

ZONING BOARD OF REVIEW MINUTES
Tuesday February 24, 2014 Meeting 7:00 pm
Town Council Chambers, Town Hall

Present: Richard Land, Chair; Renu Englehart, Vice-Chair; Ashley Cullion, Jody Sceery, and Melody Alger (Alternate).

Absent: Christopher Mulhearn and Barry Golden (Alternate).

Staff: Lea Anthony Hitchen, Assistant Town Planner; and Peter Clarkin, Town Solicitor.

Mr. Land, Chair of the Board, called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM and introduced the members and staff present. He then read the Board's procedures into the record. Each person addressing the Board will first state his or her name and address for the record. The applicant and his or her legal representative will present the case and witnesses may be called to testify. Such testimony must be relevant to the application. Expert witnesses will be sworn in and there will be no prejudgment as to the expertise of any witness. Pictures, diagrams and other documents given to the Board as evidence will be appropriately marked as exhibits and will be retained by the Board for the record. Upon completion of the applicant's presentation all other persons wishing to offer evidence in favor of the application may then do so one at a time. Following that all persons wishing to offer evidence against the application may then do so one at a time. It is asked that comments are confined to the zoning matter being heard and that repetitive remarks are avoided. Cross examination or rebuttal may be allowed if the Board feels it would be appropriate and useful. All questions from the floor will be directed through the Chair only. After all relevant facts have been heard the Chair will call for a motion; the Board will then discuss the motion and the Chair will call for a vote. During the discussion among voting Board members, the Board will not accept and new and further testimony unless it is specifically requested by a Board member. The Board will make every attempt this evening to render a decision. The written decision will be recorded in the Town Clerk's Office as soon as possible following the approval of the minutes of the meeting.

Mr. Land acknowledged that if anyone in the audience was present to hear the application for River Stone Group LLC, they have since withdrawn their submission.

Zoning Board of Appeal Hearings – 7:00 PM

1. **Nelson Niles** for property located at 136 Spring Street; being Map 85 A.P. 2 Lot 171 (Zoned Residential, R-10). The Applicant requires a Dimensional Variance from the allowable maximum height for construction of a detached garage. Chapter 260 of the Town Code, Zoning Ordinance, Table 2 – Table of Dimensional Regulations by Zone sets forth a maximum height of 15 feet for accessory structures. The Applicant is requesting to increase the garage height to 18’ feet. Additionally, a Dimensional Variance is being sought from Chapter 260 of the Town Code; Zoning Ordinance, Section 8(C&D) pertaining to the construction of a front porch roof overhang on the existing house.

Mr. Nelson Niles, owner of 136 Spring Street, and Mr. Karl F. Sauerbrey, architect for the project, represented the application.

Mr. Sauerbrey testified that he and his client are requesting two things – those being relief for a front porch overhang on the main house and a dimensional variance of three feet on a proposed detached garage. He explained relative to the front porch, as seen in Exhibit A, which shows the front elevation as well as a partial left side elevation indicating a 3’ overhang. Mr. Sauerbrey confirmed the home originally had an overhang prior to it being renovated by a previous owner. He noted that rather than a porch, he and the owner are referring to it as a roof overhang and it is essentially a 1’ infringement. Mr. Sauerbray referred to Exhibit B which shows an aerial view of the abutting homes and how the subject home and those abutting neighbors are graphically in-line with each other. He explained his argument for the front overhang is that there was one pre-existing before a prior owner removed it and Mr. Nelson would like to return the feature without columns.

Relative to the proposed detached garage, Mr. Sauerbrey testified a 3' height variance is being sought as shown in Exhibit C. He noted Exhibit C indicates what Mr. Niles prefers to construct on the left, with the 3' variance; shown on the right is what can be done by right, with no variance required – but with a shallower roof pitch. Mr. Sauerbrey stated the main reason the variance is being requested, other than his client preferring a steeper roof is “presumed historic hardship” – essentially as an architect he had trouble drawing the roof as it does not match the house as the existing house has a steeper roof. He went on to say that it is a prior action; Mr. Niles had no part of that so it is unique to the site as to the request for the steep roof. We also feel from granting this request it would not alter the general character of the surrounding area. We actually think it would be more appropriate to the area. Mr. Sauerbrey then submitted Exhibit D – 4 examples of similar garages in the Historic District (two located in the subject property's block and two located across the street).

