



TOWN OF SWAMPSCOTT

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

ELIHU THOMSON ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
22 MONUMENT AVENUE, SWAMPSCOTT, MA 01907

MEMBERS
MARC KORNITSKY, ESQ., CHAIR
DANIEL DOHERTY, ESQ., VICE CHAIR
BRADLEY CROFT, ESQ.
ANTHONY PAPROCKI
ANDREW ROSE

ASSOCIATE MEMBERS
RON LANDEN
HEATHER ROMAN
EMILY STUART

AUGUST 22, 2017 MEETING MINUTES

Time: 7:02PM – 9:23PM
Location: Swampscott High School, 200 Essex Street, Rm B129
Members Present: M. Kornitsky, D. Doherty, A. Paprocki, E. Stuart, H. Roman, A. Rose, R. Landen, A. Rose, B. Croft
Members Absent:
Others Present: Gino Cresta (Director of DPW), Michael Ruiz (Petitioner), Chris Drucas (Attorney), Jerry Perry (Resident), Joe Peznola (Civil Engineer, Hancock Associates), Jim Podesky (Architect, The Architectural Team), Michael Liu (Architect, The Architectural Team), Holly Grace (Senior Project Manager, B'nai B'rith Housing), Max Glikman (Project Manager, B'nai B'rith Housing), Susan Gittleman (Director, B'nai B'rith), Justine Oliver (Historical Commission), Naomi Dreeben (Chairwoman, Board of Selectmen), Marianne McDermott (Resident), Jerry Perry (Resident), John Picarello (Resident), Andrew Levin (Assistant Town Planner)

Chairman of the Board, M. Kornitsky called the meeting to order at 7:02PM.

MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Minutes: Motion by M. Kornitsky, seconded by D. Doherty, meeting minutes from 6/20 unanimously approved.

ZONING RELIEF PETITIONS

M. Kornitsky called forth Petition 17-15, 12 Juniper Road, the petitioner was not present, M. Kornitsky stated that the Board would hold off on opening Petition 17-15 until the petitioner was present. M. Kornitsky stated that he would wait until 7:15PM to open Petition 17-17, 200 Paradise Road.

PETITION 17-17

200 PARADISE ROAD

At 7:15PM, M. Kornitsky called forth Petition 17-17. This is a Petition by the Town of Swampscott – DPW seeking a special permit for an auxiliary structure on their DPW lot, to demolish an existing salt shed and construct a new one in a different location.

Gino Cresta, Director of the Department Public Works and Assistant Town Administrator stated to the Board that he inherited a dilapidated salt shed, and that he wishes to build a new one. Mr. Cresta also mentioned that the current shed does not hold enough space to adequately salt the Town. Mr. Cresta explained that the 2016 Town Meeting approved \$100,000 for a new salt shed. Mr. Cresta explained the shed will be built in the back of the useful part of the lot and it will make it easier for the trucks to get in and out of.

Mr. Cresta explained that he is seeking relief because this is a request to add an auxiliary structure, as well as the Building Inspector also thought it would be best to get approval from the ZBA.

M. Kornitsky asked for public comment, there was none.

M. Kornitsky constituted the Board as himself, E. Stuart, A. Rose, R. Landen, and A. Paprocki.

Mr. Cresta stated to the Board that he is forgoing the request to build the ramp as stated in the application.

MOTION : by E. Stuart to approve Petition 17-17 for a new salt structure in accordance with the plans and allowing the petitioner to forgo the ramp at their discretion, seconded by R. Landen, unanimously approved.

PETITION 17-15

12 JUNIPER ROAD

Michael Ruiz, of 12 Juniper Road was now present. M. Kornitsky called forth Petition 17-15, which is the request of Michael Ruiz, seeking a special permit (nonconforming use/structure) for the demolition of an existing one-story garage and foundation, and building a two-and-a-half story addition. Front setback to decrease 3-feet, and side setback to change 4-feet, with lot coverage increasing 312 feet. This petition was continued from the June meeting.

M. Kornitsky and Mr. Ruiz discussed revised plans provided to the Board. Mr. Ruiz mentioned that some of the driveway has been deleted, and that the proposed lot coverage is back down to the current 47%. M. Kornitsky mentioned a comment made by Community Development Director Peter Kane regarding the calculation of built space, and whether the driveway counted. Mr. Ruiz mentioned that if water runoff is the concern from adding hardscape, he is back down to the original coverage percentage, and currently there is no problem. Mr. Ruiz stated he will be adding pavers instead of asphalt. Mr. Ruiz continued to discuss the plans with the Board, and mentioned that the reason the structure is changing is so he can add code compliant stairs within the home.

