

**City of Newburyport
Zoning Board of Appeals
2/23/16, 7pm**

Present: Edward Ramsdell, Duncan LaBay, Jamie Pennington, Dick Goulet, and Renee Bourdeau
Absent: Rob Ciampitti

The minutes of 2/9/16 were approved unanimously. Mr. Goulet motioned to approve and Mr. LaBay seconded. All voted in favor.

Mr. Ramsdell noted that only four board members would be available at the 3/8 hearing so attendance was important.

Diamond Sinacori LLC

151 High Street

2016-001 - Dimensional Variance: *variance for lot area where the pre-existing non-conforming building use is changing to multifamily*

2016-002 - Special Permit for Non-Conformities: *alteration of a pre-existing non-conforming structure to allow for a new multi-family use*

2016-003 - Special Permit: *renovate existing structure into a ten unit multi-family structure (Use #103)*

This hearing was continued from the 1/12/16 meeting. The applicant requested to continue the hearing to 3/22/16. The applicant is still going through site plan review with the Planning Board. Mr. LaBay motioned to continue the hearings to 3/22 and Mr. Goulet seconded. All voted in favor.

Robert and Elizabeth MacDonald c/o Lisa L. Mead, Esq.

114-118 Merrimac Street

2016-009 - Dimensional Variance: *modify previously granted variances for height, side yard setback, and rear setback to change the egress and parking and correct a scrivener's error in the plan reference 2016-010*

2016-010 - Special Permit for Non-Conformities: *modify previously granted Special Permit for Non-Conformities to change the egress and parking and correct a scrivener's error in the plan reference*

2016-011 - Special Permit: *modify previously granted Special Permit for a two-family use (Use #102) to change the egress and parking and correct a scrivener's error in the plan reference*

The applicants requested a continuance to the meeting of 3/22/16. Mr. LaBay motioned to continue to 3/22/16 and Mr. Goulet seconded. All members voted in favor.

2016-004

Adam True, The True Company

48 Boardman Street

Dimensional Variance: *split lot to create two non-conforming lots with variances required for lot area, frontage, lot width, and rear yard setback*

Nick Cracknell represented the applicants, Adam True and Bill Palm. Scott Brown, architect, and Mark Griffin, attorney, were also present. Mr. Cracknell said their goals from the onset to look at the Capt. James Clarkson (1780) house. He said the house was in great shape externally and the internal aspects have not been substantially altered. Much of the exterior fabric, except the roof, is original or close to original. Mr. Cracknell said that historic preservation was their main goal and they worked with Newburyport Preservation Trust (NPT) in developing the application. Mr. Cracknell explained the unique landscape with three very mature trees, hickory, spruce, and sugar maple, probably over 100 years old. They tried to minimize the impact to trees and garden. They were proposing a second single family structure that would appear original and subordinate to the main house, like a carriage house that has been rehabbed. He said that this project would not be a gut and remodel.

Mr. Cracknell said that there was 11,000 s.f. of lot area, which is non-conforming for the existing three unit building. Five parking spaces exist on the site that are leased to others in the neighborhood. He said that this was a very large lot compared to others in the area and was combined with another lot in 1835. There used to be a barn on the site. Mr. Cracknell said that they did a comprehensive assessment of the neighborhood and collected 30 variables about size, orientation, age, setbacks, etc. in order to understand the neighborhood. Early on, it was obvious that another full single family home would be overbearing so the idea of a carriage house came about. It would be set back in deference to Clarkson house. Mr. Cracknell said that their approach is to be collaborative and talked about how he started with a brochure, introduced himself to the neighbors, and gave an idea of what could happen. On this project, it was apparent that the stone finish may be out of place. A survey was created that presented two design options. All but one quickly opted for the wood siding, which they ended up changing. They then asked for a continuance in January to hold an open house. They had 11 participants and discussed existing conditions and as-of-right plans. Mr. Cracknell also proposed a confirmatory set of stipulations that would ensconce all the agreements that were made to ensure there is one document that captures everything. There were 16 conditions being proposed at this time. A list of changes to the application was submitted.

Mr. Cracknell said the as-of-right option was prepared that would add a four car garage and remodel –not restore - the Clarkson house. There was an assumption that there would be less restoration due to cost. It would include a 850 s.f. addition. A request to the Building Department was submitted acknowledging whether the plan was by-right, which it was determined it was. An energy audit and structural drawings would be needed prior to issuing a building permit but this was the as-of-right plan.

