



TOWN CLERK
2021 APR -9 AM 9:59
DUXBURY, MASS.

TOWN OF DUXBURY



BOARD OF APPEALS

DUXBURY BOARD OF APPEALS

MEETING MINUTES

March 25, 2021 @ 7:30 p.m.

ATTENDANCE: Wayne Dennison, Judith Barrett, Kathleen Muncey, Freeman Boynton Jr., Emmett Sheehan, Philip Thorn & Borys Gojnycz

Other persons present at the hearing: James Wasielewski, Building Commissioner and Lauren Haché, Administrative Assistant

CALL TO ORDER: Wayne Dennison called the meeting to order and reads the Governor's Preamble: Pursuant to Governor Baker's March 12, 2020, Order Suspending Certain Provisions of the Open Meeting Law, G.L. c. 30A, §18, and the Governor's March 15, 2020, Order imposing strict limitation on the number of people that may gather in one place, the Town of Duxbury's Board and/or Committee meetings will be conducted via remote participation to the greatest extent possible with members. For this meeting, members of the public who wish to watch the meeting may do so by viewing the Duxbury Government Access Channels – Verizon 39 or Comcast 15. Viewers can visit www.pactv.org/duxbury for information about Duxbury programming. To watch a meeting live on PACTV's streaming channel, PACTV Prime, visit www.pactv.org/live. To watch replays of a meeting, visit www.pactv.org/duxbury or to watch online visit PACTV's Video on Demand at www.pactv.org/ondemand. **NO IN-PERSON ATTENDANCE OF MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC WILL BE PERMITTED.** Every effort will be made to ensure that the public can adequately access the proceedings to the best of our technical abilities; and despite our best efforts due to lack of technical infrastructure, this meeting will be available on PACTV to view a video recording and a transcript or other comprehensive record of proceedings as soon as possible after the meeting.

ZBA Case #2019-17, WB Builders, Fieldstone Farm, 1 & 25 Lincoln Street (CONT'D): *The Board voted to unanimously to continue the public hearing to April 8, 2021 at 7:30 p.m.*

ZBA Case #2020-16, The Village at Duxbury, 290 Kings Town Way (CONT'D): *The Board voted unanimously to grant the special permit.*

ZBA Case #2020-17, The Duxbury House, 298 Kings Town Way (CONT'D): *The Board voted unanimously to grant the special permit.*

ZBA Case #2021-05, Andrew, 403 Washington Street-APPEAL: *The Board voted unanimously to continue the public hearing to April 8, 2021 at 7:30 p.m.*

Administrative:

Wayne Dennison makes a motion to approve the meeting minutes of January 28, 2021. Emmett Sheehan seconds. (5-0)

Wayne Dennison makes a motion to adjourn the public hearing. Emmett Sheehan seconds. (5-0)

BOARD OF APPEALS — MINUTES

Case No: 2019-17

Petitioner: WB Builders, Fieldstone Farm

Address: 1 & 25 Lincoln Street

Date: March 25, 2021 Time: 7:30 p.m.

(Continued from February 25, 2021, January 28, 2021, November 19, 2020, October 22, 2020, September 10, 2020, July 23, 2020, June 25, 2020, June 11, 2020, May 14, 2020, March 26, 2020, March 12, 2020 and January 23, 2020)

Members present: Wayne Dennison, Kathleen Muncey, Freeman Boynton Jr., Emmett Sheehan, Philip Thorn & Borys Gojnycz

Members Voting: Wayne Dennison, Kathleen Muncey, Freeman Boynton Jr., Emmett Sheehan, Philip Thorn & Borys Gojnycz

Other persons present at the hearing: James Wasielewski, Director of Municipal Services & Lauren Haché, Administrative Assistant

- Wayne Dennison re-opens the public hearing and states we have received quite a bit of material since the last meeting. We have a response to a supplemental peer review from Vanasse and Associates dated February 1, 2021. We have a response from McMahon Transportation Engineers dated February 9, 2021 in response to the Vanasse, we have a February 14, 2021 correspondence relative to Landscape Review from Outback Engineering, we have a lengthy memo dated February 11 that addresses the requested waivers, we have a new site plan and landscape material plan date February 12, 2021, we have a series of landscape details of the same date, we have grading and drainage details of the same date, a series of nitrogen loading calculations, ground water mounding calculations, a February 19th letter from Grady Consultants addressing some of the landscape architecture peer review issues and I do believe we have received a series of drawings reflecting the various types of homes all named after famous gold courses and we have received additional communication from Mr. Prone on behalf of the Duxbury Sidewalk and Bike Path Committee and then a February 23rd letter from Amory Engineering addressing some drainage issues. Lauren did I miss anything?
- Lauren Haché states there was a letter that came in today as well from Richard Prone.
- Wayne Dennison states ok, is Mr. Prone here
- Lauren Haché states I don't believe so
- Wayne Dennison states ok, I will reserve on that shortly, with the expectation that Mr. Prone will join. The way that I would propose to proceed is to hear first from the Applicant on where they believe we are and where we need to be. Then, is anyone from Amory here
- Pat Brennan states yes

