

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

MARCH 26, 2007

WORCESTER PUBLIC LIBRARY, 2 SALEM SQUARE, SAXE ROOM

Zoning Board Members Present: Leonard Ciuffredo, Chair
Morris Bergman, Vice-Chair
Matthew Armendo
David George
Andrew Freilich
Lawrence Abramoff

Staff Present: John Kelly, Department of Code Enforcement
Robin Bartness, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services
Lara Bold, 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 Lawrence Abramoff, the Board voted 5-0 to approve the February 26, 2007 and March 12, 2007 minutes.

REQUESTS FOR CONTINUANCE

- 1. 631-635 Lincoln Street (Z-07-22) – Special Permit and Variances:** Ms. Bartness stated that a letter had been submitted requesting a continuance. She stated that the item must be re-advertised in order to include an additional request for relief, specifically a Special Permit to allow a professional office in an RG-5 zone that was inadvertently left out of the original ad. Upon a motion by Matthew Armendo and seconded by David George it was voted 5-0 by Leonard Ciuffredo, Morris Bergman, Matthew Armendo, David George and Andrew Freilich to continue the hearing to the April 9, 2007 meeting to allow staff sufficient time to re-advertise the petition.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- 2. 334 Lake Avenue North (Z-07-13) –Special Permit and Variances:** Kevin Quinn, representative for the petitioner, presented the petition. Mr. Quinn stated that the petitioner requested a Special Permit for expansion or change of a pre-existing, non-conforming structure and the following Variances: 1,937 square feet of relief from the gross dimensional requirement, 6 feet, 6 inches of relief from the frontage requirement, 17 feet, 3 inches of relief from the front

yard setback requirement, 4 feet, 4 inches of relief from the side yard setback requirement, and relief of 1 parking space from off-street parking requirements in order to remove the existing single-family detached dwelling and shed and reconstruct a new single-family detached dwelling with a smaller footprint. He also informed the Board that several of the neighbors had met with Mark Pascal, the builder, since the last Zoning Board of Appeals meeting. He additionally informed the Board that there was a note on the submitted rendering which incorrectly stated that the rendering was not an accurate depiction. He stated that the submitted rendering is an accurate depiction of what will be built and that the note has been removed from the revised plan. Chair Ciuffredo asked for clarification on the parking situation in the area. Mr. Quinn stated that the site will provide a one-car garage. Additionally, he stated that there are two additional spaces within a City of Worcester right-of-way that are currently accessible for parking but do not meet off-street parking requirements. Mr. Armendo inquired about the proposed change in square footage. Mr. Quinn stated that the current building is 2,323 square feet, including the basement and garage, and that the proposed building will be 2,798 square feet, including the basement, garage, and second floor which will result in a net increase in square footage of 475 square feet. He also stated that the current footprint of the building is 1,841 square feet while the proposed footprint will be reduced to 1,719 square feet. Mr. Abramoff inquired about the existing shed. Mr. Quinn indicated that the shed would be removed.

Shawnie Lavoy stated that she did not have any problems with the proposed building but was concerned about a tree between the two properties that she felt was in danger of falling onto her house. Mr. Quinn indicated that the petitioner would remove all trees along the property line.

Brian Pehl asked if the proposed house would have three bedrooms. Mr. Quinn stated that the application states that the petitioner is proposing a three-bedroom house but that initially it will be built as a one-bedroom house for the petitioner's mother-in-law with an unfinished second floor. Mr. Pehl also stated that he disagreed with the current square footage of the house stating that he felt it was closer to 1,450 square feet. He also expressed concern that the proposed basement area, shown on the plan as a utility room, could accommodate additional bedrooms. In addition, he expressed concern with possible future parking issues and stated that while the existing house was built prior to current zoning regulations that the proposed reconstruction of the house could fit within current setback requirements. He also stated that the proposed structure will have a large straight 50-foot long wall with no jogs or other features to break up the length. Mr. Quinn stated that the site is a challenging one, specifically because of grading issues and the 32-foot slope differential on the lot. He also stated that the lot is narrow and that the heavy equipment required to reconstruct the home will add significant cost to the project and that adding an additional jog to the house would make it financially difficult to build the house.

