

**Zoning Board of Appeals
City Council Chambers
Woburn City Hall
Wednesday, December 15, 2021 – 6:00 p.m.**

Present: Chairman Margaret M. Pinkham, Member John Ryan, Member Daniel Parrish, Member Edward Robertson, and Member Richard Clancy

1. **Kristin L. Moraes, 10 Frederick Drive, Woburn, MA, 01801, Petitioner and Landowner, seeking a Variance from Section 5.3.2 of the 1985 Woburn Zoning Ordinances, as amended, for a fence higher than 3 feet within the 25-foot front yard setback at 10 Frederick Drive, Woburn, MA (continued from meeting of November 17, 2021):** Representing the petitioner was Attorney James Juliano, 42 Pleasant St., Woburn, MA. Attorney Juliano said a revised plan was submitted. He said among the changes are the relocation of the fence two feet from the westerly side of Frederick Drive, and four feet on the easterly side from Frederick Circle. He said the applicant will plant arborvitaes on the Frederick Circle side to shield the vinyl fence. He said shrubbery will be planted in front of the gate, and a tree has already been planted. He said he hopes these changes are appropriate and satisfactory. Chairman Pinkham said she is not sure the petitioner has allowed itself enough room to plant arborvitaes so they are not in city property. Attorney Juliano said the proposal is to plant arborvitaes on the applicant's property. He said the city's right of way is unimproved. Chairman Pinkham said she thought there were existing arborvitaes on the other side of the property. She said she does not know if there is enough room to accommodate the plantings on the applicant's property. Attorney Juliano said there is 3-4 feet of space and obviously the arborvitaes will grow onto the city's space, but they won't be planted on city property. He said the applicant intends to make the tree line look nice. Chairman Pinkham asked if anyone in the audience wished to address the board in regard to the petition. There were no respondents. Motion made by Member Parrish and seconded by Member Clancy to grant the variance; approved, 4-1, with Chairman Pinkham opposed.

2. **Michael Cronin, 68 Industrial Way, Wilmington, MA, 01887, Petitioner, and SEA Property LLC, 68 Industrial Way, Wilmington, MA, 01887, Landowner, seeking a Special Permit from Section 7.3 and a Variance from Section 6.1 of the 1985 Woburn Zoning Ordinances, as amended, for renovations and to increase the height greater than 2.5 stories of a two-family dwelling at 6 Lord Terrace, Woburn, MA (continued from meeting of November 17, 2021):** Representing the petitioner was Michael Cronin, SEA Property LLC; 68 Industrial Way, Wilmington, MA. Chairman Pinkham asked Mr. Cronin if he received a memorandum from City Solicitor Ellen Callahan Doucette. Mr. Cronin answered affirmatively. Chairman Pinkham said she only had an opportunity to review the City Solicitor's memo about an hour ago. She said it is her understanding the Building Commissioner and the City Solicitor have opined the shed dormers are not going to increase the height of the building and the applicant does not need a variance. She said that is good news for the applicant. She said the applicant is left with a special permit request. Member Parrish asked if the applicant will withdraw the variance request. Chairman Pinkham said procedurally the applicant can request to

withdraw the variance and the board can then proceed to consider the request for a special permit. Mr. Cronin said he would like to withdraw the request for a variance and proceed with the application for a special permit. Motion made by Member Parrish and seconded by Member Clancy to grant leave of withdrawal without prejudice to the petitioner's application for a variance; approved, 5-0. Chairman Pinkham said that leaves the applicant with a request for a special permit to install the dormers. She said in her view there is no new non-conformity being created. She said she knows there are other areas of discussion. Member Ryan said his recollection is the applicant is willing to stipulate the dwelling will remain a 2-family home and the garage will be available only for parking and storage by the tenants. Chairman Pinkham asked if anyone in the audience wished to address the board in regard to the petition. There were no respondents. Member Parrish said he appreciates the time and effort the Building Commissioner and the City Solicitor put in. Motion made by Member Ryan and seconded by Member Parrish to grant the special permit with the following conditions: 1.) The dwelling shall be limited to a 2-family home, and 2.) The garage shall be used only for tenant parking and storage of items. Chairman Pinkham asked if the intent is to limit the storage component to the tenants of the dwelling. Member Ryan answered affirmatively. Motion approved, 5-0.

