

BERLIN ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

March 23, 2021 7:00 p.m.

The Berlin Zoning Board of Appeals will meet remotely via Webex video conference* on Tuesday, March 23, 2021 at 7:00 p.m. The Town of Berlin invites you to access and participate in this meeting via Webex video conference* or telephone conference call as provided below.

**The WebEx call to participate in this meeting is a toll call and you may incur additional charges for placing the call by your phone service provider. The Town does not reimburse participants for any toll charges. Please check with your phone service provider before making the call.*

Click the link below to join the meeting by Webex:

<https://townofberlin.my.webex.com/townofberlin.my/j.php?MTID=m669b5454075e63fd98fdcc48def53d42>

Or join by phone:

+1-408-418-9388 United States Toll

Meeting number (access code): 132 994 6433

Meeting password: ZBATu700 (92288700 from phones and video systems)

Members Present:

Antonio Francalangia, Chairman, Leonard Tubbs, Co-Vice Chairman, Sandra Coppola, Secretary, Corey Whiteside, Ryan Zelek, Alternate, seated

Members Absent:

Nelson Graca, Co-Vice Chairman, Hunter Mathena, Alternate, Christine Mazzotta, Alternate

Staff Present:

Maureen Giusti, Acting Town Planner, Adam Levitus, Zoning Enforcement Officer, Kristen Grabowski, Recording Secretary

Call to Order

Zoning Enforcement Officer Levitus took a roll call. Chairman Francalangia called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

Public Hearings:

ZBA #2021-03

0 Berlin Turnpike

**Map 10-2 Block 83 Lots 12-7333, 12-7334, 13A,
13C-7509, 13C-7510**

a.k.a. 404 Berlin Turnpike

BT 2008 LLC (Peter D'Addeo, Managing Member of D'Addeo Family Limited Liability Company, Member of BT 2008 LLC) is requesting a motor vehicle use location approval for a gasoline filling station per Berlin Zoning Regulation XI.R. The properties are owned by BT 2008 LLC and the gasoline filling station is being proposed as a component of a proposed mixed-use development. *(Continued from 1/26/21)*

Mr. Levitus noted that a proposed application is currently being heard before the Planning and Zoning Commission. It was noted that the public hearing is still open. It was noted that the applicant has requested that the Zoning Board of Appeals public hearing be postponed until the next meeting.

Chairman Francalanga moved to postpone the agenda item to the next meeting (April), seconded by Commissioner Tubbs. The motion carried unanimously. (Francalanga, Tubbs, Coppola, Whiteside, Zelek)

ZBA #2021-05 379 Main Street – East Berlin Map 23-2 Block 152 Lot 6

Ryan Haley (property owner) is requesting a variance for northerly side yard of 2 feet, 8 inches when 30 feet is required and a westerly front yard of 37 feet, 4 inches when 50 feet is required in the R-43 Zone per Berlin Zoning Regulations V.A.10 for a new 1-car attached garage and small addition. The proposed new garage and addition would be located in the same general area as an existing detached garage and an existing lean-to attached to the house (existing garage and lean-to to be removed).

NOTE: The public hearing was not opened at the 2/23/21 ZBA meeting and was postponed at the request of the applicant. The dimensions for the requested yard variances for ZBA #2021-05 have been updated by the applicant since the 2/23/21 ZBA meeting. The applicant is now requesting a 2-foot, 8-inch northerly side yard and a 37-foot, 4-inch westerly front yard instead of a 1-foot northerly side yard and 37.5-foot westerly front yard. The overall project of a new 1-car attached garage and addition to replace an existing detached garage and lean-to has not changed.

Ryan and Shelley Haley were on the call to present the application to the Board. Commissioner Whiteside recused himself, noting for the record that he would not be offering comments or feedback on the application as a commissioner or member of the public.

Mr. Haley began the presentation, noting that he and his wife purchased the property in 2010, and they have been working to update and improve the house since then. He explained that the time has come to make significant improvements to the exterior of the property. It was noted that they have two small children, and they have reached a good point to renovate and redo the exterior of the property.