Mr. George asked why the house could not be re-built within the existing footprint. Mr. Quinn stated that the proposed footprint is smaller and that they sought to move the proposed house away from the side yard lot lines to give both the petitioner and the abutting properties additional space between the houses. He also stated that if the house was built within current setback requirements that 16-feet in width would be lost and that adding onto the rear of the house would be extremely difficult due to the slope and conservation issues. Ms. Lavoy asked if a fence would be added to her side of the property. Ms. Bartness stated that the Planning Board's

condition of approval stated that a fence must be placed only on the southerly property line, which does not abut Ms. Lavoy's property.

Mr. Bergman asked how the proposed setbacks compare with other setbacks in the neighborhood. Mr. Quinn stated that many of the houses along Lake Avenue are on very dense lots.

Chair Ciuffredo indicated that the petition was a reasonable request. He also asked Mr. Quinn to clarify how much side yard setback is requested for each side of the lot. Mr. Quinn indicated that 4 feet, 4 inches had been requested for both sides; however, only 3 feet, 4 inches of relief is necessary for the southerly side yard abutting the Pehls' property.

Mr. Freilich asked if the petitioner would be amenable to a condition that the basement area not be used for bedrooms. Mr. Sutman indicated that he is not planning on selling the house right now but using it for his mother-in-law and that he would be amenable to the condition.

Upon a motion by David George and seconded by Matthew Armendo, it was voted 5-0 by Leonard Ciuffredo, Matthew Armendo, David George, Lawrence Abramoff, and Andrew Freilich to close the hearing. Upon a motion by David George and seconded by Lawrence Abramoff, it was voted 5-0 by Leonard Ciuffredo, Matthew Armendo, David George, Lawrence Abramoff, and Andrew Freilich to approve the following:

- **Special Permit: for expansion or change of a pre-existing nonconforming use/structure**
- **Variance: 1,937 square feet of relief from the gross dimensional requirement**
- **Variance: 6 feet, 6 inches of relief from the frontage requirement**
- **Variance: 17 feet, 3 inches from the front yard setback requirement**
- **Variance: 4 feet, 4 inches from the side yard setback requirement on the northern lot line**
- **Variance: 3 feet, 4 inches from the side yard setback requirement on the southern lot line**
- **Variance: Relief of one (1) parking space from the off-street parking requirement**

The Special Permit and Variances were approved with the following conditions:

- **No additional bedrooms may be built in the lower level currently called the utility room.**
- **All trees must be removed from the northerly lot line.**
- **Dwelling must be constructed in accordance with the final revised Definitive Site Plan approved by the Planning Board.**
- **Dwelling must be constructed in accordance with the submitted rendering.**

3. **1021 Southbridge Street (Z-07-20) - Special Permit:** Ms. Bartness stated that Kate Rugman, representative for the petitioner, had submitted a letter to the Chair, dated March 23, 2007, requesting a continuance in order to address issues staff had found with the petition. Mr. George

asked why a crane test was not being done. Ms. Bartness stated that crane tests are generally only done for free-standing wireless facilities. Chair Ciuffredo requested that the petitioner provide a one-page spreadsheet showing the requirements for the wireless facility and how every request is being met or not being met. Mr. George asked for clarification if the existing wireless facility is an AT& T facility and requested that the petitioner provide the required City-wide map showing the other existing wireless facilities in the City as required by the Zoning Ordinance. Upon a motion by Morris Bergman and seconded by David George, it was voted 4-1 by Leonard Ciuffredo, Morris Bergman, David George, and Lawrence Abramoff (Matthew Armendo voted no) to continue the hearing at the request of the petitioner to the April 23, 2007 meeting.

