Zoning Board of Appeals
City Council Chambers
Woburn City Hall
Wednesday, June 17, 2026 – 6:00 p.m.

Present: Chair Margaret Pinkham, Member Anne Chatfield, Member Richard Clancy, Member Daniel Parrish, Member John Ryan III, and Alternate Member Mark Cavicchi.

1. **Clair Contracting LLC, 41 Independence Drive (Lot 28), Woburn MA, 01801, Petitioner, and, Stephanie Rae, 19 Summer Street, Andover, MA, Landowner, appealing the decision of the Building Commissioner to deny a building permit for a single-family dwelling at 41 Independence Drive (Lot 28), Woburn, MA:** Chair Pinkham said Member Chatfield has recused herself from this matter and Alternate Member Cavicchi will be participating. Representing the applicant were Attorneys Joseph Tarby and Ryan Douglas, Rubin Rudman, 500 Unicorn Park, Woburn, MA; and Thomas Clair, Clair Contracting LLC, 283A Montvale Ave., Woburn, MA. Attorney Tarby said he would like to submit a letter in support of the appeal from a neighbor who lives at 10 Bay St. He said his client is appealing the denial of a building permit by the Building Commissioner on March 30, 2026, because the lot does not have 100 feet of frontage. He said he would like to state for the record he has the utmost respect for Building Commissioner Thomas Quinn, but on this matter he respectfully disagrees with his ruling. He said he has forwarded to the Board a copy of the building permit application from March 30, 2026, and a subdivision plan from the Planning Board from 1961, and a plot plan from February 2026. He said he has also included a variance decision from 1972 for a reduction in frontage for lots 30-34 on Independence Drive. He said he has also provided the Board with a copy of a variance petition from 2023 for frontage that was withdrawn. He said he has also included a written opinion from March 2025 from Lynnfield's town counsel Thomas Mullen who was brought in by City Solicitor Mark Salvati, who had a conflict of interest because he represented Ms. Rae during the proceedings for the 2023 variance application. He said he has also provided an opinion from former City Solicitor Ellen Callahan Doucette dated December 11, 2023, which he said addresses whether Lot 28 was protected on its own. He said that is not something the applicant is arguing this evening. He said the applicant is appealing the decision of the Building Commissioner to deny a building permit. He said it is the applicant's position is the variance from 1972 was exercised and it still valid. Chair Pinkham asked if the applicant has received a letter in opposition from a neighbor. Attorney Tarby answered affirmatively. Attorney Tarby said on February 27, 1961, the Planning Board approved a subdivision plan for Independence Drive for single-family homes. He said in 1961 the Woburn Zoning Ordinance did not have any frontage requirements. He said several of the lots were laid out without 100 feet of frontage. He said in 1972 the ZBA granted frontage relief for Lot 28 and lots 30-34. He said lots 30-34 were sold and received building permits, but Lot 28 was never built on. He said the variance petition was withdrawn without prejudice. He said the applicant applied for a building permit on March 30, 2026, it was denied, and the applicant subsequently filed an appeal with the ZBA. He said his client's view is that the variance from 1972 was exercised. He said he has cited a couple