He summarized the request for the variance, noting that the scope of the project includes the removal of a detached one-car garage and attached lean to, and the construction of a new attached one-car attached garage and addition to the existing 1770 colonial. He explained that the proposed new construction will be in the same general area of the property, and would total approximately 865 sq. ft. It was noted that the project would also include updating the efficiency of the home, along with replacing the siding. He noted that the home was built around 1770, and the existing detached garage was built around 1930. It was noted that all structures on the property predated zoning, and all of the

pre-existing structures are located within the front and side yard setbacks. He explained that the at the closest point, the existing structure is 2 ft. 6 in. from the property line, and the new proposed garage is 2 ft. 8 in. at the closest point, as it will be slightly shifted and pivoted. The new proposed plans are 122 sq. ft. smaller than the original proposals, which had the garage about 1 ft. from the property line. The size of the proposed garage is a result of the standard overhead of a garage door, along with space to accommodate a family vehicle and room for proper egress/circulation around the vehicle. The garage includes limited space along the east side for storage of the lawn tractor. Due to the size and proportions of the existing garage, it is not adequate for a modern vehicle.

Mr. Haley spoke about the desire to preserve the existing backyard, which is what initially drew him to the historic property.

Mr. Haley spoke about the hardship, reiterating the need for a variance for the front and side yard setbacks. He noted that coupled with the unique design of the property, along with the desire to continue to use the backyard as is, a variance would be necessary. It was also noted that the plans allow the applicant to maintain the existing driveway as the main entry to the property. He reiterated that the existing structures predated zoning, as the home was built 250 years ago. He noted that the existing structures are located tight within the north and west boundaries, and make it impossible to apply the strict zoning regulations, while also maintaining the use of the backyard as desired. Due to the location of the house within the setback area, there are not opportunities for adding onto the house without impacting a portion of the front or side yard areas. The issues described were in effect long before the Haleys became the property owners, and it was noted that they are beyond their control. Mr. Haley noted that similar conditions do not appear to be anywhere else within the adjacent properties, with the exception of the neighbor to the south, where the house appears to encroach on the 30-ft setback.

Mr. Haley discussed other potential locations for the addition on his property. He discussed the possibility of locating the proposed garage addition on the east and south sides of the property, but when drafted on plans, the structure would have taken up much of the backyard. It was also noted that there would have been significant modifications to the topography, as well as the removal of two mature maple trees. Additionally, the destruction of the hand-dug well would have been necessary. Relocating the addition to the rear of the property would have significantly impacted the backyard space, which Mr. Healy noted brings much value to the property.

Mr. Haley further discussed the design option locating the proposed garage off the southeast corner of the house, which was considered prior to submitting the current plans. It was noted that the garage would consume a significant portion of the main area of the backyard, which the property owners wish to preserve. The option would have also required a new access driveway, routed through the middle of the backyard.

Mr. Haley discussed another less-impactful option as well. He noted that they explored constructing the garage on the north side of the house (in the backyard), which would have allowed the property owners to maintain use of the existing driveway by extending it east along the property line to the new garage behind the house. With this design, the garage doors would face north, but this location would not allow for a proper turning radius to maneuver the car into the garage. In order to achieve the

turning radius, the garage would have to be pushed to the south side of the existing house, which would have consumed the majority of the outdoor space. As previously discussed in the first option, the Haleys wish to preserve the backyard outdoor space, so that option was not feasible. Additionally, that option would eliminate the existing vegetable garden, significantly reduce natural light into the eastern side of the house, relocation of the existing sanitary sewers, jeopardize the existing maple trees, and required removal of existing trees along the northern property line, which would have negatively impacted the neighbors to the north. This option would have also compromised sightlines to the backyard, which would pose a safety risk to the wellbeing of the Haleys' young children.

Mr. Haley summarized the presentation, noting that the current proposal is least impactful, and achieves the design goals of the garage and addition, which preserving the existing use and historic character of the property. While the proposed garage is larger, it allows for more space between the garage and the north property line. The northwest corner would be 5-ft. 3-in. from the property line, and it is currently 2-ft. 6-in. The northeast corner would be 2-ft 8-in, and it currently 3-ft. 1-in. The resulting side yard proposed adjacent to the garage would provide sufficient space for maintenance and upkeep of the garage. The remaining side yard would not be used to access the backyard, as there is an existing fence that would remain and prevent access around the back of the garage. The backyard would be access through the garage or the house, or through an existing gate near the southeast corner of the house.

Commissioner Coppola inquired about the proposed location of the garage, asking if it could be located on the same footing. Mr. Haley noted that the existing garage appears to be sitting on a wood framed floor, and it would not be suitable. It was also noted that the garage was shifted slightly to align with the house for the addition.

