



**MINUTES OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS OF THE CITY OF WORCESTER
August 1, 2022**

Worcester City Hall – Levi Lincoln Chamber,
with remote participation options available via Webex online at:
<https://cow.webex.com/meet/planningboardwebex> and
call-in number 415-655-0001 (Access Code: 160 884 7670).

Zoning Board Members Present: Russell Karlstad, Chair
Jordan Berg Powers, Vice Chair – *Participated Remotely*
George Cortes
Anthony Dell'Aera – *Participated Remotely*
Shannon Campaniello
Nathan Sabo – *Participated Remotely*
Eric Torkornoo – *Participated Remotely*

Zoning Board Members Absent:

Staff Participating: Michelle Smith, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services
Rose Russell, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services
John Kelly, Building Commissioner

Call to Order –

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

Requests for Continuances, Extensions, Postponements, and Withdrawals

Item 5: 681 Millbury Street (ZB-2022-040) Special Permit & Variance
Request to Postpone the Public Meeting to August 22, 2022
Extend the Constructive Grant Deadline to September 13, 2022

On a motion by Mr. Sabo, seconded by Mr. Cortes, the Board voted 5-0 to postpone.

New Business:

- 1. 77 Seymour Street (MBL 05-035-00009) (ZB-2022-003)**
Special Permit: To allow the extension, alteration, or change to a privileged pre-existing, non-conforming structure/use (Article XVI, Section 4)
Special Permit: To allow a lodging house in an RG-5 Zone (Article IV, Section 2, Table 4.1, Residential Use #8)
Variance: For relief from the minimum parking requirements for a residential use (Article IV, Section 7, Table 4.4.)

Petitioner: Maria Cuadro
Present Use: Presently on the premises is a non-conforming three-family detached dwelling
Zone Designation: RG-5 (Residence, General) zoning district
Petition Purpose: The applicant seeks to renovate and convert the existing structure into a lodging house (with +/-13 beds) and conduct related site work.

Maria Cuadro, with the aid of an interpreter described her application before the Board and the changes she has made to the application since opening the hearing in April 2022. She stated previously was proposing 17 bedrooms and now proposed 13 rooms for rent, with the entire first floor to be occupied by her and her sons. Ms. Cuadro stated she has done extensive work to the property and has the support of many of her neighbors.

Mr. Karlstad asked how many people currently live in the house; and asked if there is currently an architect working on the project. Ms. Cuadro stated she has an architect working on the project and he has prepared and approved the plans.

Mr. Karlstad asked if the applicant could bring her representative or engineer to a future meeting to help the Board understand the project. Ms. Cuadro stated her architect has approved the plans, she has the confidence of her neighbors, has fixed up the property and installed cameras to improve the property to maintain a safe conditions for her, her sons and her renters.

Ms. Cuadro explained the number of rooms on each floor. Mr. Karlstad asked if the rooms would be singles or doubles; Ms. Cuadro answered. Mr. Karlstad asked if Ms. Cuadro is aware of the fire/building codes that she has to abide to; Ms. Cuadro stated she is aware.

Board Discussion

Mr. Cortes asked for assurances that sprinklers will be installed in the lodging house. Ms. Cuadro stated she will install sprinklers.

Mr. Torkornoo asked about the safety in the area. Ms. Smith asked Ms. Cuadro to discuss her security protocols a little further. Ms. Cuadro stated she has security cameras in the front yard, backyard and hallways.

Public Comment

Joanne Slick, an abutter, expressed concerns about the amount of cars parking on an already busy, one-way street. She also asked for clarifications on whether the applicant would be living there or not. She asked if the renters would have to sign any form of agreement to not bring more people into the house.

Helen Malone, 72 Seymour Street, described the current parking issues. She noted vehicles going the wrong way down the street going into Seymour Street, and expressed concern for the dynamics of the neighborhood.

