



CITY OF HARTFORD
Zoning Board of Appeals
260 Constitution Plaza – Hartford, CT

VIRTUAL

DRAFT MINUTES

October 6, 2020

The Zoning Board of Appeals held a Virtual Public Hearing, at 6:30 p.m. on Tuesday, October 6, 2020.

Attendance

Present: Chair Stephanie Johnson, Commissioners, Phyllis Airey, Amy Bergquist, Alternate Commissioners Jonathan Cabral and William Kemp

Absent: Richard Szczypek

Staff Present: Aimee Chambers, Attorney Richard Vassallo and Vanessa Walton

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Stephanie Johnson called the meeting to order at 6:40 p.m.

II. PUBLIC HEARING

A. 86 Oakland Terrace – Request for variances from Section 3.2.1 Table of Principal Uses to allow for a multi-unit dwelling in a N-2-3 Neighborhood District.

Owner/Applicant: Bakari Stepherson

Ms. Aimee Chambers, Director of Planning, gave an overview of the proposal. Below is the statement of hardship as presented by the applicant.

Statement of Hardship

A variance from Section 3.2.1., “will permit the owner to provide low income housing to [a] majority of renters; either, single person or most common family unit (mom, dad, child) which support a 1 or 2 bedroom. This change would make housing cost[s] more affordable which would reduce the homelessness in the area, support income-based housing, provide additional housing for those in need and is in line with the City of Hartford intent of cleaning up Albany Ave.”

The applicant, Mr. Bakari Stepherson was present and he addressed the Board by sharing a PowerPoint presentation of the proposed work. The Board also heard from Ms. Luz Holmes, Co-Chair of the Upper Albany NRZ, who spoke in support of this project. There were no additional questions, comments or testimony and the Public Hearing was closed

Commissioner Phyllis Airey made a **MOTION** to **GRANT** Variance from Section 3.2.1, **Seconded** by Chair Stephanie Johnson.

Reason:

The need of residential units in the area that will support low income housing efforts that are taking place in the Albany Avenue area.

A hardship exists in the sense that the City’s goal is to provide affordable housing in the City and the configuration that the home as it is now does not address the people who are in the city.

The Commission voted as follows: Commissioner Phyllis Airey- Yes; Commissioner Amy Bergquist- Yes; Chair Stephanie Johnson- Yes; Commissioner Jonathan Cabral- Yes; Commissioner William Kemp- Yes. The Variance was **GRANTED** by a **5-0** vote.

**CITY OF HARTFORD
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
VARIANCE APPROVAL RESOLUTION
86-88 Oakland Terrace
October 6, 2020**

- Whereas,** The City of Hartford Zoning Board of Appeals (the” ZBA”) has reviewed the requested variance from the Zoning Regulations Section 3.2.1. Table of Principal Uses to allow for a multi-unit dwelling in a zone permitting a maximum of 3-unit dwellings.
- Whereas,** The subject property is located in N-2-3 Neighborhood district characterized by House B Buildings allowing up to 3 units; and
- Whereas,** The 11,985 square foot parcel hold a 2.5 story, 4,262 square foot, 3-unit House B Building with 1 unit on each floor; and
- Whereas,** The parcel is located within the Upper Albany National Historic District and is listed on the 1986 district nomination as a contributing 1905 building in the Queen Anne/Colonial Revival Style with 2 ½ floors and a gable roof; and
- Whereas,** The subject property is located within the Upper Albany Neighborhood Revitalization; and
- Whereas,** The home is currently vacant, the structure is intact and stabilized, but in need of repairs; and
- Whereas,** The adjacent MS-1 main Street district allows for multi-unit dwellings but does not permit residential on the first floor. The buildings within the Main Street District are mixed-use and many were large residential home like the one at 86-88 Oakland which have been adapted into churches or cottage commercial buildings; and
- Whereas,** The applicant proposes to repair and renovate the existing building and split one (1) of the 4-bedroom apartments, located on the first and second floor, into (2) 2-bedroom apartments; and
- Whereas,** The applicant states no intent to alter the exterior of the home beyond the required repairs; and
- Whereas,** The proposed work will result in a 4-unit dwelling; and
- Whereas,** Section 4.15.1 of the Zoning Regulations states the “Description & Intent” of the House B Building type is to “house 1 to 4 housing units”; and