Chairman Francalanga discussed the proposed garage, noting that from a variance perspective, the proposed garage location was better than the existing garage location, concerning the west side of the property. Mr. Haley noted that the side in question was the north side. Mr. Haley confirmed that the size of the garage has increased, but it has been shifted away from the property line. Chairman Francalanga confirmed the proposed distance from the property line as 2-ft. 8-in. in the back, and 5-ft 3-in. in the front of the structure.

Chairman Francalanga noted concerns about the location of the garage in reference to the northern property line. Mr. Haley discussed the previously submitted design with the original application had the garage 1-ft from the property line. He noted that the plans were tweaked to reflect an overall reduction in size. The distance went from 1-ft to 2-ft 8-in. from the property line.

Commissioner Tubbs revisited Commissioner Coppola's questions, asking why the same footprint could not be used. Mr. Haley noted that the current structure is not aligned with the house, and the proposed layout accomplishes two objectives. The first is moving the new garage away from the property line, and the second is aligning the garage with the house, which would keep the character of the house and make it more aesthetically pleasing.

Attorney Tom Vincent, attorney for Dorothy Warren (abutter to the north) asked to address the Board.

Atty. Vincent noted that a letter was emailed to Mr. Levitus, and he expressed the desire to read it into the record. Chairman Francalangia invited Atty. Vincent to read the letter. Mr. Levitus noted that he received the letter, and he projected it on the screen for audience members to review.

Atty. Vincent read the letter of opposition into the record. In the letter, Atty. Vincent noted that he represents an abutting property owner. Atty. Vincent noted that proposed garage addition is in close proximity (less than 3-ft) to the property, and the overall footprint is increasing from the current structure. He also noted that with the lot size being over 1-acre, with room in the rear of the house for the construction of a garage addition, there is an overall lack of hardship with the proposed variance request.

Atty. Vincent and Mr. Haley discussed the proposed garage addition, including overall square footage, property topography, and the proposed location.

Mr. Levitus addressed the Board, clarifying points that were made. It was noted that Staff does not have an opinion where the delineations are or are not for the garage versus other areas of the addition; rather, the key criteria for the Board's focus would be in regard to the setbacks themselves, and the encroachment on the setbacks. It was noted that the proportion of the garage itself, whether increasing or decreasing, would be less relevant than the nature of the structure increasing into the setbacks and the variances required as a result. It was noted that the variance is required because the structure is encroaching on the setbacks (front yard and side yard to the north), not because of the general size of the structure.

Comments in Favor

Ewa Whiteside, 386 Main Street, East Berlin

Ms. Whiteside addressed the Board, and noted support of the proposed variance. She noted that the applicants have explored many options, and they have appropriately resubmitted plans based on the feedback from neighbors. She noted that the proposed addition will add significant value to the neighborhood, including Mrs. Warren's property. She noted that the Town should be encouraging young couples to stay in Town.

Comments in Opposition

(See previous comments shared by Atty. Vincent.)

Staff Comments

Mr. Levitus noted that overall the topic was fairly comprehensively discussed by the applicant and members of the public. He noted that the focus for discussion would be the variances being requested. He noted that although the severity of the side yard setback is being reduced, overall, it will be a nonconforming structure. He noted that the variances must still follow the rule of hardship, so identifying whether or not there is sufficient proof of hardship would be key element to discuss for both the front and side yard setbacks. He noted that there may be confusion because of a reduction in one area, but an increase in another portion of the building.

Commission Coppola noted that the property is not an odd sized lot or a corner lot. She continued,

noting that the applicant spoke to the desire not to lose the backyard or to cut down trees, which is understandable. Ms. Coppola directed her comments to the application, stating that there would be potential for the garage to be located in other places on the property. She asked the applicant if convenience and aesthetics would make the current plan the best option.

Mr. Haley noted that it was not just the convenience or aesthetics driving the design and location. He noted that the objective was to have an attached garage to the property that allows the family to use the property as they desire, while also using the existing driveway and maintaining use of the existing backyard. He continued, stating that what was being proposed would be very minimal impact to his property, as well as the neighboring property. He noted that the plans shift the garage slightly, and expands it a bit away from the property line. Mr. Haley noted that the site plan (displayed on the screen) does not reflect the unusable portion of the yard. He explained that about 50% of the area in the backyard is heavily wooded and swamped on the east side of the property. He explained that the grade slopes significantly in the back. He explained that the usable portion of the property ends at the eastern most side of the existing shed. He explained that the primary use of the existing backyard is directly behind the house, and the applicants are trying to preserve that portion of the yard.