Mr. Ruiz explained that there is a collapsed sewer line underneath the garage slab and driveway, which is another reason behind the garage renovation request. Mr. Ruiz mentioned that he hopes to add to the value of the property and neighborhood, and explained that he had spoken with the abutters and that they are in support.

R. Landen asked about the photos provided to the Board showing properties similar to Mr. Ruiz's, Mr. Ruiz explained how his property compared to others, and explained his property's topography.

M. Kornitsky asked about the new dimensions, in regards to the garage, Mr. Ruiz explained that the new addition bumps the side of the garage out four-feet, which will not exceed the setback allowed. Mr. Ruiz explained the current conditions and new proposal, in terms of the setback requirements and lot coverage. M. Kornitsky, D. Doherty and Mr. Ruiz briefly discussed P. Kane's comments regarding lot coverage, D. Doherty clarified that he agreed with P. Kane's comments on not increasing the building, and stated that he thinks the petitioner needs a variance for their requests. M. Kornitsky and D. Doherty briefly discussed whether the property would need a special permit or a variance. M. Kornitsky read the definition in Bylaw section 2.2.7.3. The Board discussed the definition and calculations used to find the hardscape on the property, as well as the definition of 2.2.7.3.

M. Kornitsky and D. Doherty discussed what the request for relief should be from Mr. Ruiz as well as the type of relief to grant, due to his lot coverage being more than the allowed 20% extra allowed by special permit. D. Doherty, A. Rose and M. Kornitsky mentioned that it seemed that Mr. Ruiz will need a variance, A. Rose mentioned that a hardship will have to be stated. M. Kornitsky clarified the process of seeking a variance for Mr. Ruiz and A. Rose mentioned a possible hardship.

The Board and Mr. Ruiz then discussed the calculation used to find the current lot coverage. M. Kornitsky mentioned that Mr. Ruiz should meet with P. Kane and discuss the plans and calculations. A. Rose, R. Landen, and M. Kornitsky briefly discussed with Mr. Ruiz the possible relief that the Board could potentially grant.

The Board then discussed the amount of lot coverage that they can grant, and the allowable amount. Mr. Ruiz and A. Rose briefly discussed the size of the proposed additions, as well as the amount allowed.

M. Kornitsky mentioned that it might be best for Mr. Ruiz to rework the calculations and come back before the Board.

MOTION : by M. Kornitsky to continue Petition 17-15, seconded by B. Croft, unanimously approved.

PETITION 17-16

35 BURPEE ROAD

Petition 17-16 is an application by Covenant Commonwealth Corporation for a comprehensive permit to redevelop the former Machon School into 38 units for seniors and older adults. The proposal is to repurpose the original 1920 building and demolish the 1960s addition and create a new residential wing to the building. The resulting development will create affordable multi-family housing for seniors and older adults, including shared common area amenity space and parking.

Attorney Chris Drucas was present along with Holly Grace (Senior Project Manager, B'nai B'rith Housing), Max Glikman (Project Manager, B'nai B'rith Housing), Susan Gittleman (Executive Director B'nai B'rith Housing), Michael Liu (Architect, The Architectural Team, Inc.), Jim Poedesky (Architect, The Architectural Team), and Joe Peznola (Civil Engineer, Hancock Associates).

Attorney Drucas began by explaining the projects background and that it is ready to move forward. Attorney Drucas explained that B'nai B'rith has filed for Zoning waivers, but that they have gone before the Planning Board. Attorney Drucas added that the Petitioner has taken input from the Board of Selectmen (BOS) and neighbors, and if needed, could answer to a site-plan review (the petitioners requested a site-plan waiver).

Attorney Drucas handed the presentation off to Holly Grace B'nai B'rith senior project manager, who explained B'nai B'rith's mission. Ms. Grace mentioned that she understood the school held many memories for the Town. Ms. Grace continued by explaining why the location is perfect for senior housing. Ms. Grace mentioned that B'nai B'rith understands the need for senior housing in Swampscott, and that they have already received many calls from perspective tenants.

