

**MINUTES OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS OF THE CITY OF WORCESTER**

**NOVEMBER 27, 2006  
WORCESTER PUBLIC LIBRARY, 2 SALEM SQUARE, SAXE ROOM**

**Zoning Board Members Present:** Leonard Ciuffredo, Chair  
Morris Bergman, Vice-Chair  
Jerry Horton  
Matthew Armendo  
David George  
Andrew Freilich

**Staff Present:** Joseph Mikielian, Department of Code Enforcement  
Joel Fontane, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services  
Edgar Luna, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services

**REGULAR MEETING (5:30 PM)**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Ciuffredo called the meeting to order at 5:30 PM.

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

Upon a motion by Matthew Armendo and seconded by Morris Bergman, it was voted 5-0 by Leonard Ciuffredo, Morris Bergman, Jerry Horton, Matthew Armendo, and David George to continue the approval of the October 30, 2006 and November 13, 2006 minutes until December 18, 2006.

**REQUESTS FOR WITHDRAWAL**

1. **23 Lorenzo Street (Z-06-184) – Special Permit:** Mr. Luna informed the Board that Joe Boynton, representative for Peter DeProspero, Pamela DeProspero and Ronald DeProspero, had sent a letter requesting a continuation of the hearing until December 18, 2006 to allow him time to provide additional information. Matthew Armendo recused himself. Upon a motion by Jerry Horton and seconded by Morris Bergman, it was voted 5-0 by Leonard Ciuffredo, Morris Bergman, Jerry Horton, David George, and Andrew Freilich to continue the hearing until December 18, 2006.
2. **653 Main Street/5 Madison Street (Z-06-190) – Variances and Special Permits:** Mr. Luna informed the Board that David Rodriguez Pinzon, representative for Hadley Apartments, LLC, had sent a letter requesting the Board to allow his clients to Leave to Withdraw Without Prejudice regarding this petition. Upon a motion by Jerry Horton and seconded by Matthew Armendo, it was voted 5-0 by Leonard Ciuffredo, Morris Bergman, Jerry Horton, Matthew Armendo, and Andrew Freilich to grant the applicant Leave to Withdraw Without Prejudice.

3. **17 Grandview Avenue (Z-06-186) – Variance:** Mr. Luna informed that Board that Rosemary Danso, petitioner, had sent a letter requesting a continuation of the hearing until January 22, 2007 to allow her time to provide additional information, and requesting an extension of time for constructive grant until January 23, 2007. Upon a motion by Jerry Horton and seconded by Morris Bergman, it was voted 5-0 by Leonard Ciuffredo, Morris Bergman, Jerry Horton, Matthew Armendo, and David George to continue the hearing until January 22, 2007.

### **UNFINISHED BUSSINES**

4. **44 Byron Street (Z-06-141) – Special Permit:** Mr. Luna informed the Board that Jennifer Lougee, representative for Fiber Tower Corporation, had sent a letter requesting a continuation of the hearing until December 18, 2006. In addition, Mr. Luna stated that on November 22, 2006, he had received an email from Ms. Lougee stating that she had contacted the City Attorney to get a better understanding of what the Board was looking for in terms of providing alternative plans to camouflage the proposed antenna. Mr. George stated that at the opening of the hearing on September 11, 2006, the Board requested Ms. Lougee to provide the following by September 25, 2006: (1) a Radiation Emissions Report, specifically indicating the current ambient radiation levels along with the incremental increase by the proposed facility, and (2) alternative plans to camouflage the proposed antenna, and she agreed to provide it. In addition, he stated that at the time of the request, Ms. Lougee did not indicate that the request was unclear or unattainable. Mr. Armendo stated that the information requested was necessary in order to render an appropriate decision on this petition. He indicated that the Board had already allowed Ms. Lougee sufficient time, and provided clear instructions regarding the information requested. Mr. George stated that while the Zoning Ordinance clearly states the requirements for cell towers, the petitioner failed to provide them along with the petition as required; therefore, he asked the Board not to grant the petitioner's request for another continuation. Upon a motion by Matthew Armendo and seconded by Morris Bergman, the Board voted 5-0 to close the hearing. Upon a motion by Matthew Armendo and seconded by Morris Bergman, it was voted 0-5 by Leonard Ciuffredo, Morris Bergman, Jerry Horton, Matthew Armendo, and Andrew Freilich to approve the Special Permit to allow a personal wireless service facility in a RG-5 zone. The motion failed, therefore, the petition was denied.