Atty. Vincent addressed the Applicant, asking why the existing driveway could not be used. Mr. Haley noted that two other options were explored to include garage behind the house, but the turning radius would not have been sufficient unless that garage were pushed the southern most extreme side of the house. That would have impacted the existing sanitary piping, trees, and daylight into the back of the house.

Chairman Francalangia refocused the discussion, noting the purpose of the discussion had to be focused on the nature of the variance.

Chairman Francalangia moved to close the public hearing, which was seconded by Commissioner Tubbs. The motion carried unanimously. (Francalangia, Tubbs, Coppola, Zelek)
Commissioner Whiteside previously recused himself from the application.

Commissioner Whiteside rejoined the meeting for the next application.

ZBA #2021-06 276 Chamberlain Hwy Map 8-3 Block 12F Lot 5B

Tim Sullivan (property owner) is requesting a variance for a 6-foot-tall fence in a residential front yard when up to 3 feet tall is permitted in a residential front yard per Berlin Zoning Regulations §IV.B.7. The property is on a corner lot, with the requested variance along West Lane.

Tim and Melissa Sullivan were present on the call to present the application to the Board. Mr. Sullivan explained the nature of the variance, noting that the property is a corner lot, and while the location of the needed variance is considered a “front” yard, it is located in the back yard of the property. Because of the regulations, the property line is considered a second front yard. Mr. Sullivan noted that the closest corner of the proposed fence would be 243-ft to the stop bar at the intersection of West Lane and Chamberlain Highway. He noted that the fence would not impact any sight lines. The corner of the

property is 93-ft from corner to the stop bar.

Mr. Sullivan noted that nature of the hardship, citing the need for privacy from the neighbor to the south, but more importantly for the safety and security of his family. He noted that he has three young children, and West Lane has become quite busy with foot traffic, distracted driving, and speeding. The police have been notified, and it was reported that they have attempted to assist with traffic concerns.

Mr. Sullivan also noted that the existing shed falls near to the property line, and it would be outside of the 40-ft required setback. He explained that in addition to the safety and security of his family, he is looking to secure the shed due to many break-ins in the area. He noted that in the immediate area, there have been two recent car break ins, shed break ins, and children's toys have been stolen right out of the yard more than once, which were located by the shed.

Mr. Sullivan discussed alternatives, noting that a 3-ft. fence would be permitted without the variance. He explained that a 3-ft. fence would not provide the security needed. He explained that moving the fence to the 40-ft. mark would leave the shed in a vulnerable spot, and it would reduce the usable yard space by 32%. He noted that plantings could provide a border, but they would not provide security.

Mr. Sullivan noted that a previous ZBA meeting, a similar request was made, and blight was brought up as an issue. He assured the Board that the fence would be well maintained.

Mr. Sullivan noted that as a result of the required mailing, he heard from five neighbors, who were all in support of the project. He explained that the purpose of the request was for the safety and security of his family.

Chairman Francalangia noted that variances have been granted in the past, specifically referring to a one recent application that was a split vote. He explained that no precedent has been set, as all applications are looked at individually based on circumstances. He noted that there have been previous approvals, which have turned into a nightmare, and others have turned out well. He spoke about a recent variance approval, which revolved around a power structure concern. In that case, the power company would not allow for any evergreens to be planted in the location, which would have been an alternative. Mr. Sullivan confirmed that he was referring to that application. Chairman Francalangia noted that evergreens would be an alternative to the fence, noting that wholesale nurseries could be an option. Mr. Sullivan noted that arborvitae were considered, and the plan is to eventually put them in along the Chamberlain Highway frontage. He noted that that concern is safety and security, and trees do not provide the security needed. He noted that the trees would take years to mature enough to provide a visual barrier.