of cases, including Cornell vs. the Dracut ZBA. He also cited the opinion of Thomas Mullen, who concluded there has been sufficient execution of the variance. He said there is also relevant case law with Hogan vs. Hayes, and that the 1972 decision covered all six lots. He said this Board is not bound by Mullen's opinion but he feels it has weight. He said the 2023 petition does not impact the current appeal at all. Chair Pinkham said Exhibit H includes the notice of the variance that was recorded but she does not think the applicant has provided the variance itself. Attorney Tarby said that's how variances were issued back then. Chair Pinkham said there are no references to frontage in any of the materials for the variance in 1972. Attorney Tarby said there is nothing about frontage in the file but it was addressed by Ellen Callahan Doucette and the special Town Counsel. Chair Pinkham asked if there is a decision for the 1972 variance. Attorney Tarby said back then decisions were 1-page documents with references to a book and volume. Chair Pinkham thanked Attorney Tarby for the information he has submitted. She said she has some questions about the Hogan vs. Hayes case. She said the facts are very different than what is before the Board. She said in the Hogan case, the lot was created by a variance. She said the lots on Independence Drive already existed. Attorney Douglas said the Hogan facts are a little different but the important part is the variance covered both lots. He said the neighbors said she could not build on that lot but the appeals court ruled that the fact she retained the lot and built on the other lot was enough to execute the variance. He said as long as the variance is executed, that is enough to make it valid. He said unless there is a condition in the variance itself, it runs with the land in perpetuity. He said the Hogan case is an example of that. Chair Pinkham said in that case the lot was developed in 1975, after the variance was issued in 1974. She said the variance was executed within a year. Attorney Douglas said the execution of the other Independence Drive lots happened within a year. Chair Pinkham asked if the attorneys have any idea what hardship was cited in 1972. Attorney Tarby said the standard for a hardship was different in 1972. Attorney Douglas said the construction of the homes on lots 30-34 was executed because of that variance decision. Chair Pinkham asked if it is the applicant's position then that the variance was executed. Attorney Douglas answered affirmatively and said the Carroll case also supports that. Chair Pinkham said all of the cases the applicant is citing involve property being divided into two lots. She said that is not what we have here. Attorney Douglas said the 1972 variance covered Lot 28. He said the variance covered all the lots. Chair Pinkham said she completely disagrees. She said there is a variance for each separate lot. She said she does not have a decision and she's told there isn't one. She said there are six separate lots. She said she does not think it is accurate to say the decision covers all the lots. She said she has a hard time applying the case law the applicant has cited when these other cases are a lot being split in two. She said Lot 28 is not contiguous. Attorney Tarby said he thinks it's important to note this issue was raised with the City Solicitor a couple of years ago. He said because the City Solicitor was conflicted the retained outside counsel Thomas Mullen, who was town counsel of Lynnfield and Wakefield. Chair Pinkham said there are also other cases that go against the applicant's position. Attorney Tarby said that is true with any legal issue. Chair Pinkham said it's not enough to record something and sit around for 50 years. Attorney Douglas asked to which cases the Chair is referring. Chair Pinkham said she is looking at Grady vs. Langone, which is a land court decision from 2011, and Daniel vs. Harrington, which is another land court decision from 2014. She said the Cornell decision only

addresses one lot subdivided into two adjoining lots. Attorney Douglas said in the Cornell decision, the court found that the variance lapses, but it explains what needs to be done in order to get it executed. Chair Pinkham said the Cornell case still involves dividing one lot into two, not into six. She said and it's been 50 years. Attorney Douglas said he does not think that is a relevant analysis because once a variance is granted it runs with the land. Chair Pinkham said that's only true if the variance has been executed. She that argument assumes it has been exercised. Attorney Douglas said the applicant's argument is that the variance was executed. Chair Pinkham asked if anyone in the audience wished to address the Board in regard to the petition. Jonathan Britt, 33 Independence Drive, said he supports the Building Commissioner's denial of the building permit to develop Lot 28. He said Attorney Tarby did a magnificent job of summarizing the history of the property and that the variance should still be in effect but in his summary, he asked the Board to recognize the relief that was granted more than 50 years ago. He asked the Board to consider at what point should the property be considered abandoned. He said activity lapsed 45 years ago and it seems reasonable to consider that the property has been abandoned. He said the time frame he is referring to is the Zoning Act of 1978 until the time the variance application was filed in 2023. Daniela Ojeda, 43 Independence Drive, said she moved into her home five years ago and she loves the neighborhood and the community. She said she would be happy to have new neighbors, but she does have a big concern about the ledge. She said she was here two years ago when the previous variance application was filed. She said she has questions. She asked if a home wasn't built there 50 years ago what is different now that is going to make that lot buildable. She said if a building permit is approved she would like to have a little bit of information about what is going to be in with respect to the ledge; if they are going to hammer the ledge or blast, and the impact that can have on the two adjacent houses. She said she is concerned about any potential structural damage. She said if a building permit is approved, will the developer have to do a pre-blast survey. She said she has talked to the appellant, who has come to the neighborhood to explain what they are going to do and shown plans for the proposed structure. She said it is going to entail a lot of work, including utilities with the potential for further excavation. She said she thinks the site work will be more than what has been presented so far. Chair Pinkham asked Ms. Ojeda if she has addressed those concerns with the applicant. Ms. Ojeda said she understands there will be noise and vibrations with construction but she wants to know how the developer will be held accountable, and if for instance the developer has insurance. Chair Pinkham asked if the appellant could give any information about those issues to Ms. Ojeda. Attorney Douglas said those are not matters that are before the Board tonight. He said it is not relevant for this conversation. Chair Pinkham said she completely disagrees. She said the appellant is asking for relief to build a house and it is entirely appropriate for the appellant to respond to the neighbors' concerns about ledge. Mr. Clair said there was a neighborhood meeting last Wednesday and most of the concerns were about blasting, which he explained they hope not to do. He said there is ledge as you can see from the topography of the lot. He said the lot falls off toward the back and that's why they placed the house toward the back. He said it's kind of a deeper house and they placed the garage in a spot where they don't have to dig. He said they chose the location of the house based on what would have the lowest impact on the neighborhood. He said there is plenty of room to shift the house around. He said they don't know where the worst rock is. Chair Pinkham asked if there