Mr. Sauerbrey guessed that the garage roof is more than a mere inconvenience for him and his client and once they return to the HDC for final approval they may even ask for a steeper roof.

Ms. Englehart asked how the HDC reacted to the overall garage submission. Mr. Sauerbrey said the application was reviewed at the preliminary level with the HDC and they tentatively gave conceptual approval which allowed us to move forward to get zoning approval; we then have to go back to the HDC for final plan approval.

Ms. Englehart noted that her opinion of a 3 ½ car garage in the Historic District seems excessive, especially since there are no plans to remove the original garage. Mr. Nelson explained the original garage is not going to be used as a garage but will be converted to a family room come the warmer weather. He added the existing driveway off Spring Street had to be redone which does not continue down to the proposed garage.

Mr. Nelson acknowledged that he has two antique cars and his daily driver, thus the request for a 3 car garage; the extra space in the garage will be used as a tool bench. Mr. Sauerbrey added the existing garage is not wide enough for vehicles these days.

Ms. Englehart questioned if there are other large garages in the district. Mr. Sauerbrey noted he captured four examples of similar style garages in Exhibit D which he distributed to the Board.

Ms. Cullion queried if the garage roofline matches the pitch of the existing house or if it is steeper. Mr. Sauerbrey stated it does not – the existing pitch is approximately a 12 pitch or at a 45 degree angle. He noted there is a proportional balance issue that exists with architecture and the 8 pitch is generally where the historic roofs begin – shallower than an 8 pitch is not – he has achieved what he argues is the “carriage house pitch” equivalent.

Ms. Cullion also noted that after reviewing the clearance of 7’-7,” between the floor and ceiling, referring to where the vehicles are being stored, there is no further room to lower anything else. Mr. Sauerbrey stated that generally one needs 8’-4” due to garage door openers; we have already brought things down, done a low profile garage door opener and garage doors that are much more expensive and not quite as high.

Ms. Sceery asked how much of the garage will be seen from Spring Street. Mr. Sauerbrey asserted that during the summer season about 90 percent of the garage will be concealed. Mr. Niles added during the winter the garage will be exposed; the plan is to install the driveway and then plant evergreens or whatever would be fitting to shield the garage from the neighbors as they are used to not seeing anything so we will just give them back their greenery. As for being visible from Spring Street, Mr. Niles did not believe it would be visible at all.

Ms. Sceery asked if the garage would be visible from Mawney Street. Mr. Niles explained the driveway will be off of Mawney Street and that is where he anticipated installing the evergreens.

Mr. Sauerbrey verified to best answer Ms. Sceery’s questions is there is probably an angled view of about 15 degrees of the garage from Spring Street that would allow one to see down; from Mawney Street the view could either be wide open or concealed depending on the foliage. He added he and his client have already preempted a concern and put a curve within the driveway leading up to the garage from Mawney Street.

Ms. Englehart asked if there are any issues with an additional curb cut being installed from Mawney Street.

Ms. Hitchen noted the subject parcel is an “L” shaped lot which has frontage on both Spring Street and Mawney Streets; a curb cut for vehicle access can be allowed from each street.

Solicitor Clarkin asked if the garage is within the setbacks. Mr. Sauerbrey noted the proposed garage is within the zoning setbacks. He reiterated the only relief is the height variance; the property was treated as having two fronts.

As clarification, Mr. Land questioned the applicant that the height variance is being sought to make the garage more consistent with the overall area – with the house itself and the overall historic appearance of the neighborhood. Mr. Sauerbrey said that is correct, that is our main reason; we feel that the HDC would probably laugh at our drawings if we submitted a shallower garage roof.

Just to be clear, Mr. Land asked the applicant that they are not seeking any side setback, size relief or similar relief. Again, Mr. Sauerbrey confirmed the application is for dimensional height relief only.

With no further questions from the Board, Mr. Land opened the hearing for public comments.