Upon a motion by Matthew Armendo and seconded by Morris Bergman, it was voted 2-3 by Jerry Horton and Morris Bergman (Leonard Ciuffredo, Matthew Armendo, and Andrew Freilich voting against) to reconsider the motion. The motion failed, therefore, the reconsideration was denied.

5. **611 Millbury Street/1 Maxwell Street (Z-06-154) – Variance and Special Permit:** Michael O'Rourke, petitioner, presented the petition. Mr. O'Rourke stated that he was seeking a Variance for relief of four (4) parking spaces from the off-street parking requirement, and a Special Permit for the expansion or change of a pre-existing, nonconforming use/structure for the purpose of converting the commercial space in Building #1 into two residential units and expand the rear porch. Mr. George stated that while the Floor Plan recently provided showed the lay out of the proposed residential units, it failed to show the dimensions of the lot, the four (4) off-street parking spaces on site, and the on-street parking spaces in the immediate vicinity. Therefore, he asked that the hearing be continued to allow the petitioner time to provide such information. He

also requested that the Board extend the constructive grant deadline for the Variance until January 24, 2007. Upon a motion by Jerry Horton and seconded by Morris Bergman, it was voted 5-0 by Leonard Ciuffredo, Morris Bergman, Jerry Horton, Matthew Armendo, and David George to continue the hearing until December 18, 2006 to allow the petitioner additional time to submit the information requested and to extend the constructive grant deadline for the Variance until January 24, 2007.

6. **94 Sachem Avenue (Z-06-176) – Variance:** Patricia Gates, representative for Stanley Harackiewicz and Rita Petrosino, petitioners, presented the petition. Ms. Gates stated that the petitioners had decided to withdraw their petition. Therefore, she asked the Board to allow her clients Leave to Withdraw Without Prejudice. Upon a motion by Matthew Armendo and seconded by Jerry Horton, it was voted 5-0 by Leonard Ciuffredo, Morris Bergman, Jerry Horton, Matthew Armendo, and David George to grant the petitioner Leave to Withdraw Without Prejudice.
  
7. **91 Stafford Street (Z-06-185) – Variance:** John Riel, representative, and Mansour Gaval, petitioner, presented the petition. Mr. Riel stated that the petitioner was seeking a Variance for relief of 76 parking spaces from the off-street parking requirement for the purpose of leasing 22,664 square feet of additional retail space. Mr. Bergman asked Mr. Riel to inform the Board the amount spent renovating the structures located on site. Mr. Riel stated that to date, the petitioner had spent over \$300,000 on improvements, renovations and maintenance the buildings on site. Mr. Bergman stated that the renovated buildings enhance the neighborhood and contribute to the economic development of the businesses located along Stafford Street. Chair Ciuffredo read a letter from the Department of Public Works expressing concern that the Variance requested would exacerbate on-street parking on Stafford Street, which they identified as being one of the main traffic thoroughfares in the City. In addition, the letter stated that since on-street parking is significantly limited in this area, patrons of the proposed project may use the Webster Square Plaza parking lot, which would compel them to cross 44 feet of road way (or 3-4 lanes of heavy traffic), thus increasing the potential for pedestrian accidents in this area. Mr. Freilich asked Mr. Gaval to inform the Board if he was aware of the parking limitations when he purchased the building, and the date of purchase. Mr. Gaval acknowledged that he was aware of the parking limitations at the time of purchase, which occurred in 2003. Mr. Freilich expressed concern that the petitioner seemed to have renovated the building without considering the parking limitations of the site, and the parking requirements of commercial uses. In addition, Mr. Freilich stated that the parking relief requested would negatively impact other businesses in the area. Mr. Armendo stated that the site plan submitted was unclear because it did not indicate the space allocated to other uses located on site, which he considers important in order to render a decision on the petition. Therefore, he asked the Board to consider continuing the hearing to allow the applicant time to provide a table that indicates the area of each floor of every building on site along with all current and proposed uses. Chair Ciuffredo stated that in addition to the information requested by Mr. Armendo, the petitioner would need to make efforts to locate available parking on lease in the surrounding area. Mr. Freilich asked Mr. Gaval if he had potential tenants for the proposed space. Mr. Gaval stated that he had two potential tenants: a take-out restaurant, and a cell phone company. However, he indicated that the lease agreement depended upon the Variance being approved. Mr. Riel asked the Board to consider a continuation of the hearing until January 22, 2007 to allow the petitioner time to provide the

information requested. Upon a motion by Matthew Armendo and seconded by Morris Bergman, it was voted 5-0 by Leonard Ciuffredo, Morris Bergman, Jerry Horton, Matthew Armendo, and Andrew Freilich to continue the hearing until January 22, 2007.