4. **57 Humes Street (Z-07-09) – Variances:** George Russell, petitioner, presented the petition. Mr. Russell stated that the petitioner requested a Variance for 15 feet of relief from the frontage requirement and 2,000 square feet of relief from the gross dimensional requirement in order to construct a single-family detached dwelling with a two-car garage. Mr. Russell stated that in order to meet the Board’s request to not have the side of the house facing Humes Street, the building was reconfigured and downsized from the previously proposed 28-foot by 48-foot structure to a 33-foot by 41-foot structure so that the front door would face the street. Mr. George inquired if this lot was divided through the ANR process. Ms. Bartness stated that this lot could not have been created through an ANR because it does not have the required frontage for a single-family dwelling. Gladys Maldonado stated that she and her husband are currently selling their house and that she is concerned with how the structure will affect access to their lot and marketability of their house. Mr. Russell indicated that he could provide a fence on the lot and could relocate the existing driveway. Mr. Bergman asked if Ms. Maldonado used Yukon Avenue to access the site. Ms. Maldonado stated that Yukon Avenue is not passable and that they used their driveway off of Humes Avenue to access their lot. Mr. Bergman asked if there was a recorded easement for the driveway. Nelson Maldonado informed the Board that he did not think there was any formal easement for the driveway. Mr. Russell stated that he would be willing to provide a formal driveway easement. Chair Ciuffredo expressed support for relocating the driveway from its existing location so that it will be located entirely upon the property at 28 Yukon Avenue. Upon a motion by Matthew Armendo and seconded by David George, it was voted 5-0 by Leonard Ciuffredo, Morris Bergman, Matthew Armendo, David George and Lawrence Abramoff to close the hearing. Upon a motion by Matthew Armendo and seconded by Morris Bergman, it was voted 4-1 by Leonard Ciuffredo, Morris Bergman, Matthew Armendo and Lawrence Abramoff (David George voted no) to approve the following:

- **Variance: 15 feet of relief from the frontage requirement**
- **Variance: 2,000 square feet of relief from the gross dimensional requirement**

The Variance was approved with the following conditions:

- **Stockade fence must be placed in rear yard of 57 Humes Avenue to provide screening for 28 Yukon Avenue.**
- **Driveway for 28 Yukon Avenue must be re-aligned with a similar stone driveway and must be relocated entirely on property at 28 Yukon Avenue, all at the expense of the petitioner.**

- **Dwelling must be constructed in accordance with the submitted rendering and site plan.**

5. **135 Lake Avenue Street (Z-07-17) – Special Permit and Variance:** Patricia Gates, representative for the petitioner, and John Dilorio, petitioner, presented the petition. Ms. Gates stated that the petitioner requested a Special Permit for expansion or change of a pre-existing, nonconforming structure and a Variance for 3 feet of relief from the side yard setback requirement in order to construct a garage with a second floor for additional living space. She also indicated that the plan had been revised per the Board's previous comments and that the density had been reduced. She stated that because of the revisions, the petitioner would not need the requested relief for the side yard setback. In addition, she informed the Board that if the garage were to be moved closer to the rear of the lot that additional review by the Conservation Commission may be necessary. Additionally, she informed the Board that she thought the proposed project would not reduce the number of off-street parking spaces available on the site. She also stated that since the property is located north of the neighbors' property and since the sun travels east to west that there should be no concerns about access to sunlight since any shadows would be cast from the neighboring property to the 135 Lake Avenue property.

Mr. Armendo expressed concern with possible loss of open space and stated that the proposed development appears to overcrowd the lot. Ms. Gates stated that the proposed project removes a shed increasing the amount of usable green space and informed the Board that the proposed garage would be located on an area that is already impervious and already used for parking.

Mr. Freilich stated that many houses in the neighborhood, including the neighbors' property have been added onto.

Jeanne Burrow expressed concern with the proposed project's effect on property values, future parking issues and also asked who would respond if there were problems as a result of the construction. Ms. Gates stated that she was adamant that the parking would fit on the lot and stated that the proposed addition is moderate. Mr. Ciuffredo stated that Ms. Burrow could contact the Division of Code Enforcement or seek legal counsel if damage was caused to her property.

Mr. Kelly expressed concern with the proposed size of the one-car garage at 16.17 feet by 14.84 feet. He stated that an average two-car garages measure 24 feet by 24 feet and that an average one-car garage generally measures 12 feet by 24 feet or 12 feet by 22 feet, at minimum. Mr. Dilorio stated that to get the required 18', he could use a cantilever to add additional square footage to the rear of the garage. Ms. Gates stated that the proposed parking space in the garage is for a single-family residence not for a parking lot in which one has to consider additional vehicles. Mr. Freilich inquired if there was a minimum required length or width for a garage in the Zoning Ordinance or Building Code. Mr. Kelly stated that there was not a specific regulation but that required spaces are to be at least 9' x 18'. Mr. Freilich stated that the abutters' house still towers over the existing structure at 135 Lake Avenue.