106 **Whereas,** The large 1,500 square foot floor plan permits such a change without creating
107 efficiency/micro units and the rear yard provides adequate room for additional
108 parking; and
109

110 **Whereas,** The proposed work is consistent with the City of Hartford's Plan of Conservation
111 and Development, "One City, One Plan POCD 2020" (the "POCD"), that identifies
112 86-88 Oakland as medium-density residential (1-3 stories), names repairing and
113 maintaining aging house stock as a goal, and prioritizes density to "fill vacant lots,
114 attract new visitors, and increase residential population by 10% throughout the
115 city."; and
116

117 Now Therefore Be It
118

119 **Resolved,** The City of Harford Zoning Board of Appeals hereby approves the requested
120 variance from the Zoning Regulations Section 3.2.1. Table of Principal Uses to
121 allow for a four (4) unit dwelling in a zone permitting a maximum of 3-units per
122 building, with the following conditions:
123

- 124 1) The approval of this Variance is subject to approval of a Historic Review by
125 the Historic Preservation Commission and compliance with the *Hartford*
126 *Guidelines for Renovations and Additions to Historic Buildings* in regards to
127 any exterior alterations or change in materials visible from the street.

128 Be It Further
129

130 **Resolved** this 6th day of October 2020
131
132

133 **B. 170 Branford Street-** Request for Variances from Section 4.18.1.D(1)(b) of the Zoning Regulation
134 to allow for a porch and stairs to be construction beyond the veranda line in a N-2-2 Neighborhood
135 District.
136 Property Owner/Applicant: Nadine Huntley.
137

138 Ms. Aimee Chambers, Director of Planning, gave an overview of the proposed. She stated that she
139 received a letter from the Blue Hills NRZ that was in support of the proposal, which was read into
140 the records. Ms. Chambers further informed the Commission that the applicant is in need of an
141 additional variance to complete this application, however, the City was unable to reach the applicant
142 prior to this meeting.
143

144 The applicant, Ms. Nadine Huntly was present and she addressed the Board. Chair Johnson
145 explained to the applicant, Ms. Nadine Huntley what was needed in order for her to move forward
146 with her application. Ms. Huntley will reach out to and work with Ms. Paige Berschet of the
147 Planning Division to provide additional information. With the consent of the applicant, Chair
148 Johnson **CONTINUED** this application until the next Zoning Board of Appeals meeting, scheduled
149 for November 2020.
150

151 **C. 214 Prospect Avenue –** Request for Variances from the following sections of the Zoning
152 Regulations related to the razing and reconstruction of the existing McDonald's restaurant in a MS-3
153 main Street Zoning District.

- 154 • **Section 4.7.2** to allow for the Building to be located 21.3. feet from the building line.
155 • **Section 6.9.2** to allow for a 2.3-foot buffer on the north side and a 0-foot buffer on the south
156 side of the property
157 • **Section 6.7.3.D** to allow for no trees to be planted on the street frontage
158 • **Section 8.3-A** to allow for 3 wall signs on the property

- **Section 1.5.5.E** to allow for the above referenced wall signage, while a nonconforming sign remains of the property
- **Section 4.7.2** to allow for a portion of the building height to be 21.6 feet.

Owner: McDonald's USA, LLC; **Applicant:** Hinckley Allen & Snyder, c/o Leah Rubega

Ms. Aimee Chambers, Director of Planning, gave an overview of the proposed project. She informed the Board of a list of Sections that the applicants wanted variance from and stated that staff recommended the following:

- Approval of variances for items number 2, 3 and 6
- Tabling of variances for items number 1, 4 and 5

As listed below in the Statement of Hardship.

Statement of Hardship

- 1) Section 4.7.2, which requires the Building to be within two feet of the building line, to permit the Building to be located 21.3 feet from the building line, for a variance of 19.3 feet;

“For steady and safe traffic flow onto, within and off of the Property, the current configuration of the Property allows traffic to enter the Property at the entrance only driveway on the right side of the Property, circulate around the building and then to exit at the exit-only driveway to the left side of the Property... if McDonald's was forced to comply with the regulations and was required to move the Building within two feet of the building line, resulting in the removal of the circulation lane in front of the Building, it would likely result in an increase in congestion and possibly stacking on the Property and at the intersection on Prospect Avenue, thereby posing a potential safety hazard on and off of the Property. Given the nature of the drive-through use on the Property and the proximity to the traffic intersection, efficient circulation is necessary.”