The applicants were proposing to remove the sunroom and gut the second addition. The main house and first addition would be preserved inside and out. Clapboards appear to be original, if not close to original. Gutting of the second addition would be to improve the floorplan. As a result of the open house, participants requested the Clarkson house to be converted to a single family house, which the applicants agreed to. They would add a garage to make it marketable. The abutters on Olive requested the garage to be attached to reduce their impact. The carriage

house design remains for lot 2 with a reduced footprint. The rendering did not include the garage in the rear that would be set back 3' from the face. Using the cost savings for removing stone finish, they proposed to replace asphalt roof with a cedar roof. Brick sidewalks would be installed all along the property and an additional area across Boardman Street. Assuming the existing parking lease is valid, a third parking space would be added to the side. The carriage house structure would be 2,100 s.f. and set back 22'. They have made their best efforts to shrink and move it away from the abutters concerned with encroachment. Mr. Cracknell said that they went through the interior with NPT to identify things to be restored. They added restrictive covenants that there will be no additional permanent structures. They also expanded the off-street parking due to existing parking problems in the neighborhood. They also proposed to replace the cedar fence along the back property line to the mutual satisfaction of all property owners.

Mr. Cracknell said that they needed variances for both lots. A Preservation Restriction would need to be approved by the Newburyport Historic Commission. Mr. Cracknell submitted five letters in support of the application. He said the average single family lot is only 4,100 s.f. Both proposed lots would be larger. The frontage is twice than average of area. Lot coverage would be similar to the existing. There would be a comparable footprint and volume. The rear yard setbacks are consistent if not greater than most, as are side yard setbacks. The volume is 2/3 size of average in neighborhood. The height is 24' to the midpoint. Mr. Cracknell said that more than half of the homes in the area are 2 ½ stories. The proposal would provide twice as much parking as surrounding properties did. He said that the hardship is related to the lot shape. He said it was irregular and it originally consisted of two lots. Mr. Cracknell said that all of the other opposite corner lots have are pre-existing non-conforming and have insufficient side yards, lot coverage, and open space. He said the applicants have been willing to scale back their expectations through the process. They felt this was a respectful way to move forward, add value, and share the proceeds. Boardman Street has a 5-car wide curb cut, which is very unique. The resulting volume would be similar to when Capt. Clarkson bought the property. The maps submitted showed the numerous outbuildings that once existed.

In favor:

Tom Kolterjahn, 64 Federal Street, on behalf of the Newburyport Preservation Trust spoke in favor. He said the NPT very strongly supported the project and they worked for months with the project team. He said it was critical to preserve early structures in Newburyport and rarely do you see the level of outreach in the neighborhood that these applicants did. He said the team has gone the extra mile to make it a good project and made countless changes. As a preservationist, he has never seen a nicely detailed list presented to the Board and thought it would make a wonderful guide for future developers. He said typical developers gut the buildings but the ZBA has the opportunity to make the preservation of the Clarkson house a reality. He said the NPT would consult collaboratively with the developer throughout the project.

Bronson deStadler of Walnut Street spoke in favor saying it was a model of collaboration. He said he was very impressed with the applicant's willingness to listen and modify the application. He said the historic presentation speaks for itself and he strongly endorsed the application.

Timothy O'Malley of 29 Boardman Street was in favor.

Linda Miller of 20 Ship Street said the collaborative effort got the project to where it is now, which needs to happen more often. The developer chose to engage the neighborhood and Mr. Cracknell and the effort has been remarkable. She said she strongly supported the application.

Patti Talamini of 39 ½ Boardman Street said she was very much in support. She thought it was a beautiful property and she was thrilled that they will preserve the home.

Ann Teal of 37 Boardman Street said she has lived in the area since 1971. The changes in the area have been astounding. It was once a working class neighborhood and is more of an executive-type area now. She said she was truly impressed by the architect. She thought the project would improve the neighborhood and was very much in favor.

Reg Bacon of 21 Strong Street said he typically opposes applications but thinks this project will stand as a model for neighborhood/developer collaboration.

Jeannette Isabella of 1 Lime Street suggested this is the type of the collaboration that should be done.

Opposed:

John Leary of 62 Washington Street spoke in opposition. He said his family has lived there since 1966. Mr. Leary said that the hardship was self-imposed and submitted a letter summarizing his objections. The existing lot is already undersized, not unlike others in the neighborhood. He said that economic interest does not provide justification for a self-imposed hardship.