Marguerite Cormier expressed concern with future parking issues if larger vehicles wish to park on the site. Jeanne Burrow expressed concern with the impact of the construction on water

levels. Mr. Kelly stated that the applicant may need to hire a structural engineer. Ms. Cormier also expressed concern that a side window may be blocked if the garage were built further back. Mr. Kelly stated that the exterior wall must be moved in one foot to provide a 9' wide outdoor parking space on the side of the garage.

Upon a motion by Matthew Armendo and seconded by David George, it was voted 5-0 by Leonard Ciuffredo, Morris Bergman, Matthew Armendo, David George and Andrew Freilich to close the public hearing. Upon a motion by Matthew Armendo and seconded by David George, it was voted 5-0 by Leonard Ciuffredo, Morris Bergman, Matthew Armendo, David George, and Andrew Freilich to approve the following:

- **Special Permit for expansion/change of a pre-existing nonconforming use/structure.**

The Special Permit was approved with the following conditions:

- **Exterior wall must be moved in one foot in order to provide a width of nine feet for the surface parking space on the side of the garage.**
- **Existing shed must be removed.**
- **Proposed rear of garage must be extended to accommodate a parking area with at least an 18' depth.**

Upon a motion by David George and seconded by Matthew Armendo, it was voted 5-0 by Leonard Ciuffredo, Morris Bergman, Matthew Armendo, David George, and Andrew Freilich to grant the petitioner's request to Leave to Withdraw Without Prejudice relative to the requested Variance for 3 feet of relief from side yard setback requirement.

6. **Lot 4, Ascension Street (Z-07-11) – Variance:** Hossein Haghanizadeh and Benjamin Clark, representatives for the petitioner, presented the petition. Mr. Haghanizadeh stated that the petitioner requested 4.9 feet of relief from the frontage requirement in order to construct eight single-family attached dwelling units. He also stated the tax issue from the last meeting had been addressed and provided receipts from the Treasurer's Office. Mr. Armendo inquired if the open space shown on the plan was usable. Mr. Clark stated that the open space was usable and referred the Board to the open space table on sheet 3 of 4 of the submitted plan. Chair Ciuffredo asked for clarification on whether or not the project would be phased. Mr. Haghanizadeh stated that the condo construction would not be phased and that the condos would be marketed in the summer. He added that the condos would be maintained by a condo association. Ms. Bartness informed that Board that the proposed landscaped island in the middle of the plan may need to be reduced in order to provide an adequate turning radius for some of the proposed parking spaces and indicated that the issue could be addressed through the Site Plan approval process. She also stated that the site meets the Zoning Ordinance regulations relative to open space and that it also meets the Planning Board's open space policy to provide 40-60 feet of open space per proposed dwelling unit. Mr. Bergman stated that the site is a difficult one to develop with the slope and that the number of units is probably necessary to justify the proposed cost of the work. Ms. Bold informed the Board that only 1.71 feet of relief was necessary as opposed to the requested 4 feet, 9 inches. Upon a motion by

Matthew Armendo and seconded by Lawrence Abramoff, it was voted 5-0 by Leonard Ciuffredo, Morris Bergman, Matthew Armendo, David George and Lawrence Abramoff to close the public hearing. Upon a motion by Morris Bergman and seconded by Matthew Armendo, it was voted 5-0 by Leonard Ciuffredo, Morris Bergman, Matthew Armendo, David George and Lawrence Abramoff to approve the following:

- **Variance: 1.71 feet of relief from the frontage requirement**

The Variance was approved with the following conditions:

- **Proposed open space should be cleaned up and landscaped with any existing healthy trees to remain.**
- **Dwellings must be constructed in accordance with the submitted rendering.**
- **Dwellings must be constructed in accordance with the final revised Definitive Site Plan approved by the Planning Board.**

7. **86 Bowker Street (Z-07-16) – Variance:** George Hayeck, petitioner, presented the petition. Mr. Hayeck stated that he requested 1 foot, 2 inches of relief from the frontage requirement in order to create two separate buildable lots. He indicated that the area was once three separate lots and that he had filed an ANR plan to form one lot after purchasing an additional eight feet from an abutting property. Chair Ciuffredo informed the petitioner that he had created his own hardship. Nicholas Delio expressed concern with possible water run-off issues. Upon a motion by Matthew Armendo and seconded by David George, it was voted 5-0 by Leonard Ciuffredo, Morris Bergman, Matthew Armendo, David George and Lawrence Abramoff to grant the petitioner's request for Leave to Withdraw without Prejudice.