- Wayne Dennison states ok, after the Applicant speaks, we will have you present. Is there anyone from McMahon here
- Jeff Bandini states yes
- Wayne Dennison states alright, let's hear from the Applicant
- Peter Freeman states good evening, our team is here and I agree with that order of the presentation. We would like to have Greg give an overview and we also have our traffic engineer here as well. We have Andy Arseno with Vanasse, as Jeffrey Dirk is unavailable
- Wayne Dennison states I think we could just hear from McMahon to the extent that they wanted to respond to and address something that was raised in the Vanasse report.
- Greg Webb, the Applicant states we did add a 55 and over element to our plan, which made some significant changes to the plan. It will reduce the size of the septic systems, it reduces the nitrogen levels and it reduces traffic. So we now have 32 homes adding to your town's taxes without drawing on your resources. By that I mean, if a sidewalk needs fixing we fix it, we maintain our own infrastructure, we drill our own wells so we can irrigate our lawns. We don't need your dump or transfer station, we will have our trash picked up once a week by a private company and hauled away. This is what I call smart growth, it is exactly what Duxbury needs. I think this is a good plan and we've made a lot of changes along the way and I believe this is the best plan we have had. I will also add that Campbell Smith has been designing our clubhouse and Lauren we will have that drawing sent to you tomorrow morning. We have moved the homes further back from the street, so with that, I would like to turn things over to Jim.
- Peter Freeman states ok, thanks Greg. One more thing, about where we think we are at, we think that we have made all these changes to the positive, so we are ready to go over waivers if we can get to that tonight. I am hopeful we are wrapping up and can get close to a decision
- Wayne Dennison states Peter, I actually think it would be very useful to this Board, following this hearing, you put together a draft decision that would allow us to work with Town Counsel to refine. I understand the desire to go through waivers, but I would suggest in the draft decision if you could number the waivers to easily reference those waivers moving forward in discussion. If you have objection to that, that is fine, but I am trying to move us towards a point acknowledging that this matter has been before us for some time and that the Applicant has made significant changes.
- Peter Freeman states that is great Mr. Chairman and that is a great suggestion on the waivers, so numbering them is a great idea. I will get this drafted, thank you
- Wayne Dennison states Mr. Pavlik, I cut you off and I apologize, please proceed
- Jim Pavlik states thank you Mr. Chairman, for the record I am Jim Pavlik, Outback Engineering, you had referenced a letter dated February 14th from us which included 3 different plans including some landscaping responses and a new septic design detail and how it complies with state and town regulations due to nitrogen loading.
- Wayne Dennison states Jim, can I ask you a questions. There has been a lot of back and forth based on monitoring wells and background levels, what have you done with that
- Jim Pavlik states we haven't done anything with background monitoring wells, because based on the review of the town regulations and state regulations, we are not actually required to get a special permit from the town in the APOD district for instance, I think this first came up as a result of Amory's review back in, over a year ago. So, it was requested at that time that we come up with a nitrogen loading assessment, so we are actually below 5 Mg per Liter, which is the

towns requirement for the APOD zoning district. We comply with some of the wastewater flow requirements also in that bylaw, so again I can go through more specifics.