are any municipal or state regulations for blasting. Mr. Clair said blasting is regulated. Attorney Tarby said blasting is regulated through the Woburn Fire Dept. Ms. Ojeda said she understands the positioning of the house. She said it looks like it will be a beautiful house but her concern is about how the process of building the house. She said it is a wall or rock. She asked how they are going to get the utilities to the house. Mr. Clair said he does believe there is some ledge but wants to know more about what they are working with ledge. He said they do not want to blast. Chair Pinkham said the reality is it's too soon to tell if blasting will be required. She told Ms. Ojeda if she reaches out to the Woburn Fire Dept. or the Building Commissioner they can address it. Ms. Ojeda said she is also concerned with noise mitigation, vibrations and hours of construction. Mark Lynch, 39 Independence Drive, said once a variance has been granted it must be exercised within a year. He said the variance for this subdivision was issued in 1972 and now we are here 54 years later. He said he sent a memo to the clerk enumerating his concerns. He said he has serious concerns. He said he respectfully requests the Board to uphold the Building Commissioner's decision to deny the building permit. He said if this house is built there are going to be unforeseen issues. He said he has never had water in his basement and he does not want any surprises now. Attorney Tarby asked the Chair if she would like to do some more research into the cases that she cited. Chair Pinkham said she is surprised there was such a disparity among the relevant court cases. She said most of the cases involve the subdivision of two lots with individual variances. She said she thinks the cases the appellant has cited are different than what is happening with this appeal. She said the Hayes case is from 1985. She said she always likes to find more recent cases, which is why she went looking. Attorney Tarby said he is willing to prepare a more detailed brief based on the cases the appellant and the Chair have raised. Member Parrish said he thinks this appeal is similar to Hogan vs. Hayes. He said the variance was recorded, the other lots were built upon and the variance was executed. He said the problem with Cornell vs. Dracut is the variance wasn't recorded in a timely manner. He said it seems the courts are saying you have to do something with the Registry of Deeds; you have to file and then convey the land, or take at least two other actions subsequent to the issuance of the decision. He said he didn't see anything about time. He said he thinks it was eight years in the Hogan vs. Hayes case before a building permit was issued. He said he does not think the time frame is relevant whether it's eight years or 50 years. He said the important thing is that the decision was recorded at the Registry of Deeds and there was some other action involved with the variance. He said he would be happy to hear what the appellant has to say about the other cases. Member Clancy said he would also appreciate a more detailed brief. Chair Pinkham said she has other factual questions. She asked if any lots other than Lot 28 remain undeveloped. Attorney Douglas said he does not believe so but he can double check and report back to the Board. He said he believes lots 30-34 are developed. Chair Pinkham asked the appellant how they would like to proceed. Attorney Tarby said he would like the opportunity to brief the cases that have been discussed tonight and provide further information to the Board. Chair Pinkham said the cases she is looking at are Daniel vs. Harrington, which is a land court decision from 2014, and Grady vs. Langone, also a land court decision, from 2011. She said former City Solicitor Callahan Doucette's opinion refers to the Planning Board approval, which she said was conditional approval. She said she would like to know what were the conditions imposed. She asked if the applicant is requesting a further continuance until

the Board's meeting in July. Attorney Tarby answered affirmatively. Member Parrish asked if Attorney Thomas Mullen is representing the city or the Board. Attorney Tarby said his understanding is City Solicitor Salvati was involved in the previous matter with this property, recused himself and asked for an opinion from Attorney Mullen. Member Parrish asked who would represent the city if the Board denies the appeal and there is a further appeal. Attorney Tarby said the city would have to hire outside counsel. Member Ryan asked how many lots in this subdivision were developed without sufficient frontage. Attorney Tarby said there are a number of them. Chair Pinkham said Clair Contracting is listed as the petitioner and Stephanie Rae is listed as the property owner and asked if there is a contract between the property owner and the applicant. Mr. Clair said the applicant has agreed to apply for a building permit on behalf of the property owner. Chair Pinkham said the property is in a trust and Ms. Rae doesn't own it personally. She said Ms. Rae is a trustee, but if she's not the petitioner then that's irrelevant for the Board's purposes. Motion made by Member Parrish and seconded by Member Clancy to continue the hearing until the Board's meeting in July. After discussion, the Board agreed to hold the meeting on July 21, 2026, at 6 p.m. Motion carries, 5-0.