Emilia Bruce Nimely, stated her brother is a direct neighbor and spoke before the Board. She stated many of the people who live in the rooms will use the bus stop due to the close proximity, and Maria has helped a lot of people in the community.

An abutter from 72 Seymour Street asked if there is an application form renters must fill out and if they will be required to do a CORY check. Mr. Karlstad asked Ms. Cuadro to confirm; she confirmed that she did not

previously do CORY checks but she does them now. The abutter also asked for clarification on the security cameras and who would be doing the CORY checks; Ms. Cuadro stated she will be performing the CORY checks.

Ms. Cuadro asked to speak more about the parking issue the abutters brought up. She also stated she would be amenable to reducing the amount of rooms further if the Board wishes.

Katheryn Ferrazzi, 72 Seymour Street, she believed while parking is an issue, that allowing a lodging house is setting a bad precedent for the neighborhood. She stated that a landlord could make more money renting traditional apartments and fears other homes may turn into lodging houses. Ms. Ferrazzi also expressed concerns about garbage and suggested the owner must be required to live on site.

Michael Ferrazzi, 72 Seymour Street, also stated his fears about the precedent set by allowing a lodging house in the neighborhood. Mr. Ferrazzi stated he believed the value of his property would go down if this was allowed and worried about the clientele of a lodging house.

Board Discussion

Mr. Cortes stated that while he heard all the concerns from the neighbors, there is a lack of affordable housing in the city, and by allowing a lodging house, it will be a positive for the community. He stated that if the home meets the building code requirements and if the owner continues living there, he would be in favor of the proposal.

Mr. Karlstad asked if the applicant was comfortable with the conditions of approval; Ms. Cuadro confirmed.

On a motion by Mr. Berg Powers, seconded by Mr. Cortes, 5-0 to close the public hearing.

On a motion by Mr. Berg Powers, seconded by Mr. Cortes; 2-3 with Mr. Cortes and Mr. Berg Powers in favor, and Mr. Karlstad, Mr. Dell'Aera and Mr. Torkornoo to deny the application based on the proposed density.

2.	44 Esther Street (MBL 10-011-00022) (ZB-2022-035)
Special Permit:	To modify dimensional standards for a Residential Conversion (Article IV, Section 9)
Variance:	For relief from the minimum parking requirements for a residential use (Article IV, Section 7, Table 4.4.)
Petitioner:	Nguyen Do and Hao Quach
Present Use:	Presently on the premises is a single-family detached dwelling
Zone Designation:	RG-5 (Residential, General) zoning district
Petition Purpose:	The applicant seeks to convert the single-family detached dwelling into a two-family detached dwelling with no exterior changes to the structure.

David Sadowski, the representative for the application described the petition before the board. Mr. Sadowski stated that since the last meeting, he has produced a new site plan that shows a third space to remedy concerns about parking from the Board and abutters.

Public comments

Kevin Durkin, 47 Esther Street, stated his continued concerns about the parking situation on Esther Street. Mr. Durkin stated he was concerned that the third parking space was not wide enough for a car to open without

hitting the retaining wall. He stated if the parking space is not practical, that residents will continue to park on the street. He clarified his question, and asked if the space was wide enough for a parking space.

Mr. Sadowski stated the city standard is 9ft wide for a parking space.

Brian Cormier, 43 Esther Street, expressed his continued concerns for the dangerous parking situation and the amount of cars on the street.

Mr. Karlstad stated he felt that potentially getting a car parked on the street into an off-street parking lot is a positive solution for the neighborhood.

Board discussion

Shannon Campaniello stated that after conducting a site visit, she did feel that the home felt more characteristic of a single-family.

Michelle Smith, of the Planning Division stated that the lot area of this parcel is similar to the size of many of the neighboring properties, and many of the neighboring properties are two or three-family dwellings.

Mr. Sadowski stated that the lot area is similar to a lot of the neighboring lots, and many of those lots don't have any off-street parking. Mr. Sadowski requested the waivers.