- Wayne Dennison states so, which ones don't you comply with
- Jim Pavlik states that is laid out in the waiver list and in the septic system design narrative. Basically it boiled down to we don't comply with 406.7, the density regulation which limits one dwelling per 60,000 square feet of upland
- Wayne Dennison states right, that is clear
- Jim Pavlik states in terms of the wastewater flow that is 10,000 gallons per day, per 10,000 square feet of upland and the project does comply with that section. We otherwise comply
- Wayne Dennison states I appreciate the answer
- Jim Pavlik continues, so Lauren do you have the revised site plan and material plan 3
- Lauren Haché states sure and shares her screen
- Jim Pavlik continues and describes the plan on the screen about the buffering landscape and including a 3 foot high berm. We added a 2 foot high stone wall with a 3 foot high earthen berm. The other comments were minor addressing additional landscaping and maintenance notes. We also provided a new sign detail that is proposed to go in the center island at the entrance incorporating masonry and wood components.
- Wayne Dennison states before we move ahead, are you seeking any waivers relative to the sign bylaw
- Jim Pavlik states I don't believe so, I would have to refer to Peter or Greg. The other things we submit are the waiver list and the septic design
- Wayne Dennison states in our letter I seem to remember a willingness, if the Board were interested, in putting in a bike path slash sidewalk along Lincoln Street that was discussed at the last meeting
- Jim Pavlik states that is correct, we are leaving it up to the Boards decision. Primarily a sidewalk that connects the two driveways
- Wayne Dennison states I know that you are not responsible for the condition of the existing road, but from a public safety standpoint, the ability to get people off the road for recreational use is a real benefit. I was very appreciative of the Developer to acknowledge that
- Kathleen Muncey states I agree on the sidewalk, I think that is important
- Jim Pavlik states we'll defer to the Board whatever condition you agree to
- Greg Webb states I think we added a grass sidewalk, but we can certainly pave it if you would like us to. We made enough room for that in our last revision
- Wayne Dennison states yes, we have received a great number of concerns from the public but it is excellent that this Developer is speaking to a public concern. Jim do you have anything else
- Jim Pavlik states no, I think I have covered everything at this point
- Wayne Dennison states great, why don't we hear from McMahon next and then Amory
- Jeff Blake with McMahon and Associates introduces himself and states thank you for having me this evening. So, we received an update based on the last meeting, a letter from Vanasse and Associates dated, February 1st, that respond to the latest round of comments from McMahon Associates based on the traffic impact assessments conducted. We found seven particular responses that McMahon found satisfactory. Briefly, the higher issues are first being to contact the Town of Duxbury relative to the proposed bus stop relative to the project. McMahon wants

to ensure that any sort of bus traffic would have the proper ability to access the site and be able to make the proper maneuvers to access the site without interrupting the flow of traffic or impacting the safety of the Abutters. The second was the clarification of the use of the ATR information requested that Vanasse provide a COVID adjustment factor. Vanasse did do some of the study in September 2020, so we wanted to make sure that this was adjusted and the appropriate factors were being used and the speed data collected along the vicinity of the site. The third bullet point was to double check the growth factor, so that when Vanasse used the future traffic assessments, the appropriate growth rate factor was being used. Fourth, being to contact the Town of Duxbury Planning Department, to ensure that the future traffic and the appropriate background of traffic assessing was being used and it was found that all of those were being used in the analysis. The fifth was a comment on the trip generation. I know the proposed plan went from 40B to 55+, so the impacts were reduced at capacity and safety. The seventh was relative to the speed and we requested that the Applicant put together a site distance profile that demonstrated the cut sheets and existing and proposed site distances from the driveways could be achieved based on the state standards and last was an overall statement mentioning that the Applicant should provide some sort of conclusion as to whether additional mitigation beyond what McMahon suggested as part of the project that mitigation and clarification that McMahon suggested as part of this be achieved and with this latest round of comments McMahon is in agreement that Vanasse provided all of the necessary measurements and this is satisfaction at this time. I would be happy to take any follow up questions from the Board at this time.

- Wayne Dennison states I did not hear any comments from the Board, but I take it that the Town's Consultant is satisfied at this time. How about let's hear from Amory.
- Pat Brennan with Amory Engineers states thank you Mr. Chairman, I reviewed the latest plans that Outback had submitted, the last time that I had looked at these plans was June of 2020, so it has been a while and a lot of changes have been made. So I did another comprehensive review, they are in pretty good shape at this point, I only noted a couple of minor comments. A couple are drainage related one was to raise one of their drainage basins or infiltration basins, and another was that there are no test basins in that infiltration area, so if the Board were to approve the project, I would recommend the condition that they do those test holes prior or during construction early on. I am pretty confident the soils are consistent, the soils throughout the site, I am pretty confident, are consistent with sandy soils. I went through their waiver list and there is one waiver that I believe they do not need and that is from 406.10 subsection 4 and that requires recharge of storm water through subsurface infiltration rather than dry wells. On the previous plans they had dry wells throughout the project and on this latest set they have eliminated all of the dry wells and everything is run through open air infiltration facilities that are vegetated so I don't believe they need that waiver. The other waivers they have listed all require what they need to build the project. They need some additional test holes in the septic leaching areas, which they would need anyway when they have to get approved by the Board of Health through Title 5. Then my last three comments are actually left over from my June 8, 2020 letter, one is related to easement documents into the grading, they need to consider 101 Modoc Street in reference to the cell tower road access, one was to submit drainage pipe sizing calculations and lastly was for long term storm water drainage plan to be provided which they need to do anyways for their EPA permit because they are disturbing more than an acre of land,