2. **Greystone Investments LLC, 31 Grape Street, Woburn MA, 01801, Petitioner and Landowner, seeking a Special Permit from Section 7.3 of the 1985 Woburn Zoning Ordinances, as amended, to reconstruct a single-family home at 31 Grape Street, Woburn, MA:** Representing the applicant was Attorney Joseph Tarby, Rubin Rudman, 500 Unicorn Park, Woburn, MA. Attorney Tarby said he has submitted new plans to the Board that show the bulkhead, the easement and lists all of the setbacks. He said the elevation plans were updated on May 26, 2026, and the plot plan was updated on June 8, 2026. He said these new plans would be the plans of record. He said the bulkhead is shown on page S-1 of the plans. Member Parrish thanked Attorney Tarby and said the Board has received what it asked for. Chair Pinkham asked if anyone in the audience wished to address the Board in regard to the petition. There were no respondents. Member Chatfield said it looks like a second floor is being added to the garage. Attorney Tarby said that is correct. He said the applicant is also building over the garage. Chair Pinkham asked what page of the plans the garage is on. Member Parrish said the plans for the garage are on page A.104. Member Chatfield asked if the garage will be attached. Chair Pinkham answered affirmatively. Member Parrish asked if the new home is going to be a two-family. Attorney Tarby said it will be a single-family home. Member Parrish asked if the applicant will object to a condition that the new home must remain a single-family home. Attorney Tarby said he client will not object to that condition. Motion made by Member Parrish and seconded by Member Ryan to grant the special permit based on the updated plans and drawings submitted to the Board and with a condition that the new home must remain a single-family dwelling; all in favor, 5-0.

Motion made and seconded to take a 5-minute recess; all in favor, 5-0. Chair Pinkham recessed the meeting at 7:12 p.m.

Motion made and seconded to return to the regular order of business; all in favor, 5-0. Chair Pinkham reconvened the meeting at 7:15 p.m.

3. **Jeffrey D. Simpson, 1 Carroll Road, Woburn MA, 01801, Petitioner and Landowner, seeking Variances from Section 6.1 and Section 5.3.2 of the 1985 Woburn Zoning Ordinances, as amended, for a reduction in a front yard setback from 25 feet to 5.7 feet to build a pool and a fence higher than 3 feet within the 25-foot front yard setback at 1 Carroll Road, Woburn, MA:** Mr. Simpson said he has an existing pool with a structural deficiency that he would like to replace. He said he has an irregularly shaped lot with two frontages. He said he wants to replace the pool and the portion of the fence where the cement is starting to crumble. Chair Pinkham asked Mr. Simpson what he is seeking relief for. Mr. Simpson said he wants to replace the fence. He said he has evidence dating back to 1964 that the fence existed. He said he would like to replace it with something better in the same location. Chair Pinkham said in order for the Board to find the fence is a pre-existing, non-conforming use for the purposes of a special permit application it would have to determine that the fence and the pool was there for at least 10 years. Mr. Simpson said he provided to the Board aerial photographs from the City Engineer from 2006 and going back to the 1990s, as well as anecdotal evidence of the fence from May 1964. Member Parrish said if you Google the map of 1 Carroll Road you can see the fence and pool. He said he thinks there is enough evidence for a special permit. Chair Pinkham said evidence dating back to 2006 would be sufficient. Mr. Simpson said he has also submitted letters from neighbors indicating the fence and the pool have been present for at least 10 years, including one from an elderly neighbor who said she swam in the pool when she was a teenager. Chair Pinkham said she believes the Board previously established the standard for a pre-existing structure, and that a pool is not a building but it is a structure. She said she has some questions about the size of the pool. She said she would like to know if the new pool is going to cover the same area as the existing pool. Mr. Simpson said the new pool will be a different shape but similar in size. Chair Pinkham said she does not know what the area of the pool will be. Mr. Simpson said he is not set on the pool size. He said he does not have that information with him. Chair Pinkham said she has another question about the fence and the retaining wall. She said she needs to know whether the retaining wall is on Mr. Simpson's property and not in the city's right of way. She said the plot plan does not show the retaining wall at all. She said she is not going to vote on anything that will allow a retaining wall to stay on city property and then have it fenced in. She said if the retaining wall was built in the '60s it was not uncommon for things to be built without a survey or a plot plan. She said the other issue is when you put a fence on a retaining wall, the Building Commissioner sees that as one fence, with the height subject to the zoning ordinance. She said if the applicant wants to build a 6-foot fence on top of a 2-foot retaining wall, then that would be considered an 8-foot fence. Mr. Simpson said he understands. Member Parrish said the first issue is whether the Board should consider this petition as one for a special permit. He asked Mr. Simpson why he filed for a variance. Mr. Simpson said he has been dealing with the Building Dept. for 6-8 months and this is the application he was told to file. Chair Pinkham asked if Mr. Simpson wants to change his application from a variance to a special permit Motion made by Member Parrish and seconded by Member Ryan to change the form of relief for the petition from a variance to a special permit; all in favor, 5-0. Member Parrish asked if the new fence is going to be higher than the existing fence. Mr. Simpson said the new fence will not be any higher. Chair Pinkham asked if the fence