On a motion by Mr. Berg Powers, seconded by Mr. Cortes, the board voted 5-0 to close the public hearing.

On a motion by Mr. Berg Powers, seconded by Mr. Cortes, the board voted 4-1, Mr. Dell'Aera opposed to approve the requested relief.

5 minute recess

New Business:

- 3. 18-24 Oxford Street (MBL 03-022-00015 & -00021) (ZB-2022-030)**
- Special Permit:** To allow a Professional Office use in a RG-5 zone (Article XVI, Section 2, Table 4.1, Business Use #19)
- Special Permit:** To modify parking, loading requirements, dimensional requirements, layout, and/or the number of required spaces and/or landscaping requirements (Article IV, Section 7, A, 2)
- Petitioner:** Wilson Wahome Kiriungi
- Present Use:** Presently on the premises is a privileged non-conforming structure with a surface parking lot
- Zone Designation:** RG-5 (Residence, General) zoning district
- Petition Purpose:** The applicant seeks to operate a facility that caters to children with special needs.

Wilson Kiriungi, the owner and petitioner described his application before the Board; contracts with the City of Worcester to aid students with disabilities; the prior use of the building; the lack of adequate services for children with special needs; and addressed some abutter concerns about noise, parking and hours of operation.

Mr. Kiriungi stated that this is a unique proposal and that's why it doesn't fit neatly into an existing zoning category.

Neil Dixon, the engineer for the proposal, described the parking plan for 18-24 Oxford Street; the circulation through the property and the relief requested by the applicant.

Board Discussion

Mr. Cortes asked the applicant to confirm the hours of operation and that no work be happening during the night. Mr. Kiriungi confirmed the hours would be 7AM-6PM. Mr. Cortes asked the applicant if anyone would stay overnight; Mr. Kiriungi confirmed the business only operated during the day. Mr. Cortes asked if food preparation would occur on the property; Mr. Kiriungi stated no food preparation would occur. Mr. Cortes asked how many staff would be on-site; Mr. Kiriungi stated five members of staff on site.

Mr. Cortes asked if the applicant has a plan for emergency situations; Mr. Berg Powers objected to this line of questioning and stated it is out of the Board's preview.

Kirsten Fuller described her career and work with Autism Allies before the Board. She stated this program will be licensed and regulated by the Department of Early Education and Care. She stated the facility will be open from 7:30AM-5:30PM, with some programs happening after 5:30PM.

Susan DuFrane described her work with Autism Allies and her background in early childhood education and as a behavioral analyst. She described the program that is proposed for 18 Oxford Street as a unique daycare for children with Autism and for children without Autism. She also stated that Applied Behavioral Analysis would be available at the daycare.

Board Discussion

Mr. Berg Powers gave some geographic context to the site, and stated there are a variety of businesses in this area. Mr. Berg Powers asked the Board to share their feelings with the applicant before voting if they have reservations.

Ms. Campaniello agreed with Mr. Berg Powers and stated she was happy with the extent of the presentation by the applicant.

Mr. Cortes stated he is in favor of expanding services to people who need it and wants to see it done the right way and evaluate the impact on the community.

Mr. Dell'Aera stated he feels that this is an important service in our community and is interested in why the project is so contentious.

Public Comment:

Christine Johnson, representative for the Crown Hill Local Historic District Neighborhood Association, described the lack of on-going communication between the applicant and the neighborhood association; past disruptions caused by the applicant; and outstanding concerns to neighborhood posed by the application. Ms. Johnson asked the Board to uphold the Zoning Ordinance and deny the application.

Elizabeth Barnes, 14 Oxford Street, described the difficult back- and – forth when dealing with the applicant. She stated she had lived next to the daycare for a number of years, and first imagined Autism Allies as a counseling center rather than a daycare.

Mr. Karlstad asked why this use was designated as an office use rather than a daycare. Ms. Smith gave a brief description of the application and the requested relief. She stated Inspectional Services is the governing body who makes decisions about what use a property/business falls into within the Zoning Ordinance.