Ms. Mary Lou Wernig of 24 Mawney Street spoke in opposition to the application. She stated that she guesses that this is her neighbor and he is going to build a huge garage that she is going to look at head on. She has never met him before and then she received a notice in the mail. Ms. Wernig went on to say the use of the word excessive – he is going to build a 3-car garage – nobody’s pitch of their garage matches the pitch of their home’s roof. She explained that she lives in a 3-story Victorian house and also has a small 15’ one car garage. She added there are other 3-car garages in the historic district that are half the size of the proposed plans and she always gets nervous when someone wants to construct a garage that is 18’ high because that indicates hydraulic lift inside. Ms. Wernig did not

understand why the Board would approve this request; she thought a 3-car garage belongs in Los Angeles, the High Hawk or Signal Ridge neighborhoods. She reiterated that it would be her that was going to have to look at the garage and it would be bigger than some homes located on “the Hill.”

Ms. Wernig stated that she also had concerns about drainage considering everyone on Mawney Street has been dealing with water issues in their basements for the last 5 years. She asserted the Applicant essentially wants to build a small house across from me – that concerns her from a drainage and view perspective. She noted the Applicant discussed installing vegetation but she still felt as though she would be looking straight on to the 3-car garage. Ms. Wernig added the residents most affected by this project are those living on Mawney Street, not Spring Street. She moved to the Historic District so she would not have to deal with 3-car garages.

Mr. Bob Mazzeo of 34 Mawney Street spoke in opposition to the application. He explained that he purchased his existing residence back in 1989; when he presented plans to the HDC to construct a garage he went to 13 meetings and paid \$5,000 in architect fees to improve his house which is in character, the pitch is not quite the same and his house blends in with the neighborhood. Mr. Mazzeo added that a 3-car garage which Mr. Niles is seeking is elevated because there is a bank where the lot goes up; making the 18’ structure stick out that much more. He thought the garage is out of character; there is no need for three bays and a work area; it will simply spoil the whole character of the neighborhood.

Mr. Niles apologized for not reaching out to his neighbors; he was confident Mr. Sauerbrey, his architect has tried to meet and contact our neighbors because we had an idea someone would oppose the project. Mr. Niles had one issue he wanted to correct which that is there is no intention of having a business of repairing vehicles at the property. He currently has 2 cars stored that he anticipates bringing to the property; they are his cars – it is not a business; it is just a hobby and it will simply be a place to store stuff.

Ms. Englehart asked the Applicant to speak to there already being a height on the property due to the existing topography.

Mr. Sauerbrey asserted that is correct although he was uncertain of the exact incline but guessed about five feet. Ms. Cullion asked if that 5' would be from Mawney Street. Mr. Sauerbrey stated yes and that he has had tentative meetings with the engineers relative to stormwater runoff, etc. that he will then pursue if approval is granted at this level.

Ms. Hitchen referred to page 3 of the staff report which clearly shows the increase in topography off of Mawney Street.

Ms. Cullion questioned the number of trees that will be removed on the Mawney Street side. Mr. Niles explained there are a few dead trees which will have to be removed but the plan is to keep as many existing trees as possible.

Ms. Hitchen noted at the HDC meeting in October the Applicant mentioned a landscaping plan; she asked the Applicant to further explain that proposed landscaping plan to the Zoning Board. Mr. Niles stated he would have the driveway positioned to the side and have evergreens where there is an existing fence. Mr. Land questioned if the larger trees in front need to be removed. Mr. Niles did not think so; he mentioned in the rear there is sassafras trees which he definitely wants to keep.

With no further questions from the Board, Mr. Land asked for a motion.

Ms. Sceery motioned to approve the application subject to the Applicant submitting to the Planning Department a Landscaping Plan for approval; this motion also includes approval of the front door overhang. Seconded by Ms. Cullion.

Mr. Land commented that the relief being sought is a 3' height relief, not a 3-car garage – he had concerns about denying an application that he thought otherwise meets the requirements simply because there it is perceived to be objectionable from a size perspective when technically that is not before the Board. He did not find the relief personally being offensive setting aside whether or not he would agree that a 3-car garage is too big for the area – that is simply not before the Board. In terms of this particular motion, he would like to see the trees retained, particularly the large trees that are right

in front of the property because the objections primarily expressed were from an appearance and aesthetic perspective which he can understand and appreciate that in this particular area, that old growth is particularly pleasing.

Ms. Englehart commented that she was going to deny the height relief only because the increase in height is already on the property with the existing topography and with the request for the variance she believed it would be too excessive. Her opinion was the Applicant was not requesting the least amount of relief necessary and there is the possibility of lowering the roof line. Ms. Englehart noted she had no issues with the front overhang.