will be solid vinyl. Mr. Simpson answered affirmatively. Chair Pinkham said there is nothing on the plot plan that is relative to the retaining wall or fence. She said Mr. Simpson is going to have to put that on the plan so the Building Commissioner knows what was approved. She said she has concerns about the retaining wall and whether it is on Mr. Simpson's property. She asked whether the new fence will be in the same location as the existing fence. Mr. Simpson answered affirmatively. Chair Pinkham asked if Mr. Simpson can have his surveyor mark that on the plan. Chair Pinkham asked if anyone in the audience wished to address the Board in regard to the petition. Joseph DiCicco, 17 Robinson Road, said Mr. Simpson's property faces his side yard and he and his wife have no objection to Mr. Simpson replacing the pool and the fence. He said the concrete is starting to crumble. He said there are a lot of trucks that go by and he thinks it will be safer. Member Parrish asked if Mr. Simpson would even need a special permit if he was just rebuilding a section of a fence that is already there. Member Ryan said this does seem like more of a replacement. Member Parrish said he is in favor of granting the special permit and would be willing to make a motion to that effect tonight. Member Clancy said he is also ready to support a special permit. Chair Pinkham said the Board needs to know the location of the fence. Member Ryan said that sounds like a reasonable request. Chair Pinkham said she thinks the plan is incomplete. She said the Board needs to see the location of the fence on the plan. She said the Board can continue the hearing until July 21 to give Mr. Simpson time to update the plan. Mr. Simpson requested a continuance until the Board's meeting on July 21. Chair Pinkham said the applicant may want to talk to the Building Commissioner about the height of the fence. Mr. Simpson said he has been to the Building Dept. about 15 times. He said he talked about the fence with Commissioner Quinn. He said it is going to be an 6-foot fence and the top of the fence will be level but the road is sloped. Motion made by Member Parrish and seconded by Member Clancy to grant the request for a continuance until the Board's meeting on July 21; all in favor, 5-0.

4. **Maria Lavallee and Cameron Daniel, 2 Eastern Avenue, Woburn MA, 01801, Petitioners and Landowners, seeking a Variance from Section 5.3.2 of the 1985 Woburn Zoning Ordinances, as amended, for fence higher than 3 feet within the 25-foot front yard setback at 2 Eastern Avenue, Woburn, MA:** Mr. Daniel said they would like to build a 4.5-foot high scalloped fence that will not impede visibility. He said the shape of the lot is unique and they cannot comply with the zoning ordinance because they do not have a lot of area in their rear yard. He said there are significant safety concerns due to their proximity to Montvale Avenue. He said there is a lot of foot traffic going to Woburn High School and a bus stop. He said would like to submit a letter with signatures from five neighbors who are in support of the fence. He said no one is objecting to the fence. He said the fence will have an open picket design. He said one of his neighbors has a 5-foot vinyl fence. He said the hardship is the shape of the lot. Chair Pinkham asked the applicants if they have any dimensions for the fence. Mr. Daniel said they have a quote from the fence company that shows the length of one section of the fence will be 48 feet, with a gate, and another section that is 8 feet and another section of fence that will be 14 feet to the edge of the house. Ms. Lavallee said Exhibit 3 shows the dimensions of the fence. Chair Pinkham sad she does not think the paperwork from the fence company is going to be sufficient. She asked if the fence is going all the way back