Sue Hertz of 53 Boardman Street said she appreciated the detail and attention paid to the aesthetics and was thrilled with keeping and maintaining the Clarkson house but the addition on the Clarkson house would run the entire length of Washington Street where there is a little piece of green in a dense neighborhood. The hardship is self-imposed. The alternative would be so much worse. She asked why infill is required to preserve a property.

Joyce Scott of 45 Olive Street objected to application. She said that until the zoning is changed, the ZBA must follow the existing code. A valid hardship has not been proven which is crucial to process. She said that the applicant's said they lot has too much frontage, large side yard, historically significant. She felt the stated criteria were the inverse of hardship and said that self-imposed hardships are not eligible. A carriage house was usually a smaller structure used for storage. A fraction of the size of the home served, and similar architecture. This would be a large single family home on a small non-conforming lot. She said it was too big and would take

up too much side yard. She felt that the conditions were not unique to the applicant's lot. The ZBA would be granting a special privilege and set a dangerous precedent. She said the neighbors have been fearful of the process and have been threatened with a monstrosity. There were trees being cut down and height added. Open space should be left open, whether public or private. She said that the applicants were doing things that most would in order to increase financial viability. Ms. Scott said that variances should be rarely granted and requested the application be denied.

Mr. LaBay read a letter submitted from Ann McNamee and Heather Perkins of 46 Washington Street stating their concern with the increasing density of the neighborhood.

Questions:

Mr. Cracknell said that it must be recognized that the zoning ordinances allows this density, configuration, and this layout under a Planning Board VI.C application. The applicants chose the variance route because of the condominium arrangement. 98% of lots in the R3 are non-conforming. This project meets the dimensional controls if there is no lot line. The only difference would be in ownership. They felt that it did not make sense to condo if both houses did not share anything. There would be no new non-conformities and they were not intensifying any non-conformities. He said it made more sense that it be a single family. Mr. Cracknell said that if the application is denied or appealed, a VI.C application would be submitted.

Mr. Ramsdell asked the applicant to address the hardship. Mr. Griffin said that the lot is very unique by virtue of size and it being a corner lot. He noted that the ordinance acknowledges pre-existing non-conformities and the corner lot provision provides that if all surrounding corners are also non-conforming, it can be considered evidence of hardship. In this case, all three corners are non-conforming in terms of lot area and setbacks. If the application is granted, two new lots would be created that would larger than the average of any lot in the area.

Mr. LaBay asked about the impacts to the Leary property. The current setback is 31.1' and 24.2' was being proposed. Mr. LaBay showed Mr. Leary a 1960 density map showing his house was originally two homes. Mr. Leary said it was demolished in the late 40s.

Deliberations:

Ms. Bourdeau said she struggled about whether hardship is valid or financial. She thought the project was great for the structure and was very pro-preservation but was not sure if the ZBA should be enforcing historic preservation. Based on criteria outlined by the applicant, she said she was finding it hard to find that the hardship was not financial and is self-imposed. She said she wasn't able to support it at this time.

Mr. Pennington complimented the discourse and said that the opposition had some good points. He said that the ZBA is not a design review committee and they must work within very limited constraints of a very imperfect ordinance. He said that he did not like the threat of alternative approaches. He noted the strong arguments for support and said that Section 6.d.2 provides a hardship for corner lots. On that basis, the applicant is creating new violations, but it's consistent with the lots on the other corners. He said that he respected the opposition but there are also reasons to support it, including legal reasons. Mr. Pennington said he was leaning towards supporting the application.

Mr. LaBay noted that the ZBA's role is to provide relief where appropriate. He agreed that it is a flawed zoning ordinance but it is what the Board must work with. They were there as the lowest court of appeals to provide relief from the existing code, where appropriate. 6.d.2 provides hardship to corner lots if every other opposing corners are non-conforming. There are legal grounds for granting relief. He said he found it hard to find against the NPT, based on their sensitivity to past applications. He said it was very unusual to hear such strong support. The Board must balance preservation, economic issues, etc. and what is the best outcome for most. He said that he takes concerns strongly and also noted the letters submitted in support of the application. He said he could accept the hardship based on the corner lot argument.