NEW BUSINESS

8. **370 Belmont Street (Z-07-21) – Special Permits:** Robert McNeil, representative for the petitioner, and Bill Rocco, petitioner, presented the petition. Mr. McNeil stated that the petitioner requested a Special Permit for expansion or change of a pre-existing, nonconforming use/structure, a Special Permit to perform auto detailing in a BL-1.0 zoning district, and a Special Permit to allow motor vehicle sales in a BL-1.0 zoning district in order to sell used vehicles, perform auto detailing, and install breathalyzer units for the Department of Motor Vehicles. He also stated that this section of Belmont Street is one-way and stated that there will be one entrance and one exit to the site. He also stated that the three proposed uses on the site: installation of breathalyzers, auto detailing, and motor vehicle sales, will complement each other and that each use, individually, does not bring substantial traffic or business. Chair Ciuffredo asked for additional information regarding the motor vehicle sales. Mr. Rocco stated that the cars will be high-end, pre-owned vehicles. Mr. Armendo expressed concern with the lack of customer parking spaces. Mr. O'Neil stated that in case of substantial business at any point in time, there is additional on-street parking for employees on Dustin Street and Rena Street, but that for normal day-to-day business the proposed number of customer and employee parking spaces meets Code Requirements and is realistic for the business. He also stated that there will be a total of three employees on site. Mr. Bergman inquired how many cars per day are expected to need breathalyzers installed. Mr. Rocco stated that there are usually four cars per week that

need installation or a monthly calibration. He also stated that those cars would be transferred immediately to the bay area and would not take up parking spaces on the lot. In addition, he stated that the business is proposing to move to Belmont Street from its current location at 1029 Millbury Street where business is suffering because of the Route 146 construction. He stated that his employees often have to drive to the Registry of Motor Vehicles to lead customers back to the business due to the confusing location of the site. Mr. Bergman asked if it was necessary to display eight vehicles at one time. Mr. Rocco stated that as a businessman, he had come up with eight cars to supplement the other businesses on the lot. He also stated that he would be willing to display less motor vehicles. Mr. McNeil informed the Board that the number of display spaces had already been reduced from ten cars to eight cars during the petitioner's first meeting with the Interdepartmental Review Team. Mr. Rocco stated that the business also relies on advertising and networking in addition to the actual display. He also informed the Board that the hours of operation for the site would be 7:30 a.m. to 6:30 p.m. Ms. Bartness stated that the site would need to be re-configured to provide the required access aisle width or would need to apply for additional relief, which would need to be re-advertised. Upon a motion by Matthew Armendo and seconded by Andrew Freilich, it was voted 5-0 by Leonard Ciuffredo, Morris Bergman, Matthew Armendo, David George and Andrew Freilich to continue the hearing to the April 23, 2007 meeting to allow the petitioner sufficient time to reconfigure the site to provide 24-foot wide access aisles or to petition for additional relief.

9. 35, 39, & 41 Dean Street, 20, 30-32 Boynton Street, 87 Salisbury Street (Z-07-22)

Special Permits and Variance: Stephen Madaus, John Miller, Dennis Rice, Father Aved Terzian, and Edward Ceserian, representatives for the petitioners, presented the plan. Mr. Madaus stated the petitioner requested a Variance for waiver of landscaping requirements for parking lots, a Special Permit for expansion or change of a pre-existing, nonconforming use/structure and a Special Permit to modify parking, loading, dimensional, landscaping and parking requirements in order to alter and extend the privileged, pre-existing, nonconforming parking lots while razing the apartment and office buildings for the construction of a new residence hall and parking garage. He also stated that he would like to withdraw the request for the Variance for waiver of landscaping requirements based on a letter from Joseph Mikielian, Director of Code Enforcement, dated February 21, 2007, stating that landscaping relief could be sought through the requested Special Permit to modify parking, loading, dimensional, landscaping, and parking lot requirements. Additionally, he stated that Worcester Polytechnic Institute (WPI) proposes to construct a new five-story residence hall and a three-story parking garage with 188 parking spaces and that the proposed number of parking spaces for the campus meets current parking requirements. In addition, he stated that the surface parking will be leased to the abutting Church of Our Saviour of Worcester to provide off-street parking and a new, long driveway suitable for queuing cars for events, such as funerals. He informed the Board that the relief requested is not related to the construction of the buildings but to the surface parking, which is nonconforming in terms of setbacks and landscaping. In addition, he stated that it would be impossible to meet the setbacks with the proposed driveway and proposed number of parking spaces for the church because a number of the proposed spaces are placed on the property line without the required buffer.