Ms. Grace stated the proposal is for 38 affordable rental units, each unit with one bedroom, one bathroom, and a kitchen. Ms. Grace also explained some of the other rooms and spaces in the proposal, including shared spaces, computer room, community room, and shared laundry.

Ms. Grace stated that the design goal was to have the building be wheel chair accessible, and mentioned that the main entrance, from the parking area on the eastern side, will be designed in a way to accommodate all types of mobility. Ms. Grace continued that there will be an elevator to access all levels of the building, and some units will be fully handicap accessible, and meet all code requirements.

Ms. Grace explained there will be three staff; a property manager, residence service coordinator, and a maintenance worker. Ms. Grace explained the Residence Coordinator will act as a community liaison, and B'nai B'rith wants to hold an event with the neighbors.

Ms. Grace explained the tenant profile, 55 years old and up, with preference for 62 years and above, as agreed to in their land agreement. Ms. Grace explained that at other B'nai B'rith properties residents are long-term, and mentioned she hopes for the same with this property.

Ms. Grace explained that all the units will be affordable, and all will account towards Swampscott's affordable housing percentage. Ms. Grace stated that the moderate-income maximum for residents will be \$41,000 for a single resident, and \$47,000 for couples. Ms. Grace explained that 8 units will be reserved for a moderate-income maximum of \$21,000 for a single resident, and \$23,000 for couples. Ms. Grace explained the proposed breakdown of the building, and stated that 70% of units will be reserved for current Swampscott residents and tenant preference will be for Swampscott residents.

Ms. Grace explained that B'nai B'rith will compete for state funds once they have the comprehensive permit, and that the earliest possible that construction will begin is Spring 2019, with an estimated 12-months of construction (Ms. Grace mentioned this is subject to if they get funded and there are no major setbacks).

Ms. Grace moved on to parking, explaining there will be 48 spaces on the property. Ms. Grace stated that B'nai B'rith feels very strongly that this is adequate, considering visitors and the staff. Ms. Grace explained the studies and calculations done regarding parking. Ms. Grace mentioned that some residents will not have cars, and many will use alternative forms of transportation. Ms. Grace handed the Board estimated trip generation calculations and quickly summarized them, explaining the different times and days they showed.

Ms. Grace then handed the presentation off to Joe Peznola, the projects Civil Engineer to explain the properties current conditions and background to the proposal. Mr. Peznola explained that the 1920's addition will stay, but the newer addition will come down and a new one will be built. Mr. Peznola explained the setup of the parking lot near the Jackson Park side, and mentioned there will be a 20-foot wide strip in the Western boundary to be used as an easement for pedestrians to get into Jackson Park. Mr. Peznola explained there will be a new curb cut and other modifications to the sidewalks. Mr. Peznola continued to explain that the front entry will be modified, and briefly explained the topography of the front entry area. Mr. Peznola mentioned that a retaining wall will be added on the property and it will be between 2 and 5 feet tall, on two sides of the parking areas. Mr. Peznola explained that the plan is to try and blend the retaining wall in with walls in the surrounding neighborhood. Mr. Peznola explained that the details of the wall are shown on the detail sheet, but added that the wall will be dark brown blocks with lots of texture to them. Mr. Peznola explained plantings would be added near the Jackson Park parcel to blend and hide the retaining wall from some vantage points. Mr. Peznola added that DPW has reviewed and provided comments regarding several utility stubs.

Mr. Peznola explained that they will be upgrading the storm water conditions significantly. Mr. Peznola mentioned that the elevated parking lot with the retaining wall will allow for a drainage system approved by the Department of Environmental Protection, and explained how the system will work. Mr. Peznola stated the roof run-off will not be increasing, because the new addition is about the same size as the previous.

Mr. Peznola moved on to explain the landscaping plan, mentioning the plantings will be going in at focus points, as well as to provide enhancements for the abutters to the west. Mr. Peznola mentioned there will be comprehensive plantings in the front, and some street trees planted at the entry as well.

M. Kornitsky asked if the visibility of the front entrance will be impacted, Mr. Peznola responded that the trees will be in an area that won't impact visibility, and the trees will be spread out. Mr. Peznola added that some vegetation will grow on the retaining wall, and that some will be planted in front of it. Mr. Peznola continued to explain that a 30-inch maple will be taken out, but the plan is to add five Valley Forge American Elms near Jackson Park. Mr. Peznola added that the easement to the park will be taken care of as well.