Mr. Goulet said he was sold on the variance argument, with it being unique and with the corner lot argument. He said he respected both positions, for and against. He noted that the support was overwhelming. Mr. Goulet said he was in support.

Mr. Ramsdell said the corner lot provision permits the Board to find a hardship. He said it would be easy to pass the project off to Planning Board as a VI.C Special Permit, but they also need to look at the neighborhood impact. Mr. Ramsdell thought the alternative as a VI.C would be condo ownership and may a greater detriment to the neighborhood.

Mr. Pennington motioned to approve the Dimensional Variance including the revised stipulations. Mr. Goulet seconded and the application was approved 4-1. Ramsdell, LaBay, Goulet, Pennington - yes; Bourdeau - no.

Craig Pessina, Chart House Development, LLC

300-302R Merrimac Street

2016-018 - Dimensional Variance: *split existing lot and construct three residential buildings requiring variances for lot area, open space, height, frontage, and side yard setbacks*

2016-019 - Special Permit: *allow multi-family use (#103) for eleven residential units*

Mr. Griffin represented the applicant along with Mr. Cracknell, Craig Pessina, Aileen Graf, Everett Chandler, Steve Sawyer, and Tom Hughes. The subject property is in the WMD district with 231,000 s.f. of lot area. This extremely large parcel currently holds Newburyport Yacht Club. There is 72.6' of frontage derived from Merrimac Street and Woodland Street. This proposal would require 120' of frontage. The yacht club is located closer to the river along with a metal rack building. The lot would be split, both storage buildings would be removed, and

each lot would have their own frontage. Lot 1 requires a variance for frontage and all other dimensional requirements are met. Lot 2, the building lot, would require variances for lot area. The lot is over 40,000 s.f. but it requires 48,000 s.f. A frontage variance would also be required on Merrimac Street. The open space would be 37.6% where 40% is required. The proposed height has been reduced from their original proposal to 28.6', where 25' is required. A special permit would be required for a multi-family use. The applicants would still need Planning Board approval for a VI.C Special Permit and for Site Plan Review.

Mr. Cracknell said that the local design team understands the infill difficulties and said that they have had repeated conversations with the people that live around the site. They have increased the number of proposed stipulations to 29. Mr. Cracknell said that they would be removing blighted structures and adding value to the area. A lot of noise comes with rack storage and there is also an array of dilapidated buildings. They would be enhancing the long term viability of the existing boat yard and reprogramming the more industrial space. They were very sensitive to the fact that access and space will be shared. Mr. Cracknell said that the proposed buildings provide a smoother transition than what exists today. He said they were supporting a working waterfront and building sustainability for the yacht club. The application incorporates some remedial actions. He said they did a comprehensive study of the quality and character of the structures. They would be creating view corridors and providing view easements. They visited the neighborhood with brochures and had several conversations with abutters. They felt it the application was acceptable and beneficial to abutters that are directly impacted. 29 proposed stipulations were submitted that have been circulated with the direct abutters, the yacht club, and anyone that has shown interest. The proposed height has been reduced by over 2' from the original application. They have expanded the easement areas and were proposing to extinguish rights to the driveway shared with 304 Merrimac Street. They proposed to transfer 120 s.f. to 310-312 Merrimac Street. They also proposed to exchange an easement with 298 Merrimac Street for 3' to widen the driveway and construct a 4' at-grade textured sidewalk. They will also remove hump at the entrance of driveway. The applicants proposed to replace the failing timber wall and replace them with granite. They were also proposing to put in a brick sidewalk along Merrimac Street. Two or three street trees would be provided. They will install stop signs at exits. They proposed to remove the invasive species on site. Visitor and overflow parking is provided. There would be two spaces per unit plus overflow. Mr. Cracknell said they must provide public access to the walkway, per Ch. 91. The lighting will be Dark Sky compliant. The sign will be reduced in size. Mr. Cracknell said that the process has been productive and the neighborhood has been very courteous. They still need Conservation Commission approval for the Chapter 91 access.

Atty. Griffin said that multi-family use (#103) is permitted in this district by Special Permit. The lot is clearly unique. It is enormous, very unique shape, and has a very small egress from Merrimac and Woodland Streets. It borders the river. The topography is also unique as there is a sharp grade from Merrimac Street. He said these circumstances can be construed as determining that a hardship exists. He said that in addition, under Section 6.d.1 of the ordinance, a hardship can be found if adjacent properties are non-conforming, which they were. Atty. Griffin said they exceed the requirements for finding evidence of a hardship. Atty.