- 3. Thomas Murphy, 13 Fisher Terrace, Petitioner and Landowner, seeking a Variance from Section 5.3.2 of the 1985 Woburn Zoning Ordinances, as amended, for a fence higher than 3 feet within the 25-foot front yard setback at 13 Fisher Terrace, Woburn, MA:** Member Clancy recused himself. Chairman Pinkham said the board has received correspondence from Mr. Murphy asking for a continuance until the board's meeting in January. Member Ryan asked if the next meeting will be held on January 19. Chairman Pinkham asked if there are any objections to that date. Hearing none, Chairman Pinkham said the board's next meeting will occur on January 19. Motion made by Member Robertson and seconded by Member Parrish to continue the public hearing until the board's meeting on January 19, 2022; approved, 4-0.
- 4. Seaver Construction, 215 Lexington St. Petitioner, and Edward D. Bowe and John F. Bowe, 12 Dandiview Acres, Seabrook, N.H., Landowners, seeking a Special Permit from Section 7.3 of the 1985 Woburn Zoning Ordinances, as amended, for renovations to a single-family home at 2 Knollwood Avenue, Woburn, MA:** Representing the petitioner were Timothy Powderly, Seaver Construction, 215 Lexington St., Woburn, MA; and John F. Bowe, 12 Dandiview Acres, Seabrook, N.H. Mr. Powderly said the homeowners are looking to alter the existing home and in doing so raising the roof by 4.5 feet, to conform with building codes. He said the footprint is not being increased. He said they are only extending the second floor. He said the structure was damaged in a fire in April 2020. He said the house is a little bit of an eyesore. He said the house was constructed in 1910. He said the house meets none of the setback requirements except the rear setback. He said the lot is very tiny. Chairman Pinkham said there appears to be a discrepancy between the height listed on the application and the height on the building plans. Mr. Powderly said the application has the wrong height. Chairman Pinkham said she would like an assurance the height will not exceed the zoning threshold of 35 feet. Mr. Powderly said the applicant will certainly abide by the zoning ordinance.

Chairman Pinkham asked if the applicant is seeking to raise the height to 31.3 feet as shown on the plan, not the petition. Mr. Powderly said that is correct. Chairman Pinkham asked if the lot is level. She said the height will have to comply in any event. Mr. Powderly said the ridgeline does not exceed the height of any neighboring properties. Chairman Pinkham said the board has received a number of letters from neighbors and they will be made part of the record. Chairman Pinkham asked if anyone from the audience wished to address the audience in regard to the petition. Richard Harding said he is one of the owners of 1 Dodge Road. He said he is not a resident of 1 Dodge Road but he has heard some concerns from a tenant. He said the house has been given no care for a couple of years. He said there is a tree that needs care. He said the yard needs care. He said he hopes the house and the land around it will be improved. He said the biggest concern is there is no parking. He said he hopes there is some conversation about that. He said he serves on a similar board in Scituate and one of the things the board advises after it grants an approval is the petition should not come back asking for more. He said this is not an area that can stand having additional work done. Mr. Bowe said he is one of the owners of the subject property. He said it has been a year and a half since the fire. He said after 24 years he lost his job and that made the process to repair the home slower because he could not invest. He said he started a new job in June and now he can make improvements. He said he made renovations to the tree and the yard. As for parking, he said there is no paved driveway. He said his intent to put in crushed stone for vehicle parking, on the left side of the house. He said the next-door neighbor was thrilled. He said he sent out 25 letters to neighbors asking for support for the special permit. He said 15 letters were returned. Chairman Pinkham asked how many parking spaces there will be. Mr. Bowe said there will be two parking spaces. Chairman Pinkham asked if the applicant is okay with that being included as a condition. Mr. Bowe said that is no problem. Mr. Powderly said the existing home has four bedrooms and the new plans will reduce the number of bedrooms to three. Member Clancy said the home appears to fit within the character of the neighborhood. He said all the houses seem to be about the same height. Member Robertson asked Mr. Harding if he is opposed to the special permit. Mr. Harding said he is not opposed, but he wanted to raise some concerns. He said the property has not been maintained for a couple of years. He said there was some work done to a tree. He said there is more work that needs to be done. He said he is not opposed to the petition. Motion made by Member Ryan and seconded by Member Clancy to grant the special permit, with two conditions: 1.) The parking area will be installed as described, with two spaces on crushed stone; 2.) The height of the building will be 31.3 feet, as shown on the building plans; approved, 5-0.