8. **26 Hancock Street (Z-06-188) – Variance:** Douglas Scott, representative for William Randall, petitioner, presented the petition. Mr. Scott stated that the petitioner was seeking a Variance for relief of 1,192 square feet from the gross dimensional requirement for the purpose of constructing a single-family detached dwelling on site. Mr. Freilich expressed concern that the site plan attached to the application was hand-drawn, not to scale, and lacked important information such as setbacks and dimensional requirements for the proposed structure. In addition, he stated that such information was needed prior to rendering a decision on the petition. Mr. Bergman stated that in addition to providing an appropriate site plan to scale, the petitioner should include frontal, side and rear elevations to ensure that the proposed structure fits harmoniously in the neighborhood. Mr. Horton stated that while the proposed use seemed appropriate for the parcel, the petition submitted was lacking important information, which would be needed in order to render an appropriate decision on the petition. Mr. Scott stated that the petitioner would need additional time in order to provide the information requested by the Board. Therefore, he asked the Board to consider continuing the hearing until January 22, 2007 to allow the petitioner time to provide the information requested. Upon a motion by Matthew Armendo and seconded by Morris Bergman, it was voted 5-0 by Leonard Ciuffredo, Morris Bergman, Jerry Horton, Matthew Armendo, and Andrew Freilich to continue the hearing until January 22, 2007.
  
9. **104 Lamartine Street (Z-06-192A) – Special Permit:** Anthony Salvidio, representative for Goldstein Properties, LLC, petitioner, presented the petition. Mr. Salvidio stated that the petitioner was seeking a Special Permit for the expansion or change of a pre-existing, nonconforming use/structure for the purpose of operating a metal recycling facility with open lot storage within containers in an MG-2.0 (Manufacturing, General) zone. In addition, Mr. Salvidio stated that the business is family-owned and operated, and is one of the oldest enterprises still operating in Worcester. Mr. Salvidio also indicated that the proposed use is the most appropriate use for the land, and would add to the economic development of the industrial businesses that exist in the surrounding area. Mr. Salvidio stated that while the building has remained unoccupied for almost 2 years, it does not need to be altered except for minor exterior improvements. He also indicated that all the work would be performed indoors. Mr. Fontane stated that the administration recommends approval of the Special Permit because it is compatible with the other manufacturing uses in the area, and also because moving this business from Harding Street facilitates the desired redevelopment of the Union Station area. Upon a motion by Jerry Horton and seconded by Matthew Armendo, the Board voted 5-0 to close the hearing. Upon a motion by Thomas Hannigan and seconded by Morris Bergman, it was voted 5-0 by Leonard Ciuffredo, Jerry Horton, Matthew Armendo, Morris Bergman, and Andrew Freilich to approve the following:

- **Special Permit: Expansion or Change of a Pre-Existing, Nonconforming Use/Structure.**

**10. 51 Vernon Street (Z-06-194): Variance and Special Permit:** Michael Mercier, petitioner, presented the petition. Mr. Mercier stated that he was seeking a Variance for relief of two (2) parking spaces from the off-street parking requirement, and a Special Permit for the expansion or change of a pre-existing, nonconforming use/structure for the purpose of operating a retail clothing store. Mr. Mercier stated that while the neighborhood would benefit from having a retail clothing store in their immediate vicinity, the proposed business would also enhance economic development in the area. Mr. Luna informed the Board that while the petitioner had requested a Variance for relief of two (2) parking spaces from the off-street parking requirement, but only one (1) parking space was needed because the square footage of the proposed retail space was 260 square feet. Genevieve Tole expressed concern regarding traffic and parking limitations in the neighborhood. Sister Mary Thomas Senckowski expressed concern regarding traffic accidents caused by limited parking in the area. Anne Fedyk expressed concern regarding traffic and vehicular accidents in the area. Mr. Bergman stated that changing the proposed use to housing uses would be a better use of the parcel. Mr. Mercier stated that while he agreed with Mr. Bergman's opinion, the proposed retail space was limited in size and therefore not suitable for dwelling uses. Mr. Bergman asked the petitioner if he would consider continuing the meeting to another date to address neighbor's concerns. Mr. Mercier stated that he would, however, Sister Senckowski stated that the neighbors were not be interested in discussing their concerns with the petitioner because they were opposed to any further commercial development in the neighborhood. Chair Ciuffredo asked Mr. Mercier to inform the Board the proposed hours of operation. Mr. Mercier indicated that the proposed hours of operation were 10:00 am to 5:00 pm Monday through Saturday. Upon a motion by Jerry Horton and seconded by Matthew Armendo, the Board voted 5-0 to close the hearing. Upon a motion by Jerry Horton and seconded by Matthew Armendo, it was voted 5-0 by Leonard Ciuffredo, Morris Bergman, Jerry Horton, Matthew Armendo, and Andrew Freilich to approve the following:

- **Variance: Relief of One (1) Parking Space from the Off-Street Parking Requirement.**
- **Special Permit: Expansion or Change of a Pre-Existing, Nonconforming use/Structure.**

**11. 107 Water Street (Z-06-195) – Variance and Special Permit:** Robert Arakelian, petitioner, and Arthur Mooradian, property owner, presented the petition. Mr. Arakelian stated that he was seeking a Variance for relief of 65 parking spaces from the off-street parking requirement, and a Special Permit for the expansion or change of a pre-existing, nonconforming use/structure for the purpose of redeveloping the property into a 130-person occupancy lounge/nightclub. In addition, Mr. Arakelian stated that the previous use was a retail store. Mr. George asked Mr. Arakelian if he had made efforts to locate parking for lease in the area. Mr. Arakelian stated that while he had searched the surrounding area for parking for lease, he had not been successful at finding any. In addition, he stated that the few parking areas available in the neighborhood were already leased to other businesses in the neighborhood. Mr. Freilich asked the petitioner the proposed hours of operation. Mr. Arakelian stated that the proposed hours of operation are 8:00 pm to 2:00 am. Mr. Armendo asked the petitioner if he had considered valet-parking for the proposed use. Mr. Arakelian stated that while valet-parking had been considered, he did not pursue this option because the

neighborhood did not have parking lots for lease to support this option. Mr. Armendo stated that while the petitioner had made efforts to find parking areas in the immediate vicinity, he had not demonstrated his efforts in approaching privately-owned parking lots in the area. Therefore, he asked the Board to consider continuing the hearing to allow the petitioner additional time to provide such information. Mr. Arakelian acknowledged the concerns of the Board, and asked a continuation of the hearing until January 8, 2007 to allow him time to provide the information requested. Upon a motion by Matthew Armendo and seconded by Morris Bergman, it was voted 5-0 by Leonard Ciuffredo, Morris Bergman, Jerry Horton, Matthew Armendo, and Andrew Freilich to continue the hearing until January 8, 2007.

**12. 31 Indian Lake Parkway (Z-06-106) – Variances and Special Permit:** Keith and Lynda Roberts, petitioners, presented the petition. Mr. Roberts stated that they were seeking a Variance for relief of two (2) feet from the front yard setback requirement, a Variance to allow parking within the front yard setback, and a Special Permit for the expansion or change of a pre-existing, nonconforming use/structure for the purpose of cutting the curb on the property, replacing the cement sidewalk, and adding blacktop for a 47 by 16 feet parking area. Mr. Mikielian expressed concern with the width of the proposed driveway, and indicated that the petitioners should consider reconfiguring the proposed parking arrangement, in accordance with the standard parking dimensional requirements of 9 x 18 feet per vehicle. Mr. Roberts acknowledged the concerns of Mr. Mikielian, and indicated that he would like to have an opportunity to revise his proposed project in accordance to statements of Mr. Mikielian; therefore, he asked the Board to consider continuing the hearing until January 8, 2007. Upon a motion by Matthew Armendo and seconded by Morris Bergman, it was voted 5-0 by Leonard Ciuffredo, Morris Bergman, Jerry Horton, Matthew Armendo, and David George to continue the hearing until January 8, 2007.