Don Northwaite, Congress Street, described the neighborhood association and the way it has improved the neighborhood since it was first implemented.

Alex Guardiola, Vice President of Government Affairs and Public Policy for the Worcester Regional Chamber of Commerce, spoke in favor of the proposal. He stated the use will be similar to the daycare that was previously there. He stated that 60-70% of the current students at the Shrewsbury location are Worcester residents and are children of color, and that 80% of them are low to moderate income. Mr. Guardiola stated that it is difficult for families to access services in Shrewsbury and many children will benefit from reducing the barrier to access by allowing Autism Allies to operate in this location.

Elizabeth Mullaney, 7 Congress Street asked for clarification on on-going proceeding. She stated her concerns for any potential loss of green space.

Honee Hess, 6 Crown Street, described drugs, prostitution and the dangerous history of the neighborhood. Ms. Hess stated that the neighborhood has worked hard over the years to improve safety and use of the property as a residence will continue to improve the neighborhood character.

Candace Haddad, a previous resident of 18 Oxford Street stated she was surprised by the neighborhood response to Autism Allies. She spoke to the diversity of the neighborhood and rebutted some of the other neighbor concerns. Ms. Haddad stated it is not a quiet residential neighborhood, but a bustling downtown thru-street.

Marc Tumeinski, 15 Oxford Street, asked the board to deny the special permits and to honor the Zoning Ordinance. He stated there is nothing unique about this location that makes it a better location than a building in a business zone.

Carmen Michel, 11 Oxford Street, stated she would not want to see an office in her neighborhood, and asked for clarity on what exactly the applicant is proposing, and opposed a special permit to allow an office.

Jo Massarelli, 15 Oxford Street, asked the Zoning Board to not grant the special permit for a professional office. Ms. Massarelli expressed concerns about noise, traffic and parking and regular influx of people in the neighborhood who don't live there.

Justin Duffy, 144 Pleasant Street, asked for clarity about the loss of green space, and stated any opposition to loss of green space.

Mary Keefe, 10 Oxford Street, stated she is a state representative and is happy to see all the neighbors showing up and concern over their neighborhood. Ms. Keefe asked why the zoning change was necessary if the applicant is simply proposing a daycare.

On a motion by Mr. Karlstad, seconded by Mr. Cortes, the Board took a 5 minute recess.

Mr. Kelly from Inspectional Services stated he feels that the city should consult further with the law department on this application to determine if the professional office is the most appropriate zoning determination.

Wayne Haddad, stated he is the brother of Candace Haddad and also grew up at 18 Oxford Street. Mr. Haddad stated Rob Roy used to be a school and had lots of children and the property at 18 Oxford Street has more greenspace than a lot of other properties in the neighborhood.

Deborah Northwaite, 10 Congress Street, stated that this proposal is not a daycare and is not fit in with the historic character of the neighborhood and erode work done to improve the residential character of the neighborhood.

Elizabeth Barnes asked for more clarification on what exactly is going to occur on this property, whether it's a counseling center or a daycare.

Kristen Fuller described more about the application and stated it is an inclusive daycare with professionals, and will be licensed through the Department of Early Education. Ms. Fuller stated that this will be a daycare with additional licensed providers to aid in development for children with ASD.

Elizabeth Barnes asked if it is a daycare is it just for school age children or older children, and asked if it was possible to see a business plan.

Mr. Kelly stated due to the overwhelming public interest, he feels more time is necessary to get input from the law department to finalize a use determination.

Ms. Campaniello stated for the record that this special permit would be conditioned to be held with the applicant in an effort to help mediate worries about an office coming into the neighborhood.

Mr. Karlstad stated a condition that could be added to require a net-zero loss of green space, and asked the applicant for consent to continue the item.

Ms. Smith listed some conditions of approval mentioned by the Board during the discussion; using residential type trash pickup; limiting hours of operation; the special permit to be held by the applicant only etc.