5. **Arailton Jose Pereira and Maria Luisa Baeza Diaz Pereira, 46 Winter Street, Woburn, MA, 01801, seeking a Variance from Section 6.1 of the 1985 Woburn Zoning Ordinance, as amended, for a reduction in the front yard setback from 25 feet to 18.5 feet to install a deck at 46 Winter St., Woburn, MA:** Mr. Pereira said he and his wife are looking to build a deck. He said their yard is sloped. He said they are hoping to use the area under the deck for storage, including for a snow blower. He said a huge stump in the yard was recently removed. Chairman Pinkham said the plans show the proposed deck, but the plans do not show the dimensions of the existing deck. She said she can't tell if the existing deck is 12-feet deep. Mr. Pereira said he has an existing plan. Chairman Pinkham asked when the existing front stairs were built. Mr. Pereira said the

existing front stairs were built more than a year ago. Member Parrish asked if the appropriate form of relief is a special permit since the distance to the corner is 24.4 feet. Chairman Pinkham said the house was built in 1960 and it looks like it's been updated. She said one of the corners is too close to the front setback by half a foot. She said that makes the structure pre-existing, non-conforming. She said because the house didn't comply with zoning, it's subject to a different form of relief. Mr. Pereira said he was not aware of that. Chairman Pinkham said the standard for a variance is very high, and the standard for a special permit is much more lenient. Chairman Pinkham said the applicant could ask to change the petition from a variance to a special permit. She said she is not sure who gave the applicant guidance for a variance. She said the applicant will have to request a change to a special permit. Mr. Pereira said he would like to switch his application from a variance to a special permit. Chairman Pinkham asked if anyone in the audience wished to address the board in regard to the petition. Andrea Adams, 118 Green St., said she has 30 years of experience as a land use planner. She said she came here for the next petition. She said the notice of hearing is for a variance, and if people knew the form of relief was going to be changed to a special permit, then they might have attended the hearing. Motion made by Member Parrish and seconded by Member Ryan to change the application from a variance to a special permit; approved, 5-0. Member Ryan said if the request were for a variance instead of a special permit, he thinks it would satisfy the requirement for a variance. Member Ryan said if the relief that is requested extends an existing non-conformity, that is a real gray area. Chairman Pinkham said that is why a special permit exists as a form of relief, in cases of intensifying the non-conformity. Chairman Pinkham asked if there is any discussion about squaring off the deck area. Motion made by Member Parrish and seconded by Member Robertson to grant the special permit; approved, 5-0.

- 6. Neil Rebelo, 124 Green St., Woburn, MA, 01801, seeking a Variance from Section 6.1 and a Special Permit from Section 7.3 of the 1985 Woburn Zoning Ordinance, as amended, for an addition with a reduction in the rear yard setback from 30 feet to 21.3 feet and reduction in a side yard setback from 12 feet to 10.3 feet at 124 Green St., Woburn, MA:** Mr. Rebelo said he and his wife have lived at 124 Green St. since 2009. He said they are seeking a variance to install an 8-foot by 27.5-foot addition. He said the home is a raised Ranch that was damaged by a fire in June 2021. He said one flaw of the home is the size of the bedrooms, which he said are on the small side. He said the closets are small. He said they are looking to increase the size of the bedrooms as their family continues to grow. He said the layout of the house and the unique shape of the lot make trying to build an addition challenging. He said the proposed addition would make the house a little more non-conforming. Chairman Pinkham asked if the garage is being converted to give more room. Mr. Rebelo said the garage is being eliminated. He said they will use the area underneath the addition for storage. He said the storage area will not be visible from the street. He said the first thing he did when he decided to build an addition was consult the neighbor to the right. He said he believes the board has letters from neighbors who support the variance. He also submitted an insurance declaration that indicates the house was built in 1964. Chairman Pinkham asked if the house has been used as a 2-family. Mr. Rebelo said he has not used the house as a 2-family. He said his children use the basement but not as separate living quarters. Chairman Pinkham said it seems to her there is a great deal of room on the westerly side of the lot to expand