- 2) Section 6.9.2, which requires a five-foot side buffer, to permit a buffer of 2.3. feet on the north side of the Property, and to maintain the existing 0-foot buffer on the south side of the Property, for a variance of 2.7 feet and five (5) feet respectively;

“...if McDonald's were to comply with the required five-foot side buffers while maintaining sufficiently wide travel lanes and the parking spaces at the required size, the Building would have to be reduced to such a size that would prevent McDonald's from operating a restaurant with drive-through effectively and therefore would deprive McDonald's of its reasonable use of the land. The Project proposes to increase the buffer on the north side of the Property from 0.6' to 2.3'. In addition, the Project proposes to bring the existing non-conforming rear landscape buffer into compliance and proposes to add landscaping and increase the pervious coverage on the Property.”

- 3) Section 6.7.3.D, which requires one street tree from every 40 feet of street frontage;

“...because of the traffic signals directly in front of the Property, McDonald's cannot safely plant five trees as required by Section 6.7.3.D, as there are site constraints limiting feasible tree locations, including overhead utility wires running along the north property line from Prospect Ave., two traffic mast arms along the center of the frontage, and potential site distances issues for vehicle turning into the entrance driveway then merging with the recirculation lane.”

- 4) Figure 8.3-A, which permits one wall sign on the Building, to permit three (3) wall signs, for a variance of two (2) wall signs;

“Altogether, the signage that McDonald's is proposing for the Property is less than the 504 square feet of signage that is permitted at the Property, and instead of one large wall sign, McDonald's is proposing smaller wall signs so that it may adequately identify the restaurant

and playplace from passerby coming from the north and south on Prospect Avenue, as well as those in the shopping plaza across Prospect Avenue. The location of the Property and Building in relation to the intersection directly in front of the Property, as well as the Property's close proximity to the intersection of Prospect Avenue and Kane Street are unique considerations to the Property and require wall signage on more than one side of the building.'

- 5) Section 1.5.5.E, to permit the above referenced wall signage while a nonconforming sign remains in the Property;

"Consistent with national rebranding, McDonald's is proposing smaller individual, more discrete wall signs, which includes two (2) "M" logo signs at 14 square feet each and a "playplace" sign at 28.3 square feet. McDonald's will be maintaining its freestanding sign in front of the building."

- 6) Section 4.7.2, which permits a maximum building height of 18 feet, to permit a portion of the building to be 21.6 feet, for a variance of 3.6 feet;

"The existing McDonald's restaurant currently contains a playplace, and the existing building's height is higher at that portion of the building which contains the playplace than the rest of the building. McDonald's proposed Project includes a similar building structure, such that the entire building is in compliance with the 18-foot height requirement, except that portion of the building that contains the playplace, which is proposed to be 21.6 feet, requiring a 3.6-foot variance. The playplace is a crucial component to the restaurant's operation and rebuild, as the placeplace is widely used by the customers and citizens within the community... The proposed building with a new playplace is consistent with how the Property has been used for the McDonald's operation at this location for many years, which is unique to its historic operation at this Property."

- 7) Any other variance necessary to complete the Project as proposed in the plans.

No other specific variances are anticipated at this time.

The applicant, Attorney Leah Rubega was present and she along with Mr. Eric Dubrule Bohler addressed the Board. Mr. Dubrule Bohler gave a detailed presentation of the proposal by sharing his screen and answered questions from the Board.

There were some items that the Board felt were unsatisfied and Chair Johnson with the consent of the applicant **TABLED/CONTINUED** this application until the next Zoning Board of Appeals meeting in November 2020.