Griffin said that the final list of stipulations would benefit the City, the neighborhood, and the project. He said there would not be a significant change in traffic and perhaps there would be a net decrease. The condos will still have the right to access the Woodland Street frontage. Legally the frontage changes, but not in reality. He said there have been similar developments that have been constructed on smaller lots. This application presented a modest increase in height but also a modest impact. They expected the occupants of the proposed units to be participants in the marina.

Atty. Griffin addressed the Special Permit criteria. He said the current buildings are aesthetically undesirable. The proposed buildings, in contrast, will improve the property. He submitted letters from Police Department, the Dept. of Public Services, and the Fire Department. The site plan has been revised to address the Fire Department's concerns. The outstanding issues with the Fire Department will be addressed during Site Plan Review. Atty. Griffin said that only 17% of the neighboring properties are multi-family so it would not be an excess of that use.

In favor:

Brad Duffin, 2 Cutting Drive, spoke in favor. He said he was a member of the yacht club and on the Board of Directors. He spoke on behalf of the yacht club members to lend support to the project. He said it would be a great improvement to the neighborhood. It would increase sight lines and he strongly urged the Board to approve the project.

James Lagoulis, owner of 300R Merrimac Street supported the application. He explained that years ago he bought a parcel on the river and formulated a plan for a mixed use marina. He presented the plan in the early 90s. The Board approved a plan with the marina and 17 units. He never started the project because of the recession. Eventually he said he built the rack storage building to support the marina. Since that time, the area has changed. Mr. Lagoulis said that rack storage is not ideal use next to a residential area. To keep the marina financially stable, they had the option of adding more racks of storage. The other alternative would be the project being proposed. He believed this was in keeping with residential character of the neighborhood. It would add value, reduce traffic, and would contribute to the tax base. Mr. Lagoulis said it was a net positive to the neighbors, the marina, and the City.

Patricia Portanova of 304 Merrimac Street said she fully supported the application. She thanked Mr. Pessina and Mr. Cracknell for working with them. She felt there were many wonderful things being proposed and said she enthusiastically supported the project.

Cheryl Fisher of 304 Merrimac Street said she has lived there since 1986 and has seen many changes. She said she is not always a fan of development and was initially opposed due to the height. She said that Mr. Cracknell took a lot of time to listen to her concerns and felt they have gone above and beyond in trying to meet expectations. She said she was enthusiastically in support. She added that the team has been very sensitive. She was most concerned with her view but they have reduced the size of the buildings.

Charles Rotondi of 302 Merrimac Street was in support. He said he currently looks at the rack storage building, which is very noisy. He said he appreciated that all his questions had been answered.

Joe Brown of 298 Merrimac Street was in favor. He said that initially he was concerned but Mr. Cracknell spent a lot of time with him explaining the project. He said it was a collaborative effort and thought the applicants were very proactive. He felt the project would enhance the neighborhood.

Arthur Chaisson of 300 Merrimac Street said that his house also looks onto the rack storage building. The proposed condos would be located further away. The entrance will be widened and improved. Currently the club house is in the middle of the boat yard and with this plan the they can have an attractive yacht club.

Joe McCurdy of 312 Merrimac Street was in favor.

Chris Currier of 18 Munroe Street, member of the yacht club, was in favor. He said that the problem with the current club has been the boat yard and storage buildings being there.

Opposed:

Gary Rawnsley of 1 River Street said that he just met with Mr. Cracknell over the past few days. He said there seems to be a consensus that traffic is not a problem but he disagreed. He said the yacht club leases the property from Mr. Lagoulis. Part of his obligation is to provide winter storage for the boats. He said there were about 120 boats on site now. He asked where the boats are going to be stored. Mr. Rawnsley said that a fence has been knocked over twice along Woodland Street. He was concerned that emergency apparatus would not be able to be accessed during holidays. He said that Woodland Street will become the primary corridor. He asked why 11 units were being proposed and suggested the site could only accommodate two houses. He was also concerned with there being not enough parking.