I am just asking that they submit that to the Zoning Board as well, so that the Town has that on file. I did go through the revised nitrogen calculations and I agree with their nitrogen loading calculations and their use of the denitrifying system and I saw the request for background information. I did a nitrogen loading calculations on a typical lot 60,000 sq. ft. with 5,000 sq. feet of wetlands and 15,000 sq. feet of lawn area and 2,500 sq. ft. building and 1,000 sq. ft. driveway, again on a regular lot, the denitrification system would produce about 4.05 Milligrams per Liter of Nitrogen, so something that actually complied with your Bylaw would produce more Nitrogen than what they are proposing with their denitrifying system. So I am comfortable with what they are providing with that system, it will provide more protection than what your actual zoning provides right now. If you have any questions, I would be happy to answer them

- Wayne Dennison states I have a question for the Applicant, is there anything that Mr. Brennan is suggestions that you cannot do or are unwilling to do
- Jim Pavlik states, we know these are still preliminary plans and that we still have to file with Conservation and the test pits Mr. Brennan is mentioning we are aware of and will comply with after we receive a comprehensive permit, so that we know we have some basis to move forward with. The same is true for that of the Board of Health as well.
- Wayne Dennison states I am going to be honest with you Jim, I ask questions for a living and I am not sure how you just answered that question, was that yes or no
- Peter Freeman states I will clarify, we have agreed to make those changes and so unless there is anything there you cannot do, then you would answer yes
- Jim Pavlik laughs and says I am going to go with what Peter said
- Wayne Dennison laughs and said, ok, I'll take that as a yes. So we have a whole bunch of drawings of various units, has the Design Review Board seen these
- Greg Webb states no, they have not
- Wayne Dennison states we actually have another 40B in town where we have asked for a Design Peer review, does the Applicant have any concerns with submitting these designs to the Design Review Board for comment before the next public hearing
- Greg Webb states we can certainly do that
- Wayne Dennison states that would be a useful thing to have, now that we have some more definitive plans and compliments the designs
- Wayne Dennison continues is there anyone here as a peer reviewer or here on behalf of the Applicant that would like to speak, otherwise I would like to open it up to the public
- Peter Freeman states we are all set presenting, here to answer any questions
- Christine Bulman, Mayflower Street, states I don't think Rich Prone is here. I have a few things on is this growth in town and mentions the high school is over capacity.
- Wayne Dennison states Ms. Bulman at least as I understand it, they are proposing this to be over 55+
- Christine Bulman states oh, the whole neighborhood
- Wayne Dennison states I will confess to you I am over 55 and I have high schoolers but
- Christine Bulman states ok, I apologize, I am the person concerned with the environment, so I am hoping things pertaining to that are not waived.
- Peter Freeman states we have addressed those as we file with the EPA and will comply with the State and wildlife and Natural Heritage Office. We will not be waiving and following as the Law requires.