Mr. Land clarified the Board will make separate motions for each portion (garage and overhang) of the application.

Ms. Alger echoed Mr. Land's comments and stated she would vote for both pending motions without the additional requirement of submitting a landscape plan. She asserted that she is cognizant of the restraints of the Board's functions and job here; while she understood the abutters have objections to the building of a 3-car garage it is simply not in the Board's purview to deny that but it is in our purview to review the 3' variance.

Ms. Cullion agreed as well; she too would be voting for both motions. She believed the orientation of the lot being "L" shaped allows space for the garage to be placed and thinks the Applicant did a good job of locating that as far back from Mawney Street as possible. She added that she would like to see the landscape plan be provided to the Planning Department and would also like to see as many trees maintained as possible to act as a buffer.

In order to be granted a dimensional variance, Mr. Land read into the record the following standards that must be met:

The hardship from which the applicant seeks relief is due to the unique characteristics of the subject land and not the general characteristics of the surrounding area.

The hardship is not the result of any prior action by the applicant and does not result primarily from the desire for greater financial gain.

Granting the request will not alter the general character of the surrounding area or impair the purpose or intent of the Zoning Ordinance or Comprehensive Plan.

The relief to be granted is the least relief necessary.

The hardship suffered by the owner if the variance is not granted shall amount to more than a mere inconvenience, which shall mean there is no other reasonable alternative to enjoy a legally permitted beneficial use of one's property.

Motion by Ms. Sceery, seconded Ms. Cullion to approve the front porch overhang.

VOTE: 5 – 0.

Motion by Ms. Sceery, seconded by Ms. Cullion to approve the 3' height variance for the detached garage subject to the Applicant submitting to the Planning Department a Landscaping Plan for approval.

VOTE: 4 – 1 (Ms. Englehart opposed).

2. David & Jennifer Giardino for property located at 55 Rock Way; being Map 69 A.P. 12 Lot 486 (Zoned Farming, F-1). The Applicant requires a Special Use Permit to accommodate an accessory family dwelling unit (in-law apartment) on the property. Chapter 260 of the Town Code, Zoning Ordinance, Section 9C(2) and Table 1 of the Zoning Ordinance, Table of Permitted Uses by Zone, establish the provision for such accessories to be permitted by special use permit.

Mr. David Giardino, owner of the property, represented the application. He testified that he is in the process of constructing a new home and would like to have a 1,000 square foot in-law apartment within the house. Mr. Giardino noted the reason for the request is due to him having two 27-year old twin handicapped sons whom he would like to have live with him. He asserted

the house was designed in order to have the apartment tucked behind the garage. Additionally, he noted the house was designed to aesthetically fit into the neighborhood as there is a requirement that homes have a minimum size of 3,500 square feet; his home will be 5,500 s.f. Mr. Giardino confirmed he understood the Building Official has the right to inspect his home every year to make sure it is being used properly and that it can never be rented.

Mr. Land asked if there were any questions from the Board. None noted.

Mr. Land opened the hearing for public comments. None noted.

Mr. Land asked for a motion.

Motion by Ms. Cullion to approve the application as submitted. Seconded by Ms. Sceery.

VOTE: 5 – 0.

- 3. Francis Fallon** for property located at 999 Tillinghast Road; being Map 16 A.P. 19 Lot 38 (Zoned Farming, F-2). The Applicant seeks a Dimensional Variance from Table 2 of Chapter 260 of the Town Code; Zoning Ordinance, Dimensional Regulations by Zone which sets forth the minimum frontage. Additionally, the Applicant seeks a Special Use Permit from Table 1 of the same chapter, Permitted Uses by Zone, which establishes horse boarding to be permitted by special use permit. The Applicant requests zoning relief to accommodate inadequate frontage and to board horses in a recorded subdivision.

Attorney John Brunero with law offices located at 1070 Main Street, Coventry, represented the owner and applicant of the property. Atty. Brunero recognized Mr. Michael McCormick of Alpha Associates, the Land Surveyor, as being present as well as the Fallon Family who have owned the property for over 38 years.