Mr. Sabo asked if the use was determined to be a daycare would it have to return to the Board; Mr. Smith clarified.

Mr. Karlstad requested the applicant meet with neighborhood association or conduct some outreach to the concerned residents.

Mr. Kiriungi stated he was amenable to continuing the application to August 22nd.

On a motion by Mr. Berg Powers, seconded by Mr. Cortes, the Board voted 5-0 to continue the public hearing to August 22, 2022.

-
- 4. 16-18 Taunton Street (MBL 35-26B-00059 & -00060) (ZB-2022-037)**
- Special Permit:** To allow a single-family attached dwelling in a RL-7 zone (Article IV, Section 2, Table 4.2, Residential Use #12)
- Lot B
- Special Permit:** To modify parking, loading requirements, dimensional requirements, layout, and/or the number of required spaces and/or landscaping requirements (Article IV, Section 7, A. 2)
- Variance:** For relief from the minimum lot area dimensional requirement for a single-family attached dwelling in an RL-7 Zone (Article IV, Section 4, Table 4.2)

Lot C

Special Permit: To modify parking, loading requirements, dimensional requirements, layout, and/or the number of required spaces and/or landscaping requirements (Article IV, Section 7, A. 2)

Variance: For relief from the minimum lot area dimensional requirement for a single-family attached dwelling in an RL-7 Zone (Article IV, Section 4, Table 4.2)

Petitioner: Tony Nguyen of Gold Star Builders, Inc.

Present Use: Presently on the premises is a vacant lot.

Zone Designation: RL-7 (Residence, Limited) zoning district

Petition Purpose: The applicant seeks to construct a single-family attached (townhouse) dwelling, with a total of 4-units (each on their own lot), and to conduct related site work.

Donald J. O Neil, representative for the Gold Star Builders, Inc. described the application before the Board. Mr. O’Neil described the relief requested, the character and zoning of the surrounding neighborhood. Mr. Karlstad asked for clarification on the architectural plans; Mr. O’Neil clarified.

Public Comment

James Scanlon Jr, 20 Taunton Street, asked about drainage on the lots and described flooding in the neighborhood during spring and heavy rains.

Mr. Berg Powers asked the applicant if the proposal would have to before the Conservation Commission and asked if Bridgeport Street may be extended. Ms. Smith stated the proposal is scheduled for the next Conservation Commission meeting and the property is not located in a flood plain.

Nick Facendola, the engineer for the application stated that Bridgeport Street will not be developed and he believes it’s owned by the city.

Inspectional Services had no comments.

On a motion by Mr. Berg Powers, seconded by Mr. Cortes, 5-0 to close the public hearing.

On a motion by Mr. Berg Powers, seconded by Mr. Cortes; 5-0 to approve the requested relief.

6. 25 Carver Street (MBL 17-010-00030) (ZB-2022-046)

Special Permit: To modify parking, loading requirements, dimensional requirements, layout, and/or the number of required spaces and/or landscaping requirements (Article IV, Section 7, A, 2)

Special Permit: To modify dimensional standards for a Residential Conversion in an RL-7 zone (Article IV, Section 9)

Variance: For relief from the minimum rear yard setback dimensional requirement for a two-family detached dwelling in an RL-7 Zone (Article IV, Section 4, Table 4.2)

Variance: For relief from the minimum parking requirements for a residential use (Article IV, Section 7, Table 4.4)

Petitioner: Arnold Villatico, Jr.

Present Use: Presently on the premises of 25 Carver Street is a pre-existing, non-conforming single-family detached dwelling with associated driveway and parking.

Zone Designation: RL-7 (Residence, Single-Family) zoning district

Petition Purpose: The applicant seeks to convert the existing structure into a two-family detached dwelling, add a rear stairway, to (retroactively) pave a portion of the front-yard, and to conduct associated site work.