Mr. Peznola then moved on to explaining the proposed lighting types and fixtures, and stated the lighting in the parking lot will be on 10-foot tall poles. Mr. Peznola continued that the fixtures will be equipped with screens and the ability to put panels on the back of the fixtures to stop spillage.

Attorney Drucas added to Mr. Peznolas explanation of the plantings that no invasive species will be planted. Mr. Peznola then stated that there might be some non-native species. Mr. Peznola stated that landscape architect James Emmanuel had designed the plans.

A. Rose and Mr. Peznola discussed the size of the trees being planted (2 ½" instead of 3 ½"). Mr. Peznola mentioned cost and studies stating the smaller are better. Mr. Peznola mentioned that they are open to looking at the financials of adding 3 1/2" trees, if the Board asked.

Michael Liu, principal architect for the project began by explaining the square-feet being created from the new addition and modifications to the auditorium. Mr. Liu continued by explaining the design scheme and background on how schools were designed, and how they are redeveloped into housing.

Mr. Liu reiterated the proposed plan to change the grade for the front entrance, and explained some details regarding the design. Mr. Liu also explained the details of the buildings design, stating the new addition will be subordinate while also complimenting the existing. Mr. Liu mentioned the buildings will have matching floors, but the floor to floor height will be different, and added that the new addition will be lower and setback farther than the existing structure.

Mr. Liu explained that it is not desirable or practicable to reproduce the existing, so the plan is to compliment it. Mr. Liu stated the base of the new structure will be brick with a belt course and cornice to match the existing. Mr. Liu then explained the windows and how they will be designed. Mr. Liu explained that some of the HVAC and other equipment will be kept on the roof, including an elevator override, but due to the parapet and placement they will not very noticeable.

Mr. Liu explained to the Board the proposed sizing of the addition and the current size of the existing, explaining the number of units in each.

A. Rose asked if there will be hearing and air conditioning, which there will be.

Attorney Drucas mentioned that a lot of the design came from listening to the BOS and neighbors. Attorney Drucas explained the ground-lease and Land Development agreements, and then summarized the waivers requested in the application. Attorney Drucas asked that the Board grant the waivers based upon the plans presented to the Board, adding that the plans are not construction plans but concept. Attorney Drucas stated that B'nai B'rith had worked hard to make sure the proposal looked like it belonged in the neighborhood and mentioned that the petitioners could answer to any of the conditions in the Bylaw, and mentioned that they have addressed the comments provided by different Boards and Committees.

M. Kornitsky asked if there were any questions from the Board, H. Roman asked what the façade will look like when the grade is lowered at the entrance. Mr. Liu responded that the he believed you will see a concrete foundation wall, but when the lowering is done, that is when they will decide what to do with the façade, mentioning that they must dig first to see what is there.

B. Croft asked for clarification on the parking, Mr. Liu explained there will be 33 spaces on the Jackson park side and 15 on the other, Mr. Peznola helped clarify on the maps the entrances and where there will be a handicap accessible ramp at the second entrance. Mr. Liu then used the map to show the elevator and mentioned it will be a two-door elevator due to the change in elevation of the additions.

Attorney Drucas then mentioned to the Board that funding and timing could potentially be an issue, and asked the Board for three years to start the use of the permit. M. Kornitsky and Attorney Drucas briefly discussed this.

M. Kornitsky then asked for public comment.

Jerry Perry, 60 Burpee Road, mentioned that he lives diagonally from the property, and asked about noise from the HVAC system. Mr. Liu explained how the newer systems are highly efficient and mentioned that with acoustics there is a line-of-sight issue, and added that the equipment will be behind the parapet and screened. Mr. Perry asked the Board to consider the noise. A. Rose mentioned that there will be decibel levels that B'nai B'rith will have to comply with. M. Kornitsky and Mr. Liu discussed where the equipment would be placed, Mr. Liu mentioned it would be set back on the roof behind the parapet. M. Kornitsky mentioned that acoustics could be added to the conditions. Mr. Peznola stated that there is a noise standard in place.

Mr. Perry stated to the Board that he also has concerns over traffic on the street, mentioning the location on a hill and the proposal of senior citizens walking on the sidewalks, Mr. Perry asked that a traffic study be done. Mr. Perry stated that he asks, because the Petitioners have asked for a traffic study waiver. Mr. Perry mentioned that there was a previous study done on Burpee Road, but mentioned that he would be more comfortable with a traffic study that cited potential recommendations for safety.