Atty. Brunero explained the property is a 16 acre site of which the owner would like to subdivide into an additional lot; parcel #1 is going to be the

existing home which would be accessed from Tillinghast Road by the existing driveway. He noted a 2.9 acre lot is being proposed using the stone wall as a boundary; the second parcel is 13.3 acres in size which is currently used as the horse farm and has been that way for over 30 years. He asserted that parcel will be accessed by the driveway that is 50 feet in front which is the existing frontage to that particular area of the property.

Atty. Brunero acknowledged the plan shows there will also be a 25 foot access easement across parcel #2 to the Town of East Greenwich for accessibility to E.G. Historic Cemetery #66. He reiterated the Applicant is asking for a special use permit for the horse farm noting the assumption is that it is a grandfathered use but as an abundance of caution and the language in the zoning ordinance, we are requesting the special use permit.

Atty. Brunero summarized the history of the property, as included in the staff report; the matter was before the Planning Board on November 4, 2014 and was granted Master Plan approval for the subdivision of the property into two lots coupled with a positive recommendation to the Zoning Board. Additionally, Atty. Brunero explained that back in 1973 the 50' of frontage on Tillinghast Road was originally intended to be an access point to a proposed subdivision that never panned out. He noted this new proposal will only be for one new lot to be on 13 acres, never to be subdividable again, in perpetuity. Atty. Brunero added that Mr. Fallon will be giving that parcel over to his son to build his home on. He explained at this point the Fallon's have to go back to the Planning Board, subject to the Zoning Board's approval, to receive preliminary/final plan approval to show soil conditions, engineering work, ISDS, etc.

In terms of the standards to be met, Atty. Brunero asserted the application is requesting the least relief necessary and it will not alter the general character of the surrounding area – there will be one small home set on 13 acres, the same horse farm will remain as will the same equestrian center. He added the project is not for financial gain – Mr. Fallon has been living on the property for 38 years and is simply transferring the new parcel to his son. Atty. Brunero noted if the application is denied it would be more than a mere inconvenience – a parcel of land that has 13 acres in East Greenwich not being able to build a one-single family home would constitute more than

the mere inconvenience. As far as the special use permit is being considered, Atty. Brunero felt as though the horse farm was grandfathered as it has always been there but it is in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the zoning ordinance and the comprehensive plan and it will not result in or create conditions that will be inimical to the public health, safety, morals and general welfare of the community.

Ms. Cullion asked the Applicant to highlight the 50' of frontage.

Mr. Michael McCormick of Alpha Associates, a Professional Land Surveyor, pinpointed exactly where on the site plan the 50' of frontage is located for the new lot. He explained the existing house will conform to the zoning ordinance in all respects; the proposed house will have access from the 50' of frontage which will remain a gravel road.

No public comments.

With no further comments, Mr. Land asked for a motion.

Motion by Ms. Sceery to approve the application as presented. Seconded by Ms. Englehart.

Ms. Cullion believes the application is a reasonable request and she would be voting in favor of it.

Ms. Englehart commented that in order to maintain all of the existing property for one house she would be voting in favor of the application.

Ms. Alger noted that one house and the preservation of 13 acres is important; she too would vote in favor of the application.

VOTE: 5 – 0.

- 4. Chrissie, LLC** for property located at 146 Duke Street; being Map 85 A.P. 1 Lot 416 (Zoned Manufacturing/Light Industry Office). The Applicant seeks a Use Variance from Table 1 of Chapter 260 of the Town Code; Zoning Ordinance, Permitted Uses by Zone. Additional relief is also needed from Table 2 of the Zoning Ordinance, Dimensional Regulations by Zone and Article VI of Chapter 260 of the Town Code; Zoning Ordinance, Off-Street Parking Regulations, Sections 20 and 21(D). The Applicant plans to open a consignment store at the subject property; the change of use necessitates relief since retail is not allowed in an M/LIO zone, there is inadequate on-site parking, and dimensional non-conformities already exist.

Ms. Cullion voluntarily stated for the record that Mr. Paul DiSegna, owner of the property, is a family friend; she has no financial interest or gain to be had and believes there is no conflict of interest for her to be voting on the matter.

Ms. Christianne Anderson and Mr. Ron Sarro, represented the application. Also present was Mr. Paul DiSegna, owner of the property.

Mr. Sarro explained he is requesting a use variance as well as parking relief; the parcel is short 13 spaces although 23 spaces are being provided as seen on the site plan.

Mr. Land questioned if this is a new business or an existing business moving to the subject property. Mr. Sarro stated it will be a new business.