- Christine Bulman states ok, they told me that they are waiting for a report from you, that there was an initial consultation and they haven't received the full paperwork yet
- Peter Freeman states yes, and the reason is because we knew we would be going through a lot of changes as the plan proceeds along.
- Christine Bulman states the final thought I have is for the road safety and Rich Prone's idea of maybe putting in a third lane for a turn lane into the development and also notes the sidewalk and hopes for that
- Wayne Dennison states in fairness to the Applicant, they have been quite responsive to that request and as for Mr. Prone's right turn request, I don't think they have seen that letter until today.
- Wayne Dennison states is there anyone else who would like to speak
- Borys Gojnycz states directed toward Mr. Pavlik, did you have a chance to speak with the Abutter at that blind curve. I am very concerned of the blind drive ahead sign there and maybe some of the site line could be cleared with agreeance from the Abutter. Also, the two utility poles, once the buffer zone is cleared the two poles will stick out like a sore thumb. Have you had a chance to look into that
- Greg Webb states yes, I did meet with the Abutter on the south side and the day after we purchased the property we removed all of the vegetation along the roadway so we could increase the site line visibility there and I met them at their home and suggested we could maybe move that tree and I will offer to move or replace it for them, but we will offer again and would be happy to move it for him. I tried to back out of his driveway and he would be better off moving it
- Jim Pavlik states so, also the utility poles there, is that for 101 Modoc street is that what you mean Borys
- Borys states there are matching poles that create a tight bottle neck as they are on both sides of the road. If you open up that area it will create a sense of more space but the poles will still be there and create a tighter width
- Jim Pavlik states ok, so not 101 Modoc, more so along Lincoln Street. There are a couple of poles there in the center of the site there are a couple between the two driveways and will likely be replaced when we regrade the shoulder but there are two other poles that are I believe feeding the 101 Modoc site and the house at 25 Lincoln. Those will be removed and the site will have underground electric and cable services.
- Borys Gojnycz states that's great
- Jim Pavlik states they will have to set one pole and go underground from there but my letter from February 14th does touch on that and this will be done as we go further along
- Wayne Dennison states any other comments or questions
- Jim Wasielewski the Building Commissioner states that when the design review looks at this, when they see density like this, is there any resistance to fire or sprinkler system, it may come up
- Wayne Dennison states alright, thank you, so at the beginning of this continued public hearing I suggested to you peter that you put together a draft comprehensive permit and get it to us and town counsel, so that we can get town counsels view on the various waivers so we can streamline this. I do think that Town Counsels view on the waiver, this would be great
- Peter Freeman states absolutely, certainly by the end of two weeks

- Wayne Dennison states what do we have at the end of April
- Lauren Haché states we have two cases on that date
- Kathleen Muncey asks if that is school vacation week
- Lauren Haché states yes
- Wayne Dennison states it could be problematic for some
- Kathleen Muncey states not for me
- Wayne Dennison states what does the first date in May look like
- Lauren Haché states we have two new cases
- Wayne Dennison states lets have the Applicants decide
- Peter Freeman states we would prefer that April 22nd date
- Wayne Dennison states so I think you understand what we are looking for and let's continue to April 22nd 2021
- Emmett Sheehan seconds
- All in favor WD, KM, ES, FB, BG

Motion: It was moved, seconded and unanimously voted continue the public hearing to April 22, 2021.

Moved by: WD

Seconded by: ES

Number in favor: 5

Number Opposed: 0

BOARD OF APPEALS — MINUTES

Case No: 2020-16

Petitioner: The Village at Duxbury

Address: 290 Kings Town Way

Date: March 25, 2021 Time: 7:30 p.m.

(Continued from January 14, 2021)

Members present: Wayne Dennison, Kathleen Muncey, Freeman Boynton Jr., Emmett Sheehan & Philip Thorn

Members Voting: Wayne Dennison, Kathleen Muncey, Freeman Boynton Jr., Emmett Sheehan & Philip Thorn

Other persons present at the hearing: James Wasielewski, Director of Municipal Services & Lauren Haché, Administrative Assistant

- Wayne Dennison re-opens the public hearing and states we have received a new sign drawing from the Applicants dated 3/11/2021, Lauren have we received anything else
- Lauren Haché states no, that is it
- Wayne Dennison states why don't we hear the Applicant present now
- Kevin Gaughan, Counsel and Agent for the Applicant, introduces himself and asks to share his screen. Mr. Gaughan states we have revised the sign proposal to stay within the Bylaw guidelines and will no longer be requesting a variance.
- Wayne Dennison states so, the new sign you depicted in the plan dated 3/11/2021 fully complies with all dimensions in the Bylaw
- Kevin Gaughan states that's correct
- Wayne Dennison states alright, does anyone have any questions about the proposed sign
- Freeman Boynton Jr states I am wondering if the location is changing at all on the two signs, I didn't see a revised site plan
- Kevin Gaughan states there will be no change on the location of the 298 Kings Town way sign; that will be the same location. As you can see, where it exists today, it will be in the same place
- Wayne Dennison states alright, so this is the first application-the 298 Kings Town Way
- Wayne Dennison continues, Is there anyone here who would like to comment from the public
- Wayne Dennison states alright, I move to close the public hearing
- Emmett Sheehan seconds
- WD, KM, ES, FB, PT
- Wayne Dennison states alright, does the Board feel they need to have any discussion, it appears to me that the Applicant went back and did exactly what we asked them to do and have now proposed a sign that is completely appropriate. If no one has any comments, I would simply propose to approve the special permit for the sign consistent with the plan dated March 11, 2021.

- Emmett Sheehan seconds
- All in favor WD, KM, ES, FB, PT

Motion: It was moved, seconded and unanimously voted to close the public hearing.