M. Kornitsky asked Attorney Drucas for a response. Attorney Drucas explained that an analysis had been provided, and mentioned the proposed one car every 10 - 12 minutes produced from the building, will not make a significant difference to be resolved by a traffic study. Attorney Drucas cited this and the traffic seen at other similar sites, in requesting the waiver.

M. Kornitsky explained the information from the analysis provided to the Board, and mentioned that it is his opinion to grant the request for the waiver. Mr. Perry stated that his biggest concern is the pedestrian traffic and safety.

Justina Oliver of the Swampscott Historical Commission, stood and mentioned that the Town might want to analyze the pedestrian street crossing and possibly add a crosswalk. M. Kornitsky asked about the traffic light, Gino Cresta (DPW Director/Assistant Town Administrator) explained the timing on the light and mentioned the timing can be adjusted, as well as the pedestrian button can be pushed at any time. M. Kornitsky asked about the possibility of adding a crosswalk, Mr. Cresta mentioned the crosswalk in question was just recently painted.

A. Rose asked the petitioner and their representatives for more clarification on the side wall of the building, after it will be uncovered when the grade is modified. A. Rose asked if the Historical Commission will dictate what will be done with the foundation, Ms. Oliver responded that a member of the Historical Commission had mentioned this is a concern. Ms. Oliver mentioned that this member had stated that the foundation could be decayed and dilapidated, and that an idea could possibly be to put a mimicking flower bed or retaining wall with some sort of landscaping in front of it.

A. Rose and B'nai B'rith briefly discussed this, and Mr. Liu mentioned that a solution is to build a planter. Mr. Liu explained the top of the planter would be at the existing grade, and that the planter would help with aesthetics. A. Rose, M. Kornitsky, and Mr. Liu discussed the Historical Commissions comments and the proposed planter.

A. Rose and Attorney Drucas briefly discussed possible solutions when the wall is uncovered, and Attorney Drucas explained that he can agree to extending a planter. H. Roman asked the height of the planter, Mr. Podesky responded 2 ½ to 3 feet, and Mr. Liu explained the possible materials of the planter. A. Rose mentioned that he wants this to be an age appropriate solution, Mr. Peznola responded by explaining the planters and their locations.

M. Kornitsky mentioned comments from the Historic Commission regarding the proposed entrance and windows. Attorney Drucas mentioned that the windows are not something that the petitioners can agree to at this point. Mr. Podesky explained that in a way to better imitate the composition of the façade on Burpee, they decided not to have broad panels, which were similar to the Pearl Street School (which was mentioned in the Historical Commissions comments).

Discussion on the windows continued and it was clarified that the design intention is for double-hung windows. M. Kornitsky asked that the petitioners respect the character, Mr. Liu and Mr. Podesky both stated that was their intent.

Discussion on the proposed color of trim was had.

E. Stuart asked about proposed signage, Ms. Grace mentioned there will be a sign for Jackson Woods, and mentioned that she would like a small sign for a site sign, potentially located before the parking lot. Attorney Drucas, Mr. Peznola and M. Kornitsky briefly discussed potential signs and potentially having conditions for the sign. M. Kornitsky and Ms. Grace briefly discussed the sign, and Ms. Grace mentioned that she would be fine with the ability to come back before the Board to request a sign.

M. Kornitsky asked about the Historical Commissions comments on the entrance door, Mr. Liu and Attorney Drucas mentioned it is their intent to follow the comments. M. Kornitsky asked about the Historical Commissions request to take a tour of the building and see if there was anyway to incorporate any existing features into the design, M. Kornitsky clarified this is not a demand, but a request, Mr. Liu responded that it is fine.

Mr. Liu, M. Kornitsky, and Ms. Oliver briefly discussed the proposed windows.

Max Glikman, Project Manager for B'nai B'rith mentioned that the plans being shown at the meeting look different than what was presented to the Historical Commission, Mr. Liu helped explain, Ms. Oliver mentioned the design shows more continuity.

M. Kornitsky mentioned a comment regarding tinting of the sidewalks, Mr. Liu explained that is fine, Ms. Oliver explained the request.

M. Kornitsky asked if the sidewalk crosswalk will be accessible, Mr. Cresta responded it would.

B. Croft asked for clarification on the design of the existing structure, Mr. Liu and Attorney Drucas helped clarify. Ms. Oliver mentioned that overall, the Historical Commission is grateful the Petitioners listened to their ideas and recommendations.