Ms. Hitchen further explained the reasoning behind the request for parking relief – the Applicant submitted a site plan for the interior use of the building which is a total of 3,229 square feet of retail space that will be utilized; based on the parking requirement of one parking space per 90 s.f. of floor area they will need a total of 36 parking spaces hence the relief for 13 spaces. She does believe the existing 23 spaces are sufficient for the proposed retail business. Ms. Hitchen commented at first glance looking at the exterior of the building it does not appear the structure could fit over 3,000 s.f. of space but there are three floors within the building.

Mr. Land questioned how goods will be offloaded/loaded and the process stocking the facility. Mr. Sarro stated the large interior space will essentially be subdivided into smaller spaces to be rented to antique dealers. He noted there is an existing bulkhead which goes directly to the basement and there is a ramp that leads to a storage room which will be used for bringing in/out products. He added we will confine goods coming and going to handtrucks and dollies to the rear of the building where there is a ramp for access.

Mr. Clarkin confirmed there will not be regular deliveries so to speak. Mr. Sarro stated there will not be large daily truck deliveries pulling up to the building every day rather antique dealers might pull their truck up, load off with a couple of their pieces, and we would bring the pieces in.

Ms. Sceery questioned if all three floors will be used as retail. Ms. Anderson noted the first floor has the largest amount of square footage followed by the second floor and the third floor is essentially a walk-up loft.

Ms. Hitchen noted the requirements for a dumpster according to Section 260-8(J) of the Zoning Ordinance: Where permitted dumpsters shall be enclosed and buffered from adjacent properties. The owner or operator of any commercial establishment which receives a license or permit from the Town Council and where garbage accumulates shall provide a covered container. She added the subject lot is adjacent to residential properties.

Mr. Land asked about the use of the asphalt area to the north of the building. Mr. Sarro explained the prior use of the building was a school and that area was used as a playground which is an open and fenced in area; he intends to use the area as retail space using it for outdoor furniture, sculptures, etc. Ms. Anderson added the space is completely fenced in and the only access is through the building.

Mr. Land questioned if any ingress/egress will be altered from the building. Ms. Anderson confirmed there will no alterations from an ingress/egress perspective; the only interior changes will be the internal divisions to separate the antique dealer spaces.

Ms. Alger asked if the dealers will be responsible for selling their products. Ms. Anderson asserted that she will be selling their products for them and they do not have to be there. She added that before moving to R.I. she had managed a similar consignment store in Florida and is very familiar with how the process works.

No public comments.

In order to be granted a dimensional and use variances, Mr. Land read into the record the following standards that must be met:

In order to be granted a **Use Variance and Dimensional Variances**, the following must be met:

The hardship from which the applicant seeks relief is due to the unique characteristics of the subject land and not the general characteristics of the surrounding area.

The hardship is not the result of any prior action by the applicant and does not result primarily from the desire for greater financial gain.

Granting the request will not alter the general character of the surrounding area or impair the purpose or intent of the Zoning Ordinance or Comprehensive Plan.

The relief to be granted is the least relief necessary.

That the subject land or structure cannot yield any beneficial use if it is required to conform to the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance. Nonconforming use of neighboring land or structures in the same district and permitted uses of lands or structures in an adjacent district shall not be considered in granting a use variance. (Use Variance)

The hardship suffered by the owner if the variance is not granted shall amount to more than a mere inconvenience, which shall mean there is no other reasonable alternative to enjoy a

**legally permitted beneficial use of one's property. (Dimensional
Varinace)**

With no comments from the public, Mr. Land called for a motion.

Motion by Ms. Englehart to approve the application as submitted. Seconded by Ms. Cullion.

VOTE: 5 – 0.

Zoning Board of Review Business

1. Minutes: Review/action on the minutes of the October 28, 2014 and November 25, 2014 meetings.

Motion by Ms. Gladstone to approve the minutes of October 28, 2014 and November 25, 2014 meetings. Seconded by Ms. Cullion.

VOTE: 5 – 0.

With conclusion of all business, there was a motion by Ms. Englehart, second by Ms. Cullion to adjourn at 7:10 PM. Motion supported 5-0.

Minutes respectfully submitted by:

Lea Anthony Hitchen,
Assistant Town Planner

For more information, please refer to the recording available in the Planning Department.