Moved by: WD	Seconded by: ES
Number in favor: 5	Number Opposed: 0

Motion: It was moved, seconded and unanimously voted to grant the special permit for the sign proposed on at 290 Kings Town Way.

Moved by: WD	Seconded by: ES
Number in favor: 5	Number Opposed: 0

BOARD OF APPEALS — MINUTES

Case No: 2020-17

Petitioner: Duxbury House LLC

Address: 298 Kings Town Way

Date: March 25, 2021 Time: 7:30 p.m.

(Continued from January 14, 2021)

Members present: Wayne Dennison, Kathleen Muncey, Freeman Boynton Jr., Emmett Sheehan & Philip Thorn

Members Voting: Wayne Dennison, Kathleen Muncey, Freeman Boynton Jr., Emmett Sheehan & Philip Thorn

Other persons present at the hearing: James Wasielewski, Director of Municipal Services & Lauren Haché, Administrative Assistant

- Wayne Dennison re-opens the public hearing and states this is also a project similar to the last, a continuation on the similar property, Mr. Gaughan would you like to talk about it
- Kevin Gaughan states I would be happy to, I will share my screen again and talk about the revised plan. We went back to the drawing board with the comments from the Board at the previous public hearing. This is for a new special permit, as there was no previous sign at this property. We had also requested a variance for the minimum height requirement, but we are withdrawing that variance request. We are just looking for a special permit for this sign, which is now 55" in height from the ground, so well about the required height.
- Wayne Dennison states so, other than the size of the sign previously, the Board had a series of questions about the orientation of the sign, is it going to be orientated the same way as it had been previously requested in the special permit application
- Kevin Gaughan states looking back, I think that was based on the site plan approval, where there was concern about folk's sight lines for entering and exiting. I think if we were to modify that orientation, we would be happy to have that conditioned in the special permit and we can agree with that
- Freeman Boynton Jr. states I think that if you meet the minimum height requirement, you can see underneath the sign and it really doesn't matter where you put it.
- Wayne Dennison states yeah
- Emmett Sheehan states I agree, Freeman
- Wayne Dennison states I am inclined to agree with that as well. Are there members of the public that would like to comment on this application 2020-17? Mr. Gaughan states, I have a question, the drawing from the sign company is dated 1/15/2021, did we not have this drawing previously

- Kevin Gaughan states I will have to check the dates, but I remember we got this revised plan within a day or so after appearing before the Board. It took a little bit longer for the other sign, which is why it has a more recent date
- Wayne Dennison states alright, I am going to move to close the public hearing
- Emmett Sheehan seconds the motion
- All in favor WD, KM, ES, FB, PT
- Wayne Dennison states any discussion
- Kathleen Muncey states it looks good to me
- Wayne Dennison agrees and moves the special permit request consistent with the sign drawing January 15, 2021 on the condition that sign be orientated in such a way that it does not impair visibility in terms of making turns around the corner of which it's located.
- Emmett Sheehan seconds
- WD, KM, ES, PT, FB

Motion: It was moved, seconded and unanimously voted to close the public hearing.

Moved by: WD	Seconded by: ES
Number in favor: 5	Number Opposed: 0

Motion: It was moved, seconded and unanimously voted to grant the special permit with conditions for the sign proposed on at 298 Kings Town Way.

Moved by: WD	Seconded by: ES
Number in favor: 5	Number Opposed: 0

BOARD OF APPEALS — MINUTES

Case No: 2021-05

Petitioner: Christopher Andrew/Barrel Fund LLC

Address: 403 Washington Street

Date: March 25, 2021 Time: 7:30 p.m.

Members present: Wayne Dennison, Kathleen Muncey, Freeman Boynton Jr., Emmett Sheehan
Philip Thorn & Borys Gojnycz

Members Voting: Wayne Dennison, Kathleen Muncey, Freeman Boynton Jr., Emmett Sheehan
& Borys Gojnycz

Other persons present at the hearing: James Wasielewski, Director of Municipal Services &
Lauren Haché, Administrative Assistant

- Wayne Dennison opens the public hearing and makes a motion to continue the public hearing to April 8, 2021 at 7:30 p.m. per the Applicants request
- Kathleen Muncey seconds
- All in favor WD, KM, ES, FB, BG

Motion: It was moved, seconded and unanimously voted continue the public hearing to April 8, 2021 at 7:30 p.m.

Moved by: WD

Seconded by: KM

Number in favor: 5

Number Opposed: 0