to the house. Mr. Daniel answered affirmatively. Member Ryan asked if the fence on the property boundary to the left is owned by the applicants of the neighbor. Mr. Daniel said that is a 5-foot fence that is owned by the neighbor. Member Ryan asked if there is a fence across the street. Mr. Daniel said there is a 5-foot fence across the street. Chair Pinkham asked if either fence was permitted. Mr. Daniel said he does not believe there was a permit issued for the fence next door. Chair Pinkham said the aerial photo appears to show a dumpster. Mr. Daniel said they moved in in March and he is not aware of a dumpster. Member Ryan asked if the applicants know the height of the fence at the property at the corner of Montvale Avenue. Mr. Daniel said there is another house on the corner. He said they closed on the house in December and moved in in March. Member Parrish said the neighbors' fence appears to have been there since 2017. Mr. Daniel said he cannot speak to that. Chair Pinkham asked if anyone in the audience wished the address the Board in regard to the petition. There were no respondents. Member Parrish said he prefers to see fences likes the ones the applicants are proposing rather than a 6-foot block fence. He said he will support this with the qualification the applicants are proposing a 4.5-foot high white vinyl picket fence. He said he does think the Board is going to have to ask for a continuance so the petitioners can indicate where the fence is going. Ms. Lavallee said she does not think there is a risk of the fence being located on city property or anyone else's property. Member Parrish said the Board likes to see the location of the fence on a plot plan. Chair Pinkham asked the applicants if they would like to request a continuance. The applicants answered affirmatively. Motion made by Member Parrish and seconded by Member Chatfield to continue the matter until the Board's meeting on July 21, 2026; all in favor, 5-0.

5. **James M. Gallagher, 11 Lillian Street, Woburn MA, 01801, Petitioner and Landowner, seeking a Special Permit from Section 7.3 of the 1985 Woburn Zoning Ordinances, as amended, for an addition to a single-family home at 11 Lillian Street, Woburn, MA:** Representing the applicants was John Andrews, JFA Design Group, 81 Burpee Road, Swampscott, MA. Mr. Andrews said the applicants own a single-family home with about 1,500-square-feet of living space with four bedrooms and are proposing two small additions on the front of the property and another on the rear to square off the house. He said the applicants are looking for more space and the expansion of the bedrooms. He said it will be a regular foundation and they will not be increasing the basement space. Chair Pinkham asked what is in the existing basement. Mr. Andrews said there is no living space. Chair Pinkham asked if there are two kitchens. Mr. Andrews said there is only one kitchen. Chair Pinkham said sheet A-1 of the building plans shows an area mislabeled as a kitchen, and that is why she asked. She asked if there is a bulkhead. Mr. Andrews said there is a door that you can walk in and out of. Chair Pinkham said it looks like there are two French doors. Mr. Andrews said the doors aren't shown on the plan. Chair Pinkham asked if the doors connect to the basement. Mr. Andrews answered affirmatively. Chair Pinkham said she does not have any concerns about the proposed addition. She said it is unfortunate the applicants had to come here for such a small addition. Member Chatfield asked if two cars can fit in the Lillian Street driveway. Mr. Andrews answered affirmatively. Chair Pinkham asked if there is a bedroom being added upstairs. Mr. Andrews said there is not. Member Chatfield said it appears the house is going to have four bedrooms and two bathrooms and asked if one of the bedrooms is

going to be used as an office. James Gallagher answered affirmatively. Member Parrish asked if the house will remain a single-family home. Mr. Andrews answered affirmatively. Chair 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 Chatfield to grant the special permit; all in favor, 5-0.

6. **Approval of minutes from meeting of May 20, 2026:** Chair Pinkham said. Motion made by Member Parrish and seconded by Member Clancy to approve the minutes of the meeting of May 20, 2026, as presented; all in favor, 5-0.

7. **Any other matters that may be legally before the Board:** None

8. **Motion** made by Member Clancy and seconded by Member Ryan to adjourn; all in favor, 5-0. Chair Pinkham adjourned the meeting at 8:07 p.m.

ATTEST:

_____

Gordon Vincent
Clerk of the Zoning Board of Appeals