**13. 40 Coral Street (Z-06-197) – Variances:** James Vevone, representative for Oak Hill Community Development Corporation, petitioner, presented the petition. Mr. Vevone stated that the petitioners were seeking a Variance for relief of nine (9) feet from the frontage requirement, a Variance for relief of 1,554 square feet from the gross dimensional requirement, and a Variance for relief of three (3) feet from the exterior side yard setback requirement for the purpose of constructing a two-family semi-detached dwelling structure on the premises. In addition, Mr. Vevone stated that the proposed structure would improve the physical characteristics of the neighborhood by providing an attractively designed building on vacant land. Mr. Armendo asked Mr. Vevone to inform the Board the reason the petitioner has been constructing duplexes in the area, instead of single-family detached dwellings. Mr. Vevone indicated that the overriding objective of the petitioner is to encourage home ownership for moderate and low-income families in the neighborhood. Consequently, while single-family detached dwellings may be more desirable, a duplex is more effective in that it allows two families to have homes on one lot that may have been previously occupied by only one family. Mr. Bergman expressed concern that the proposed architectural features did not coincide with the traditional architectural features of the neighborhood, and encouraged the petitioner to be proactive in duplicating the traditional architectural features of the neighborhood in the future. Chair Ciuffredo stated that the petitioner should include frontal and side elevations on any proposed residential dwellings in the neighborhood. Mr. Armendo stated that the proposed design would not fit harmoniously

in the neighborhood, and asked the petitioner to consider duplicating the architectural features of the neighborhood when designing residential structures in the area. Mr. Horton stated that while he supports the efforts of the petitioner to provide new housing units for moderate and low-income families in the neighborhood, it should not be done by relying on the Board to grant dimensional relief each time. In addition, he stated that the petitioner had not demonstrated hardship for the proposed project to justify approving the Variances requested because the proposed site more closely meets the required gross dimensional area for a single-family detached dwelling. Upon a motion by Morris Bergman and seconded by Matthew Armendo, it was voted 3-2 by Leonard Ciuffredo, Morris Bergman, and Andrew Freilich (Jerry Horton and Matthew Armendo voting against) to approve. Therefore, the motion failed and the Variances were denied.

**14. 9 Imperial Road (Z-06-198) – Variance:** Patricia Gates, representative for John Schofield, petitioner, presented the petition. Ms. Gates stated that the petitioner was seeking a Variance for relief of three (3) feet from the side yard setback requirement for the purpose of continuing construction of a two-family detached dwelling on the premises. In addition, she stated that the petitioner had been informed that the requested Variance was needed for the proposed stairs/deck while constructing the two-family detached dwelling. She also stated that the proposed structure was near completion, and indicated that the petitioner had built it in accordance with the architectural characteristics of the neighborhood. Upon a motion by Morris Bergman and seconded by Matthew Armendo, the Board voted 5-0 to close the hearing. Upon a motion by Morris Bergman and seconded by Matthew Armendo, it was voted 5-0 by Leonard Ciuffredo, Morris Bergman, Jerry Horton, Matthew Armendo, and David George to approve the following:

- **Variance: Relief of three (3) Feet from the Side yard Setback Requirement.**

The approval carries the following condition:

- **The applicant must submit a revised floor plan showing the proposed stairs/deck with dimensions, and a complete set of the Site Plans used for the proposed structure.**

**15. 722 Plantation Street (Z-06-199) – Special Permit:** Kevin Quinn, representative for David Russell, petitioner, presented the petition. Mr. Quinn stated that the petitioner was seeking a Special Permit for the expansion or change of a pre-existing, nonconforming use/structure for the purpose of restoring the building on site and reconfiguring the parking area to accommodate delivery trucks. In addition, Mr. Quinn stated that the petitioner was proposing to use 8,000 square feet of the 16,000 square feet building on the premises for warehousing general grocery products such as canned fruits, pasta, and paper towels, and would rent 8,000 square feet to another tenant. Mr. Quinn also stated that the proposed project would have four to six truck deliveries per month, and indicated that seven new jobs would be created. Christine Toomey expressed concern that the proposed project could exacerbate the traffic problems and parking limitations in the area. Mr. Quinn stated that the proposed project would provide off-street parking; therefore, the area would have less parking problems than previously. Chair Ciuffredo asked Mr. Quinn to inform the Board the estimated investment on the parcel

for the proposed use. Mr. Quinn stated that the projected investment was \$700,000.00 to \$800,000.00. Upon a motion by Morris Bergman and seconded by Jerry Horton, the Board voted 5-0 to close the hearing. Upon a motion by Morris Bergman and seconded by Jerry Horton, it was voted 5-0 by Leonard Ciuffredo, Morris Bergman, Jerry Horton, Matthew Armendo, and Andrew Freilich to approve the following:

- **Special Permit: Expansion or Change of a Pre-Existing, Nonconforming Use/Structure.**

The approval carries the following condition:

- **The proposed project must meet Department of Public Work standards for GP-2 - Water Resources Protection Overlay District.**

**16. 21-23 Osceola Avenue (Z-06-200) – Variance:** Nicholas Grande, petitioner, presented the petition. Mr. Grande stated that he was seeking a Variance for relief of 500 square feet from the gross dimensional requirement for the purpose of dividing the two-family structure on site into two single-family semi-detached dwelling units (duplex). Mr. Fontane stated that in order to meet the definition of a duplex, the structure would need to have separate entrances, a party/fire wall from the ground to the roof, and be located on two separate lots. In addition, Mr. Fontane stated that the shed shown on the site plan was a nonconforming accessory structure; therefore, it would need to be relocated or removed from site. Mr. Grande stated that there will be two separate entrances, and indicated that the shed would be removed. Mr. Horton stated that the petitioner had not demonstrated hardship regarding this petition and asked the Board to consider continuing the hearing to provide the petitioner time to submit such information. Mr. Grande asked the Board to consider continuing the hearing to January 22, 2007 allow him time to review the proposed project. Upon a motion by Matthew Armendo and seconded by David George, it was voted 5-0 by Leonard Ciuffredo, Morris Bergman, Jerry Horton, Matthew Armendo, and David George to continue the hearing to January 22, 2007.

**17. 12 Rockwood Avenue (Z-06-201) – Variances:** Michelle Nietsche, petitioner, presented the petition. Ms. Nietsche stated that she had recently purchased the property and was seeking a Variance for relief of five (5) feet from the frontage requirement for the purpose of dividing the lot to create two lots. In addition, Ms. Nietsche stated that when she submitted the petition, she had also requested a Variance for relief of 500 square feet from the gross dimensional requirement in error, which is not needed because the proposed lots would have sufficient area. Mr. Armendo stated that Ms. Nietsche was in effect creating her own hardship by the proposing to divide the lot as petitioned and asked her to reconsider the Variance requested. Mr. Bergman asked Ms. Nietsche if she had considered dividing the lot prior to purchasing it. Ms. Nietsche acknowledged that she had purchased the lot with the intent of dividing it because her realtor had assured her that the lot could be divided into two lots. Ms. Nietsche asked the Board to consider continuing the hearing until January 22, 2007 to allow her time to review the petition and provide the Board with additional information. Upon a motion by Matthew Armendo and seconded by Morris Bergman, it was voted 5-0 by

Leonard Ciuffredo, Morris Bergman, Jerry Horton, Matthew Armendo, and Andrew Freilich to continue the hearing until January 22, 2007.

**18. 22-24 Russell Street (Z-06-202) – Variance and Special Permit:** Edward Hawes, petitioner, presented the petition. Mr. Hawes stated that he was seeking a Variance for relief of 1 foot and 5 inches from the side yard setback requirement, and a Special Permit for the expansion or change of a pre-existing, nonconforming use/structure for the purpose of adding an access/egress for the third floor apartment located on the premises to comply with Building Code. In addition, Mr. Hawes stated that the structure was built in 1890, and is registered in the Massachusetts Register of Historic Places; therefore, the proposed project was also reviewed and approved by the Worcester Historical Commission on October 26, 2006. Mr. Bergman asked Mr. Hawes to inform the Board if the Worcester Historical Commission had recommended the use of architectural details appropriate to the period of construction to maintain its historic integrity and significance. Mr. Hawes stated that the Commission recommended the use of architectural details appropriate to the period of the house, and indicated that he was planning to implement such recommendation. Upon a motion by Morris Bergman and seconded by Jerry Horton, the Board voted 5-0 to close the hearing. Upon a motion by Jerry Horton and seconded by David George, it was voted 5-0 by Leonard Ciuffredo, Morris Bergman, Jerry Horton, Matthew Armendo, and David George to approve the following:

- **Variance: Relief of 1 Foot, 5 Inches from the Side Yard Setback Requirement.**
- **Special Permit: Expansion or Change of a Pre-Existing, Nonconforming Use/Structure.**

**ADJOURNMENT:** Chair Ciuffredo adjourned the meeting at 10:00 PM.