Commissioner Whiteside inquired about the hardship, asking if any reports of criminal activity were included in the application, especially because part of the hardship speaks to recent thefts in the area. Mr. Sullivan noted that he's had recent communications with neighbors impacted. He noted that he doesn't have any police reports, but the security cameras show quite a bit of activity. Mrs. Sullivan noted that within the last two weeks, there were people going into sheds on West Lane. She noted that there have been many times when people have pulled over to ask her children directions, and the kids have been terrified. She noted the desire to have her children feel safe. She noted that she contacted

the police department, asking for a sign to be installed. The Department was able to set up a “warning” speed sign for a few weeks, but that did not help much. She noted that her children have made “slow down” signs in an effort to get cars to slow on West Lane. She explained that it would be peace of mind to know that they yard would be secure with the children playing in the backyard. It was also noted that that area of the backyard is a blind spot, and it cannot be seen from inside the house, as there is not clear sightline.

Commissioner Coppola inquired about the possibility of moving the fence to the 40-ft line. Mr. Sullivan noted that moving the fence to the 40-ft. line would not include the shed in the fenced area. It would also reduce the reasonable use of the backyard.

Mrs. Sullivan noted that the front yard is not safe for the children to play, as it is quite busy. She noted that there is a daily clean up of trash in the front yard. She explained that the fence would provide security, and it would prevent the children from running into the street. It was also noted that arborvitae would not do the same, as the kids could simply walk between the trees.

Staff Comments

Mr. Levitus noted that the main Staff comment would be to focus the discussion on the hardship versus the Applicants’ requested fence configuration. It was also noted that the regulations allow for a 3-ft. fence, but because the request is for a 6-ft. fence, a variance would be needed.

Comments in Favor

There were none.

Comments in Opposition

There were none.

Commissioner Coppola moved to close the public hearing. Commissioner Whiteside seconded the motion, which carried unanimously. (Francalangia, Tubbs, Coppola, Whiteside, Zelek)

Regular Meeting:

**ZBA #2021-03 0 Berlin Turnpike Map 10-2 Block 83 Lots 12-7333, 12-7334, 13A,
13C-7509, 13C-7510**

a.k.a. 404 Berlin Turnpike

BT 2008 LLC (Peter D’Addeo, Managing Member of D’Addeo Family Limited Liability Company, Member of BT 2008 LLC) is requesting a motor vehicle use location approval for a gasoline filling station per Berlin Zoning Regulation XI.R. The properties are owned by BT 2008 LLC and the gasoline filling station is being proposed as a component of a proposed mixed-use development. *(Continued from 1/26/21)*

Continued to the April 27th meeting.

ZBA #2021-05 379 Main Street – East Berlin Map 23-2 Block 152 Lot 6

Ryan Haley (property owner) is requesting a variance for northerly side yard of 2 feet, 8 inches when 30 feet is required and a westerly front yard of 37 feet, 4 inches when 50 feet is required in the R-43 Zone per Berlin Zoning Regulations V.A.10 for a new 1-car attached garage and small addition. The proposed new garage and addition would be located in the same general area as an existing detached garage and an existing lean-to attached to the house (existing garage and lean-to to be removed).

NOTE: The public hearing was not opened at the 2/23/21 ZBA meeting and was postponed at the request of the applicant. The dimensions for the requested yard variances for ZBA #2021-05 have been updated by the applicant since the 2/23/21 ZBA meeting. The applicant is now requesting a 2-foot, 8-inch northerly side yard and a 37-foot, 4-inch westerly front yard instead of a 1-foot northerly side yard and 37.5-foot westerly front yard. The overall project of a new 1-car attached garage and addition to replace an existing detached garage and lean-to has not changed.

Commissioner Tubbs moved to approve application for discussion only. Commissioner Zelek seconded the motion.

Commissioner Coppola noted concern about the stated hardship. She noted that there were other places on the property to put the garage addition. While the other locations may not be as convenient or cost effective, there were other locations to consider. She noted that the homeowners' line of site may be impacted, but that does not fall into the definition of hardship.

Commissioner Tubbs agreed with Ms. Coppola's statement about hardship. He noted that there is over one-acre of land, which would allow the Applicant to put the garage in the rear of the property. He noted that there would be room on the opposite side of the house.