without the need for a variance. Mr. Rebelo said an addition on the westerly side would not work because of the change in grade. He said there is also exposed rock on the westerly side of the lot. Chairman Pinkham asked what the closest road is across the street. Mr. Rebelo said James Terrace is across the street. Member Parrish said there appears to be a retaining wall on the property. He said the property appears to be on a hill. He asked Mr. Rebelo if he is getting rid of the driveway near the garage area. Mr. Rebelo said that is where the garage door was. He said that will be a window. He said there will be no change to the driveway. Member Parrish said there are no topographical lines on the plot plan. He asked if it will more of a hardship to build on the left side of the house. Mr. Rebelo said there is room to build, but there is an exposed rock and a big tree in the front yard. Member Ryan asked if the open area next to the garage is going to be a carport. Mr. Rebelo said that will be an area for storage. He said neighbors won't be able to see anything. He said there is also a shed in the back. Chairman Pinkham asked if anyone in the audience wished to address the board in regard to the petition. Andrea Adams, 118 Green St., said she submitted a letter to the clerk. She said her primary qualm is whether the application meets the standard for a variance. She said there is a rock protruding in Mr. Rebelo's yard, just as there is a rock protruding in her yard. She said there is a 2-part test for a variance and a special permit. She said the Building Commissioner has determined this to be a significant addition. She said she sympathizes with the petitioner because there was a fire, but she said that does not entitle him to a variance. She said the applicant has stipulated the house was built in 1964, but the assessors' data base indicates the house was built in 1989. She said there is no record blasting was needed. She suggested the applicant revise the plans in toto to eliminate the need for a variance. She said the house is not designed to modern standards. She said the applicant could redesign the house to comply with the zoning ordinance by shrinking the size of the addition. She said she does not believe the topography of the lot constitutes a hardship. She said if the applicant provided evidence of ledge on the property; she would not have any qualms with the approval of a variance. She said the change of elevation has to be at least 25 percent to justify the issuance of a variance based on topography. She said without evidence the application meets the standard for a variance, the board should not enter into discussion about a variance. She said case law for special permits is still evolving. She said she does not have access the city solicitor or KP Law for a legal opinion. She said she looked at every available website, which she said indicates case law is still evolving. She said if the board is to grant a special permit, it would have to determine the application meets all the tests without substantially derogating from the ordinance. She said it is terrible that there was a fire, but she respectfully requested that the applicant be held to the same standard she would if she requested a dimensional variance. Chairman Pinkham asked if Ms. Adams lives two or three houses down from the subject property. Ms. Adams said she lives three houses away. Chairman Pinkham asked if Ms. Adams walked by the property and if so could she see rock. Ms. Adams answered affirmatively. Chairman Pinkham asked where the steep area of the property is. Ms. Adams said she brought a topographical map with her and submitted it to the board for inspection. Chairman Pinkham said the topographical map indicates a decrease in elevation from 114 feet to 106 feet by the driveway. She asked if the steepest part of the lot is to the left of the house. Member Robertson said the topographical map indicates there is an eight-foot differential. He asked who established the 25 percent threshold for a

change in topography as the standard for granting a variance. Ms. Adams said Jonathan Whiten from KP Law has suggested a slope of 25 percent determines a hardship. Member Robertson asked if Attorney Whiten cites a specific case. Ms. Adams said she can find it. Member Robertson asked Ms. Adams if the petitioner submits test borings that show ledge, if she would not object to the board determining there is a hardship. Ms. Adams said she does not think the application is sufficiently complete. She said the applicant's rationale is weak. She said because he wants bigger bedrooms does not mean he is entitled to a variance. Member Robertson said the shape of the lot seems to have an impact on the issue of the rear setback. Ms. Adams said in her opinion based on her experience as a land use planner in Watertown, the lot is oddly shaped but not sufficiently irregular. Member Robertson said he is looking at the plot plan with respect to the rear lot line and it appears to create an oddity. Justin O'Connor, also of 118 Green St., said he hopes Mr. Rebelo gets to do what he wants, but it appears the applicant is exacerbating an existing non-conformity, which he said may not be in everyone's best interests. And he said that by everyone, he means anyone who lives in an R-1 zoning district. He said he has a degree in natural science and he studied geology. He said Blueberry Hill has ledge, but Mr. Rebelo's property has glacial till, not ledge. He said it is incumbent of the board to look at what's really there. He said from the top of the hill to Nashua Street the land is higher on the west side. He said he does not think there is a lot of ledge. He said the applicant has the ability to build on the left side of the property. He said he does not believe a hardship has been established. He said his number one concern is the potential harm to the zoning regulations in the R-1 district. He said he thinks this petition will impact every person in R-1. He said he hopes the applicant can do what he wants but he does not want the board to create any new zoning standards. Member Robertson asked what the difference is between a large rock and ledge. Member Ryan said he does not know if that's ledge or not. He said he grew up in that neighborhood and there is probably ledge there. He said he agrees with Member Robertson that the shape of the lot could constitute grounds for a hardship. He said the slope of the property could also constitute a hardship. He said he knows there is ledge in that neighborhood. Mr. O'Connor said his point is without evidence the board does not know whether there is ledge. Member Robertson asked Mr. Rebelo if he considered doing test borings on the westerly side. Mr. Rebelo said he did not. Member Robertson said, in all candor, if you can pull something hard out of the ground, it's not necessarily ledge. Mr. Rebelo said he was told there is ledge on the property. Member Ryan asked who told Mr. Rebelo the proposed addition was large scale. Mr. Rebelo said his architect told him it was a small-scale addition. He said he was trying to make it as minimal as possible. Member Ryan said based on a length of 48 feet, the proposed addition is 17 percent. He asked Mr. Rebelo if the Building Commissioner would consider that a large-scale addition. Member Robertson asked to which part of the application does the variance apply, and to which part of the application does the special permit apply. Chairman Pinkham said there is an existing non-conformity with a rear setback of 26.1 feet. Member Robertson said he cannot see the need for a special permit. Mr. Rebelo said his contractor recommended he apply for both a special permit and a variance. He said he spoke to Building Commissioner Quinn who also told him to apply for both forms of relief. Member Ryan asked if the rear setback requires a special permit and the side setback requires a variance. Chairman Pinkham said the addition is going to be closer to the rear lot line.