Chair Ciuffredo asked how many parking spaces would be lost if the site conformed to setback requirements. Ms. Bartness stated that the petitioners would lose ten newly proposed parking

spaces but that the other parking spaces on the site would be protected if the Board approved the requested Special Permit for expansion or change of a pre-existing, nonconforming use or structure since they are privileged, nonconforming spaces.

Mr. Madaus also stated that through conversations with the Code Department, Variances were not needed for the height, FAR and 50-foot setback for Institutional zones based on letters from Joseph Mikielian, Director of Code Enforcement, dated February 21, 2007 and March 6, 2007 in which Mr. Mikielian determined that it would be “unreasonable for the City of Worcester to impose, apply or enforce (i) the RG-5 height limitations on the Project located in the RG-5 Zoning District, (ii) the FAR limitation on the portion of the project located in the RG-5 Zoning District, and (iii) the fifty (50) foot setback requirement for structures in the IN-S Zoning District as set forth in Note 13 to Table 4.2 in Article IV” for the proposed project pursuant to M.G.L. Chapter 40A, Section 3.

Mr. Ceserian stated that the two sites have a history of sharing parking spaces and that the college does not receive substantial traffic on Sundays when the church would benefit from additional parking for its attendees.

Mr. Abramoff noted that the project will be important to support the \$45 million investment at Gateway Park.

Mr. Miller also indicated that the proposed dormitories will provide an apartment-like atmosphere with amenities such as wireless internet access, kitchens, and up-to-date fire suppression. He also stated that modern, on-campus housing will possibly appeal to female students who may feel more secure on campus.

Donald Melville stated that he objected to the waiver of landscaping requirements because WPI was the largest landowner in the neighborhood, because it may set a precedent for other parking lot redevelopment in the future and because it would set a poor example to engineering students on campus. Mr. Madaus stated that additional landscaping has been added to the site along the “Arts Walk” and in the proposed parking lot that was not there previously. He stated the waivers were for the areas where the parking buffer could not be accommodated and for interior landscaping islands, which cannot be provided while still providing the same amount of parking. Father Terzian stated that it was important for the church to have as close to the requested 43 parking spaces as possible.

Lisa Thomas stated that as a parishioner she strongly supported the project and the additional parking for the church. She also stated that the additional parking will reduce the number of elderly people crossing the street and will be beneficial to the neighborhood. Mr. Madaus informed the Board that the church will take care of the snow storage and maintenance.

Mr. Melville informed the representatives for the petitioner that it would have been helpful to have held a neighborhood meeting to explain the project.

Upon a motion by Matthew Armendo and seconded by Lawrence Abramoff, it was voted 5-0 by Leonard Ciuffredo, Morris Bergman, Matthew Armendo, Lawrence Abramoff, and Andrew

Freilich to close the public hearing. Upon a motion by Matthew Armendo and seconded by Lawrence Abramoff, it was voted 5-0 by Leonard Ciuffredo, Morris Bergman, Matthew Armendo, Lawrence Abramoff, and Andrew Freilich to approve the following:

- **Special Permit for expansion or change of a pre-existing, nonconforming use/structure.**
- **Special Permit to modify parking, loading, dimensional, landscaping, and parking layout requirements.**

Upon a motion by Matthew Armendo and seconded by Morris Bergman, it was voted 5-0 by Leonard Ciuffredo, Morris Bergman, Matthew Armendo, Lawrence Abramoff, and Andrew Freilich to grant the petitioner's request for Leave to Withdraw without Prejudice for the Variance for waiver of landscaping requirements for parking lots, including the five (5) foot buffer, landscape screening, and interior landscape requirements.

OTHER BUSINESS:

Chair Ciuffredo requested staff to copy materials from the March 17, 2007 Citizen Planner's Training Collaborative training he attended.

Mr. Armendo suggested that the Board consider making recommendations to the Land Use Committee regarding the Zoning Ordinance as previously suggested.

ADJOURNMENT: Chair Ciuffredo adjourned the meeting at 8:45 PM.