Jay Gallant, an architect for the application spoke on behalf of the petition. He stated the applicant wanted to add a second unit to the residence through the residential conversion provision. Mr. Gallant stated the additional paving was added for additional parking since the residents were previously parking on the lawn in that area.

Ms. Smith gave staff comments and described the two options the Board could take when granting relief, and described the variance for the side yard setback which is requested to be withdrawn through Option C.

Board Discussion

Mr. Berg Powers stated he felt that option C is preferable but wished residents would reach out to the city prior to completing additional paving, as was done in this case.

Mr. Karlstad requested a second tree be added in place.

Mr. Gallant requested the waivers, and a leave to withdraw for the parking variance.

No public comments.

On a motion by Mr. Berg Powers, seconded by Mr. Cortes, 5-0 to close the public hearing.

On a motion by Mr. Berg Powers, seconded by Mr. Cortes, 5-0 to approve the requested relief and granted a leave to withdraw without prejudice for the variance for relief from the minimum parking requirements.

7. 22 Enid Street (MBL 38-012-00134) (ZB-2022-050)

Variance: For relief from the minimum lot area dimensional requirement for a single-family detached dwelling in an BL-1.0 Zone (Article IV, Section 4, Table 4.2)

Variance: For relief from the minimum rear yard setback dimensional requirement for a single-family detached dwelling in an BL-1.0 Zone (Article IV, Section 4, Table 4.2)

Petitioner: George Russell

Present Use: Presently on the premises is a vacant lot.

Zone Designation: BL-1.0 (Business, Limited) zoning district

Petition Purpose: The applicant seeks to construct a single-family detached dwelling and conduct associated site work.

George Russell described his application before the Zoning Board. He stated he feels a single-family dwelling is the best use of the property rather a business. He stated the relief requested; discussion with neighbors; and stated his willingness to work with the Zoning Board and any abutter to improve the project.

Ms. Russell described the staff comments on the application.

Board Discussion

Mr. Karlstad asked the applicant to add a street tree to the property, or save any mature trees on the property as possible; Mr. Russell stated he would be amenable to that.

Mr. Cortes asked for clarification on the type of proposed house; Mr. Russell clarified.

No public comments.

Inspectional Services had no comment.

Public comment

Mary Menaso, 140 Commonwealth Avenue, expressed concerns about neighboring multifamily homes adjacent to this property have driveways so short, the cars stick into the road, and if that would also be an issue on this property. Ms. Menaso also stated concerns about loss of green space.

Steven Magnuson, 134 Commonwealth Avenue, expressed concerns about grading on the lot and stated they have a lot of flooding issues since the neighborhood has continued to be developed.

Mr. Karlstad stated the project will also have to go before the Conservation Commission; Ms. Smith clarified the application may not be required to go to the Conservation Commission, and encouraged interested parties to follow up with the Planning Division if they are interested.

Christina, Commonwealth Avenue, expressed concerns about sidewalks on Enid Street, and flooding issues in the neighborhood.

Ms. Smith suggested a friendly amendment to minimize the tree clearing and minimizing the width to 22ft of the driveway; Mr. Russell stated he was amenable to the conditions.

On a motion by Mr. Berg Powers, seconded by Mr. Cortes, 5-0 to close the public hearing.

On a motion by Mr. Berg Powers, seconded by Mr. Cortes, 5-0 to approve the requested relief with the added condition to minimize tree clearing as possible and minimize the length of the driveway to a maximum width of 22 FT.

8.	69 West Street (MBL 37-23A-00006) (ZB-2022-044)
Special Permit:	To allow the extension, alteration, or change to a privileged, pre-existing, non-conforming structure and/or use (Article XVI, Section 4)
Variance:	For relief from the minimum rear yard setback dimensional requirement for a multi-family low rise dwelling in an RG-5 Zone (Article IV, Section 4, Table 4.2)
Petitioner:	Jianqing Luo and Peng Feng
Present Use:	Presently on the premises of 69 West Street is a partially demolished, privileged, nonconforming 11-unit multi-family low-rise dwelling that suffered fire damage.
Zone Designation:	RG-5 (Residence, General) zoning district
Petition Purpose:	The applicant seeks to rebuild an 11-unit multi-family low-rise dwelling with associated site improvements

Todd Rodman, on behalf of the applicant, discussed the application before the board. Mr. Rodman described the fire that had destroyed the structure and the plans to restore the multi-family dwelling to its prior status of 11 units.