Member Robertson said a lot of times he looks to the petitioner to make his case. He said the legal standards for a variance are fairly strict, and he expects the petitioner to be cognizant of that. He said if the applicant established there is ledge on the left side of the lot, he would find that to be a hardship. He said he is not sure whether the applicant's observation is sufficient, because he has not seen the outcropping. He said it is not his responsibility to deduce that. He said it is the petitioner's responsibility to make a case. Mr. Rebelo said Ms. Adams is not a direct abutter, and his direct abutters all support the variance, as evidenced by the letters he submitted. He said building on the west side of the property is not feasible. He said he is just trying to add space in the bedrooms. He said to use the west side of the property would require him to change the layout of the house. Chairman Pinkham read the relevant section of MGL Ch. 40A as it relates to variances. She said the petitioner will need to convince her that there is something that compels him to put the addition where he wants to put the addition. She said when she looked the plans, she was struck by the slope. She said it is very prominent. She said the applicant can build bigger bedrooms if their addition is only 6 feet, for which a variance would not be required. She said she does not know if the applicant wants to do a little more research. Member Ryan said if the applicant were to square the addition to the street, the addition would be within the setbacks. He said that is enough for him to support it. Member Parrish said he agrees with Member Ryan. He asked if a financial hardship would also include paying for borings and soil tests. Member Robertson said a financial hardship would be an excavation project, for which the applicant is not making a case. Member Parrish said if Mr. Rebelo has to build on the westerly side, it would create a financial hardship since there would be blasting and excavation. Chairman Pinkham said the hardship has to relate to the request for relief. She said she has no idea why the house is situated the way it is situated. She said going by the pictures it looks like something was excavated. Mr. Rebelo said there is a flat area where there was a pool that was removed. Member Robertson said it appears Member Ryan is satisfied with the topography creating a hardship. Member Ryan said he would also base a hardship finding on the shape of the lot, and the possibility there is ledge. Member Robertson asked if a site visit would help. Member Clancy said the issue he has is it is unknown what type of soil is in the ground. Chairman Pinkham said the applicant needs affirmative votes from four of the five members of the board of approval of a variance. She said her sense is at least two members of the board want to know if it is ledge or rock. She said if the application is denied, the petitioner cannot come back for similar relief for two years. She said if the applicant asks for a continuance, he can do some research and come back to the board in January. Mr. Rebelo said time is of the essence. He said his insurance company wants to see something done. He said a continuance could set them back, and they don't have the time. He said he is confused why the topography isn't considered a hardship. Chairman Pinkham said if Mr. Rebelo does not have four affirmative votes, he needs to make a decision about how he wants to proceed. Member Clancy said he would like to make a site visit to determine if the topography and soil constitute a hardship. Chairman Pinkham said if the board makes a site visit, there still will no vote until January. Member Parrish said the current structure only has 13.6 percent ground coverage, and the petitioner could knock down the house and build a huge McMansion. He said that is just a thought. Member Robertson asked if the home is currently vacant. Mr. Rebelo said the house has been vacant since the fire. He said it has taken a while but