Questions:

Mr. LaBay asked what the plans were for boat storage. John DiFilippo, manager of yacht club said that they average about 135 boats per year. They were currently working on an agreement to take ownership of the yacht club. Mr. DiFilippo said that there are 169 members in the boat club. They assuming there to be about 150-160 boats each year though they are always moving numbers. He said that not every member stores their boat on site and they have met their storage obligation for past 15 years. He said the yacht club does not anticipate a problem and if one presents itself, they will be obligated to find another site to store boats. Mr. DiFilippo said the reason for widening the road is to allow access onto Merrimac Street. Mr. Pessina said the boat storage would be relocated, not removed.

Mr. Pennington asked if there was a plan available for the entire boat yard. Mr. DiFilippo said the storage buildings would come down and access would be improved. Mr. LaBay asked if there were boats on the site in the summer. Mr. DiFilippo said there have been 3 or 4 in the past. Mr. Goulet noted that they were focusing on the yacht club and not the proposal. Mr. Griffin said that although it's practical to view the boat layout, it's not in the board's jurisdiction as to what a business owner does. Mr. Ramsdell said it could tangentially affect impact. Mr. Griffin said the traffic being generated is by the project, not associated with the existing business. Mr. Cracknell showed a plan showing the ability to store all the boats on Lot 1.

Mr. Pennington asked to view the rear elevation drawings. Mr. Cracknell noted that the driveway is a non-buildable strip. Mr. Griffin said that 18 parking spaces were required and 30 were proposed. Mr. Pennington asked about the possibility of an affordable unit. Mr. Cracknell said the VI.C process would be ironed out with Planning Board.

Mr. LaBay said that he was uncomfortable receiving a six page document at the meeting and would like the opportunity to have time to review it. He added that it was the process more than the content. Mr. Pennington said he was concerned with the scale and repetition of the design. Thought it was a missed opportunity putting the back to the Merrimac Street side. He said he didn't object to the concept as a whole but was not prepared to approve it at this meeting. Mr. Goulet agreed.

Mr. LaBay asked how the affordable unit would work. Mr. Cracknell said that would be determined by the Planning Board. He also said the neighbors preferred no active use areas in order to protect the privacy of the neighbors.

Mr. Pennington said he needs time to digest the proposal and wanted a concept plan of the entire site. He said he hadn't had a chance to view the site. Mr. Pennington said that he didn't believe a decision could be made in one night. Mr. Goulet, Mr. LaBay, and Mr. Ramsdell agreed. Mr. Pennington said needed time to look at the mitigation package. Mr. LaBay also wanted to see how both lots interact. Ms. Bourdeau asked for more details on the traffic patterns resulting from the changes.

Mr. LaBay motioned to continue the hearing to 4/12/16 and Mr. Goulet seconded. All voted in favor.

BullDawg USA Realty IV LLC, c/o Lisa L. Mead, Esq.

194-196 Route 1

2016-021 - Sign Variance: *install a free-standing sign*

Atty. Lisa Mead represented the applicant. She provided a revised plan taking into account the Board's concerns from the previous meeting. The new plan calls for the base of the sign to be flush. The height has been lowered from 20' to 17'. Domino's across the street is 25'5" and Subway is at 14'5". Tractor trailer trucks are 14' high so visibility is a concern when determining the height. They got rid of the changeable letters but continue to propose an internally lit sign.

2/23/16

She said that the relationship between the lower and upper signs have been brought together and felt they were more consistent with the signs in the area. In discussions with the applicant, they didn't think the spotlight plan would work but would consider a bar-type light.

Questions:

Mr. Ramsdell asked if the second sign was actually necessary. Atty. Mead said the AAA logo was beneficial. But the other words indicate their specialties. Mr. LaBay mentioned that the Sunoco sign the Board approved has some additional information similar to this.

Deliberations:

Mr. Ramsdell noted that the gooseneck lighting did not work with this sign. He said he was still adamantly opposed to internal illumination. He was not opposed to the bar light.

Ms. Bourdeau asked if the bar would block the logo. It shouldn't. Mr. Ramsdell asked if it would be lit all night. Atty. Mead said it would not. The business opens early in the morning in the dark and would probably want to keep it on until the last train runs. Mr. Pennington said he preferred the internal illumination but was good with the bar light. Atty. Mead said the applicant preferred the internal illumination. Mr. Pennington motioned to approve the application with internal illumination with 11pm shut off and Mr. Goulet seconded the motion. The sign variance was approved 4-1. (LaBay, Pennington, Goulet, Bourdeau – yes; Ramsdell – no)

The meeting adjourned at 10:56pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Dianne Boisvert
Note Taker