times. He said he thinks a good sign will clarify the location of the business. Member Parrish said he agrees with Member Robertson. He said he will be happy to support the variance. He said the applicant is not asking for a big sign. Member Ryan said he agrees with Member Clancy. He said when he drove by he did not know how to access the business. Chairman Pinkham said the front yard setback requirement in 1959 was 15 feet. She said if the business was established 80 years ago, that would be 1941. She said at that time the sign could have been placed 15 feet from the road. Motion made by Member Robertson to grant the variance. Chairman Pinkham said she is at a loss to identify where the sign is going. Member Robertson asked if the sign will go next to the engraved rock. Member Robertson said the only alternative is to request a certified plot plan. Member Parrish asked if the board could stipulate it will be not closer than the existing monument. Member Robertson said he would be comfortable using the existing monument as a benchmark. Chairman Pinkham said 50 years from now, there will be a decision on file that does not reference a plot plan. She said she does not know how she will draft a legitimate decision without a certified plot plan. She said she does not think the ordinance applies to a previously non-conforming use. Member Robertson said the only alternative then is to have the applicant submit a certified plot plan. Chairman Pinkham said she does not need to see all 17 acres. Member Parrish said the plot plan is dated 1985 and said there could be stakes in the ground. Chairman Pinkham said there is no way of knowing that. Member Robertson advised Mr. Gaffney he needs to submit a plot plan. Mr. Gaffney said he will have to ask Mr. Heimlich. Chairman Pinkham asked Mr. Gaffney if he would like to request a continuance. Mr. Gaffney answered affirmatively. Motion made by Member Parrish and seconded by Member Ryan to continue the hearing until the board's meeting on October 20, 2021; approved, 5-0.

7. **Approval of minutes from meeting of August 18, 2021:** Motion made by Member Ryan and seconded by Member Clancy to approve the minutes as presented; all in favor, 5-0.
8. **Any other matter that may be legally before the Board:** None
9. **Motion made by Member Ryan and seconded by Member Clancy to adjourn;** all in favor, 5-0. Chairman Pinkham adjourned the meeting at 8:16 p.m.

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Gordon Vincent  
Clerk of the Zoning Board of Appeals