Commissioner Zelek noted that if the garage was located on the other side of the house, it would still be within the 50-ft. front setback. He noted that the whole house was within the setbacks. Chairman Francalangia confirmed, noting that if the garage was located on the other side of the house, a variance would not be needed. Commissioner Zelek noted that no matter how the garage was attached to the house, a variance would be needed. Commissioner Coppola noted that if it was attached in the back, a variance would not be needed. Commissioner Zelek noted that a variance would still be needed, even if the garage was located in the back of the property. Commissioner Zelek referred to the first site plan (F-1). Commissioner Tubbs noted that even if a variance was needed, it would be less invasive. Chairman Francalangia noted that if the garage were located in the back of the property, a variance would be needed there, but it would not be as invasive as the side yard. Commissioner Tubbs noted that the setbacks are 30-ft. and 50-ft., so the variance would be needed. It wouldn't be a 2-ft. 8-in. variance, and it would be greater. Commissioner Tubbs also noted that the current pre-existing structure is nonconforming. Chairman Francalangia noted that if the proposed garage were built using the same footprint, the building would be skewed, which would not be ideal. Chairman Francalangia and Commissioner Tubbs asked for Staff clarification on whether a variance would be needed if the

Applicant used the existing footprint to construct the garage.

Mr. Levitus spoke to the regulations (separate from the application). He noted that an existing nonconforming structure shall not be increased by any means without a variance, as part of regulations. It can be reduced, as part of the regulations, and it would be permissible without a hardship-based variance. He noted that there are provisions within the regulations that speak to repair of existing residential structures, up to 100%. He noted that they would have to dive into exactly what would be done, but there is potential to approve without a variance. It comes down to a project by project basis, but if it were to come to the exact same spot, there are potential avenues for constructing that without a variance.

Commissioner Zelek noted that the existing garage would not accommodate modern car, which was further discussed by Chairman Francalangia. He noted that the applicant reported that the existing garage would fit a modern car, further noting that if a car fits, but doors cannot open, it would not serve the purpose. He noted that a 270 sq. ft. garage does not allow for much, as most cars are about 120 sq. ft.

Commissioner Zelek moved to close the discussion, which was seconded by Chairman Francalangia. The motion carried unanimously. (Francalangia, Tubbs, Coppola, Zelek)
Commissioner Whiteside recused himself.

Commissioner Zelek approve application as submitted, and the motion was seconded by Chairman Francalangia. The motion was unanimously defeated. (Francalangia, Tubbs, Coppola, Zelek)
Commissioner Whiteside recused himself.

ZBA #2021-06 276 Chamberlain Hwy Map 8-3 Block 12F Lot 5B

Tim Sullivan (property owner) is requesting a variance for a 6-foot-tall fence in a residential front yard when up to 3 feet tall is permitted in a residential front yard per Berlin Zoning Regulations §IV.B.7. The property is on a corner lot, with the requested variance along West Lane.

Commissioner Tubbs moved to approve the application, and it was seconded by Commissioner Zelek. The motion was defeated with a vote of 3-2-0. Voting in favor: Tubbs, Coppola, Zelek. Voting in opposition: Francalangia, Whiteside.

Approval of Minutes:

October 27, 2020 (Francalangia, Whiteside, Mazzotta, Zelek, Coppola) – 1005 Kensington Remand Underlined

Commissioner Whiteside moved to approve the minutes of October 27, 2020. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Zelek. The motioned carried unanimously. (Francalangia, Coppola, Whiteside, Zelek). It was noted that Ms. Coppola was not part of the remand, and she voted for the non-remand portions of

the meeting.

February 23, 2021 (Francalangia, Tubbs, Graca, Coppola, Zelek)

Commissioner Coppola moved to approve the minutes of February 23, 2021. The motion carried unanimously (Francalangia, Tubbs, Coppola, Zelek). Commissioner Whiteside was not in attendance at the February meeting, and did not vote.

Housekeeping

Mr. Levitus discussed an item for housekeeping purposes. It was noted that at the present time there is an item before the Planning and Zoning Commission for a text amendment to change the regulations for gas stations, effecting the 1500-ft. rule. He noted that there are additional provisions that would impact the size of the attached retail store. He noted that the verbiage would be emailed out to the Board just so the board was aware, as motor vehicle approvals are part of the ZBA purview.

Commissioner Zelek noted that it would be helpful for future applicants to submit photos with the application package. He asked Mr. Levitus to encourage applicants to do so moving forward. Mr. Levitus noted that he would suggest that to future applicants.

Adjournment

Commissioner Tubbs moved to adjourn the meeting, which was seconded by Commissioner Coppola. The time was 8:36 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kristen Deliman Grabowski