D. 330 New Park Avenue- Request for Variances from the following section of the Zoning Regulations to allow for the construction of a Multi-Use development, consisting of three lots, each with one new building (hereinafter referred to as Property 1, Property 2, and Property 3

1. **Parcel 1 and 3** relates to proposed construction of a Downtown General Building type in a DT-3 Downtown District:
 - **Section 4.3.2.A(9)** to allow less than the required 90% Building coverage for the proposed Downtown Storefront buildings.
 - **Section 4.3.2.C(16)** to allow residential use within the Primary Street Ground Story of the proposed downtown Storefront buildings.
 2. **Parcel 2** related to proposed construction of an Apartment Building Type in a MX-2 Multi-Use Mix District:
 - **Section 4.11.2.C(15)** to allow Commercial use on the Ground Story of the proposed Apartment building.
- Owner: DP 103, LLC; Applicant: Dakota Partners, Inc. c/o Mark Pilotte

Ms. Aimee Chambers, Director of Planning, gave an overview of the proposed and stated that she received a letter of support from the Parkville NRZ.

Statement of Hardship

In regards to Section 4.3.2.A(9), Downtown Storefront building type, 90% Building Coverage requirement:

“The specific hardship is that the lot size and shape, through no fault of the applicant, is much larger than the lot size envisioned by the DT-3 zone, which was written for much smaller lots located in the downtown Hartford area.”

In regards to Section 4.3.2.C(16), Downtown Storefront building type, residential use on Primary Street Ground Story where only retail, service, office and library use is permitted:

“The specific hardship is that the location of the property, through no fault of the applicant, does not make it possible to achieve the City’s strategic plans and neighborhood needs, which are consistent with a retail/residential mix, weighted towards residential, are not consistent with the T-3 zone requirements for the setback of residential units. The regulations lends itself to a more heavily weighted residential use, as the combination as proposed meets the City’s strategic goals and the neighborhood needs.”

In regards to Section 4.11.2.C(15), Apartment building type, neighborhood retail use on Ground Story where only residential and lodging use is permitted:

“The specific hardship is that the location of property, through no fault of the applicant, wants a mix of commercial and residential use, more heavily weighted towards residential. The regulations require 100% residential in this zone, which is not in concert with the City’s strategic plans of the neighborhood needs.”

The applicant, Mr. Mark Pilotte, Dakota Partners, Inc. was present, and he introduced Attorney Tim Hollister. Mr. Pilotte addressed and answered questions from the Board. There were no testimony, questions or comments from the public and the Public Hearing was closed

Chair Stephanie Johnson made a **MOTION** to **AMEND** the resolution to add the condition: “and upon the applicant’s receipt of State Funding”

Seconded by Commissioner Amy Bergquist. The Board voted as follows: Commissioner Phyllis Airey- Yes; Commissioner Amy Bergquist- Yes; Chair Stephanie Johnson- Yes; Commissioner Jonathan Cabral- Yes; Commissioner William Kemp- Yes. The Variance was **GRANTED** by a **5-0** vote.

Reason: The applicants have done the most they could to meet the proposed use in concert with the proposed use.

**CITY OF HARTFORD
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
VARIANCE APPROVAL RESOLUTUION
330 New Park Avenue
October 6, 2020**

Whereas, The City of Hartford Zoning Board of Appeals (the” ZBA”) has reviewed the requested variance from the Zoning Regulations Section 4.3.2.A(9), Section 4.3.2.C(16), and Section 4.11.2.C(15) to allow for the construction of a Multi-Use development, consisting of three lots, each with one new building (hereinafter referred to as Property 1, Property 2, and Property 3); and

Whereas, The property is located at 330 New Park Avenue, near the intersection of New Park Avenue and Prospect Avenue in the MS-3 zoning district and within the Transit Oriented Development Overlay; and

Whereas, The Applicant seeks a Variance from Section 4.3.2.A(9) to allow less than the required 90% Building Coverage from the proposed Downtown Storefront buildings on Property 1 and Property 3; and

Whereas, The Applicant seeks a Variance from Section 4.3.2.C(16) to allow Residential use within the Primary Street Ground Story of the proposed Downtown Storefront buildings on Property 1 and Property 3; and

Whereas, The Applicant seeks a Variance from Section 4.11.2.C(15) to allow Commercial use on the Ground story of the proposed Apartment building on Property 2; and