they are trying to move forward. Chairman Pinkham asked if there is any interest in a site visit. Chairman Pinkham asked if the petitioner could assent to a site visit. Mr. Rebelo said he has no objection to a site visit. Ms. Adams said her qualm is not with the petitioner. She asked if the petitioner is willing to reduce the size of the addition, alleviating the need to a variance. She said if the applicant comes back with a petition that does not require a variance, he could move ahead. Mr. Rebelo said he would like to take a minute to consider his options. Chairman Pinkham said the board will move on to the next item on the agenda. (break in hearing) Mr. Rebelo said what happens if he asks for a vote on a smaller version of the addition. Chairman Pinkham said Mr. Rebelo will have to provide the board with a substantially different plan. She said without a variance, the vote is useless to him, if the addition remains in its current form. She said he needs a variance to build the addition. She said Mr. Rebelo can also request a continuance to the January meeting. Mr. Rebelo asked if the board can base a hardship on the results of soil testing. Chairman Pinkham said she does not know because the board does not know what's there. Member Ryan said soil testing is something the applicant may want to consider before next month. Mr. Rebelo said if they reduce the addition to six feet, would that require only a special permit, and if so can that be decided tonight. Chairman Pinkham said Mr. Rebelo can amend his application. Mr. Rebelo said he would like to amend the application. Chairman Pinkham asked to what dimensions Mr. Rebelo would like to amend the addition. Mr. Rebelo said he will acquiesce to reducing the addition from 8 feet by 27.5 feet to 6 feet by 27.5 feet, which abrogates the need for a variance. He asked if he needs to submit another set of plans. Chairman Pinkham said the board can stipulate the reduction in the addition but the Building Dept. will need an updated set of plans. Motion made by Member Parrish and seconded by Member Robertson to amend the dimensions of the proposed addition to 6 feet by 27.5 feet; approved, 5-0. Motion made by Member Ryan and seconded by Member Parrish to give leave to withdraw without prejudice for the variance application; approved, 5-0. Member Robertson asked if the abutter who spoke has any objection to the amended addition. Ms. Adams said she would like to thank the board of taking the time to consider her comments. She said the Building Commissioner deemed the addition large scale under Section 7.1.6 of the zoning code. She said since the application for a variance has been withdrawn, she is wholeheartedly in support of the project. Motion made by Member Robertson and seconded by Member Parrish to grant the special permit; approved, 5-0.

- 7. Scott E. Lang, 8 Kennedy Road, Woburn, MA, 01801, Petitioner and Landowner, for a Special Permit from 7.3 of the 1985 Woburn Zoning Ordinance, as amended, for a 2-story addition to a single-family home at 8 Kennedy Road, Woburn, MA:** Representing the petitioner were Scott and Amanda Lang, 8 Kennedy Road, Woburn, MA. Mr. Lang said they are looking to put an addition in the right side of their home. He said the lot lacks the frontage and square footage required in the zoning code, and there is an existing, non-conforming garage that is between 5-5.5 feet from the property line. He said the addition will be eight feet off the property line. He said they have been in the home for 10 years. He said the former owner lived there for 30 years. He said the home was built in 1953. Chairman Pinkham said the board has jurisdiction to consider the approval of a special permit. She said the plans do not indicate the setback for the garage. She asked what the basis is for the applicant's statement that the garage is setback five

feet from the property line. Ms. Lang said the surveyor indicated there is a 5-foot setback. Mr. Lang said the setback is 5.3 feet at an angle. Ms. Lang said she believes the architect drew the map. Chairman Pinkham said she went to page A2 of the building plans, but she could not read the text that indicates the dimensions of the front part of the house in the lower right-hand corner. Mr. Lang the test indicates there will be a vaulted ceiling and open to the first floor. Chairman Pinkham asked if anyone in the audience wished to address the board in regard to the petition. Motion made by Member Parrish and seconded by Member Clancy to grant the special permit; approved, 5-0.

8. **Approval of minutes from meeting of November 17, 2021:** Chairman Pinkham said she has made a series of corrections she will submit to the clerk. Motion made by Member Parrish and seconded by Member Clancy to approve the minutes as amended; all in favor, 5-0.
9. **Any other matter that may be legally before the Board:** None.
10. **Motion made by Member Parrish and seconded by Member Ryan to adjourn;** all in favor, 5-0. Chairman Pinkham adjourned the meeting at 8:03 p.m.

ATTEST:

Gordon Vincent
Clerk of the Zoning Board of Appeals