Ms. Smith summarized the application before the Board.

Mr. Cortes asked if any of the units are accessible; Jim Chen, the architect for the project described the proposal and stated accessible units are not able to be provided. Mr. Rodman stated there is no way to provide accessible units within the floorplan.

Ms. Smith stated the threshold for proving accessible units are greater than 20 units but defers to Inspectional Services for specific requirements in this case, and that would be handled during the building permit stage.

Public Comment

Eric Benander, 49 Bowdoin Street, described his concerns about how much “building” is proposed for the lot and issues with trash and the current state of the property. He also asked about the process and why the building wasn’t completely torn down and about the process of gaining approval; Mr. Karlstad answered.

Board Discussion

Mr. Berg Powers stated he lives in this neighborhood and agrees with the abutter that he is not in favor of the architecture and hopes the architecture will get resolved further down the line.

Ms. Smith stated that the project is will not require Planning Board approval and asked the Board to discuss their concerns in this hearing, and asked the applicant to describe the changes; Mr. Chen described the changes.

Mr. Karlstad expressed he is also frustrated with the architecture, and stated he would like see an ADA complaint unit added.

Mr. Dell’Aera stated his disappointment for going beyond what is legally permissible and states one ADA compliant unit isn’t something to aspire too, but should be standard practice.

Ms. Smith summarized the Board comments to the applicant, including addition of an accessible unit and an enhanced architectural design.

Mr. Berg Powers repeated his unhappiness with the design; Mr. Karlstad stated that the number of units isn’t the issue but stated his wish for a better design.

Mr. Rodman stated he would be amenable to continue the hearing and explore some design options.

On a motion by Mr. Berg Powers, seconded by Mr. Cortes, 5-0 to continue the public hearing.

9. 26 & 0 Hermitage Lane (MBL 16-002-00031 & -031-1) (ZB-2022-056)

Lot 1 (26 Hermitage Lane)

Variance: For relief from the minimum frontage dimensional requirement in an RG-5 Zone (Article IV, Section 4, Table 4.2)

Variance: For relief from the minimum off-street parking/loading requirement (Article IV, Section 4, Table 4.2)

Lot 2 (Proposed)

Variance: For relief from the minimum frontage dimensional requirement in an RG-5 Zone (Article IV, Section 4, Table 4.2)

Petitioner: Eric M. Figuerido

Present Use: Presently on the premises of 26 Hermitage Lane (aka Lot 1) is a privileged, non-conforming, two-family detached dwelling, and on the premises of 0 Hermitage Lane (aka Lot 2) is a vacant lot.

Zone Designation: RG-5 (Residence, General) zoning district

Petition Purpose: The applicant seeks to construct a two-family detached dwelling at 0 Hermitage Lane with associated site improvements.

Donald J. O'Neil described the petition before the Board. Mr. O'Neil explained the permit for the property had recently expired, and the current petition is the same as the prior application.

Ms. Smith described the petition and staff comments to the Board.

No board discussion

No public comments

On a motion by Mr. Berg Powers, seconded by Mr. Cortes, 5-0 to close the public hearing.

On a motion by Mr. Berg Powers, seconded by Mr. Cortes, 5-0 to approve the requested relief

Other Business:

10. Communications

No discussion

11. Approval of Minutes

No discussion

12. Discussion of Board Policies and Procedures

No discussion

Adjournment

On a motion by Mr. Berg Powers, seconded by Mr. Torkornoo, the Board voted unanimously to adjourn at 10:45PM.