Whereas, The proposed work is consistent with the Transit Oriented Development Overlay's intent "to allow for greater flexibility and require greater density in the vicinity of fixed nodes of public transportation"; and

Whereas, The proposed work is consistent with the City of Hartford's Plan of Conservation and Development, "One City, One Plan POCD 2020" (the "POCD"), and the Future Land Use Map; and

Whereas, The proposed work is consistent with objectives set forth in the "Parkville Strategic Plan, 10/09/2008"; and

Whereas, The Zoning Board of Appeals [finds or does not find] the proposed request for Variance to warrant relief from strict compliance with the provision of the Zoning Regulations; and

Now Therefore Be It

Resolved, The City of Hartford Zoning Board of Appeals hereby approves requested variance from the sections stated above with the following condition(s):

- 1) The approval of this variance is subject to the approval & filing with the land records of the proposed 330 New Park Avenue subdivision, as shown in the attached Variance Application Plans and upon the applicant's receipt of State Funding.

Be It Further

Resolved this 6th day of October 2020

E. 580 Farmington Avenue- Request for variance from Section 3.2.1 of the Zoning Regulation to allow for a Drinking Place in an MX-1 Multi-Use District.

Owner: Ron's Properties, LLC; **Applicant:** Ron's Properties, LLC c/o Marina Sasonov.

Ms. Aimee Chambers, Director of Planning, gave an overview of the proposed and stated that she had not receive a letter of recommendation from the West End Civic Association for this project. Ms. Chambers read into the records the Statement of Hardship as submitted by the applicant.

Statement of Hardship

For about fifteen (15) years, up until January 2015, the Restaurant Space was vacant due to the Property owners' inability to lease out the space due to lack of sufficient parking space at the Property. In 2015, to mitigate damages, the Property owners opened a restaurant (Metro Café, LLC), however after about five years Metro Café dissolved amid the Covid-19 pandemic. In July 2020, Fogata rented the Restaurant Space for a trial period of six (6) months (see attached Lease Agreement) with the plan to obtain Liquor Permit. Mrs. Angelica Garcia*, the owner of Fogata indicated that not having the Liquor Permit effects significantly the bottom-line of Fogata and hence she is planning to close the place if a Liquor Permit is not obtained. Closing Fogata will necessarily result again in a long-lasting vacancy of the Restaurant Space, which will directly impose exceptional difficulty and unusual hardship on Ron's Properties, LLC's ability to pay property taxes for the said Property.

*Mrs. Garcia is also the owner of El Nuevo Sarape Restaurant (931 Broad Street, Hartford) where liquor is served, and which is crucial for the survival of the restaurant business.

SUMMARY

The unique nature of the 580 Farmington Ave property, due to the insufficient parking space imposes unparalleled hardship on Ron's Properties, LLC to lease out the space to tenants. The insufficient parking space at the said Property greatly decreases and completely deprives the Property of its value. If the City of Hartford does not allow Use Variance to obtain Liquor Permit for the Restaurant Space at 590 Farmington Ave, the City of Hartford necessarily renders the said Restaurant Space practically worthless. Currently there is about 1000 sq. ft. of dead/non-leasable space in the said Property, if Fogata terminates the Lease due to inability to obtain the Liquor Permit, there would be total of about 3,000 sq. ft. of dead/non-leasable space. Further, authorizing the requested variance will enhance the restaurant experience for the community, and it would not impose any foreseeable health and/or safety issues.

The applicant, Ms. Marina Sasonov and Mr. Ron Sasonov were present and they addressed and answered questions from the Board.

There to speak in support of the applicant's proposal was Mr. Jory Johnson, Ms. Angelica Garcia, Ms. Nancy Boone and Ms. Rebecca Quach. There were no further testimony, questions or comments from the public and the Public Hearing was closed.

The Board entered into deliberation and Commissioner Airey requested that Chair Johnson bring clarity to public this Board's duty as it pertains to hardships. Chair Johnson stated that "financial does not render a hardship."