John Piccarello, of Carson Terrace stood up and mentioned that he agreed with Mr. Perrys comments on traffic and added that people park on the buildings side of the street to use the playground and that this creates a bottleneck at the crosswalk. Mr. Piccarello asked that no parking be enforced on the building side of the street. M. Kornitsky mentioned that the ZBA does not have jurisdiction over that request, and that it is up to the Selectmen. Mr. Piccarello asked if a traffic study could help with this problem, M. Kornitsky responded that this would be up to the Selectmen. Mr. Perry added that traffic and parking can be addressed by an expert in a traffic study, and this information could be passed on to the Selectmen. A. Rose mentioned a potential possibility the study could produce. Ms. Dreeben stated that the BOS understand this is a problem, and mentioned that this would get brought forth before the Traffic Study Commission and they could make a decision. Ms. Dreeben added that there is an additional \$50,000 in funds provided by B'nai B'rith for neighborhood improvements, and that the BOS could apply this for a study on traffic or a specific purpose. A brief discussion was held on the possibility of granting the study, and what it would entail.

M. Kornitsky mentioned a possible condition of having a modest traffic or parking study done to look for improvements, A. Rose added, only if it would not hold up the project. Attorney Drucas mentioned that the Traffic Study Commission, DPW, and the BOS could analyze the traffic and come to a solution without using the \$50,000, and explained his solution further, ban parking on the buildings side of the street, and mentioned the existing sidewalks. Mr. Perry mentioned what he would want the money to be spent elsewhere instead, and mentioned that he would like to see study be done. The Board discussed with Attorney Drucas the possibility of having a study done, M. Kornitsky reiterated a condition could be added that a modest traffic study be done.

Marianne McDermott mentioned to the Board that the traffic Burpee Road is difficult, and mentioned that a traffic study would only be for a small area, when in reality the traffic is cause by a much larger problem, and mentioned where the traffic is coming from. Ms. McDermott mentioned that a traffic study should be beholden to the Town.

Susan Gittleman, Executive Director at B'nai B'rith mentioned that they could ban parking in front of the building. A. Rose asked if this would help with abutters concerns, Mr. Perry responded he is concerned over waiving a traffic study being conducted. A. Rose and Mr. Perry discussed the request, and Mr. Perry reiterated his concern over pedestrian safety. Attorney Drucas mentioned there are existing sidewalks, M. Kornitsky mentioned that what is requested to be waived does not cover pedestrian safety. Ms. Grace mentioned that B'nai B'rith would agree to do a brief pedestrian safety and parking study by a professional engineer to submit to the neighbors to petition the Selectmen.

M. Kornitsky asked for any other public comments, there were none. M. Kornitsky then asked if there was any discussion amongst the Board, there was none. M. Kornitsky constituted the Board as the five regular members.

Attorney Drucas stated that he would write the decision, to be reviewed by whomever makes the motion.

MOTION: by M. Kornitsky to approve comprehensive permit that has been submitted to the Board by B'nai B'rith housing New England, Inc. for the redevelopment of the Machon School consistent with the plans filed; the architectural plans and the site plan. Consistent with the Bylaw and M.G.L 40B. And granting the waivers that have been requested in the most recent filing, subject to the following conditions; 1. that the applicant provide a pedestrian safety and on-street parking study and letter report from a qualified expert to the Selectmen and the immediate abutters on the street to analyze that area immediately adjacent to the project, and then the BOS or neighbors can do with it as they please. 2. To provide an extension from 2 to 3 years to make use of the comprehensive permit. 3. To reasonably consult with the Historic Commission, for advice and a walk through the interior of the structure, for what can be used. 4. That the applicant in excavating below grade for the ground level floor, for the exposed area to adopt the wall and planter suggestion as has been described at the meeting. 5. The waiver granted on signage as requested, for temporary signs only, but other signage be permitted by bylaw or further relief permitted by the Board. 6. Trees of 2 ½ inch variety shown on the planting plan be permitted, but if do not survive within a 2-year period they be replaced with 2 ½ inch, at that time. 7. Reasonably attempt to retain original character and architectural quality of the building. Seconded by A. Rose, unanimously approved.

M. Kornitsky moved to close the meeting, seconded by B. Croft, the meeting was adjourned at 9:23 PM.

Andrew Levin
Assistant Town Planner