At that time, Chair Johnson made a **MOTION** to **DENY** the variance, **Seconded** by Commissioner Airey. The Board voted as follows: Commissioner Phyllis Airey- Yes; Commissioner Amy Bergquist- Yes; Chair Stephanie Johnson- Yes; Commissioner Jonathan Cabral- Yes; Commissioner William Kemp- Yes. The Variance was **DENIED (without prejudice)** by a vote of **5-0**

F. 150 Kenyon Street- Request for Variance from Section 4.20.3.C(3) of the zoning Regulations to allow for the construction of an 8'x12' shed as an additional Out building located in a N-2-1 neighborhood Zoning District.

Owner & Applicant: Grant Ehrlich

Ms. Aimee Chambers, Director of Planning gave an overview of the proposed and stated that she visited the site on Friday to find that the shed had been erected. She shared photos from her screen. She further stated that she received letters of opposition from the following:

- Ms. Nancy Boone
- Mr. Douglas Cohen and Ms. Phyllis Shakora
- Ms. Alaine Griffin
- Mr. Dan Hitchell
- Mr. Tom and Ms. Tracy Quigley
- Ms. Kathleen Sandin

- Mr. Scott Griffin
- The Martin Family
- Ms. Alicia Fournier
- And a petition of opposition signed by several people in the community.

Statement of Hardship

"However small your garden, you must provide for two of the serious gardener's necessities, a tool shed and a composite heap." - Anne Scott-James, cited at CT.gov/.../...Composting and Organics Recycling

Hardship statement

We request a variance to permit an 8'x12' shed in the backyard at 150 Kenyon. We need a small space suitable to store shovels, rakes, and other tools. A shed will prevent theft by placing the tools out of sight and behind a door. The shed will be in our rear yard, and have an area of about 96 square feet.

Because it is less than 200 square feet, a building permit is not required. However, because we have a detached garage, we need a variance for an additional accessory structure.

Our garage, while not original to the property, was likely built around 1920 to 1930. It is small, having 7' doors and 1' of clearance between the side of the door and the outside wall. We debated replacing the garage, and had plans drawn by Jim Vance. That process allowed us to realize that a larger garage would be more than is needed, and a shed would be more attractive.

The shed has natural wood pine siding with a rough-sawn texture. We plan to let the siding age and weather naturally so in time it will be grey. The shed is above ground, no electrical and no plumbing.

The door is a barn door style sliding door.

Our southern neighbor, Scott Griffin at 148 Kenyon, said he would have not object to the requested variance.

Our eastern neighbor, Alicia Fournier at 155 Girard, is also supportive, and said she would not object to the requested variance.

Our northern neighbor, Berthel Johnson at 154 Kenyon is similarly supportive and has provided a letter of support, a copy of which is provided with this application.

Attached are drawings and pictures of the shed, and a drawing indicating its location on our property. Requested is a variance to permit this additional accessory structure"

The applicant, Mr. Grant Ehrlich was present and he addressed and answered questions from the Board.

At that time, Chair Johnson reiterated that everyone had an opportunity to speak and be heard, however, if the speakers were not offering additional information, other than what was submitted to the Board by letters written by the community, she suggested that they hold their comments. She then opened the Public Hearing.

The Board then heard from a neighbor, Mr. Doug Cohen who stated that the neighbor Mr. Ehrlich eluded to as a supporter of 154 Kenyon Street, is an investor who does not live at that address and should not be considered as a true supporter. There were no further comments, testimony or questions and the Public Hearing was closed.

Commissioner Amy Bergquist made a **MOTION to DENY** the variance, **Seconded** by Commissioner Phyllis Airey. The Board voted as follows: Commissioner Phyllis Airey- Yes; Commissioner Amy Bergquist- Yes; Chair Stephanie Johnson- Yes; Commissioner Jonathan Cabral- Yes; Commissioner William Kemp- Yes The Variance was **DENIED** by a **5-0** vote.

Reason: No real hardship

At that time, Ms. Aimee Chambers, Director of Planning informed the applicant, Mr. Grant Ehrlich that the shed must be removed.

G. 1200-1264 Park Street- Request for Variances from the following section of the Zoning Regulations related to installation of new signs on property in the MS-3 Main street Zoning District:

- **Section 1.5.3.E** to allow replacement of existing signs on a lot while nonconforming signs remain

Owner: Carlos Mouta c/o 1200 Park Street, LLC; **Applicant:** Jeffrey Perez

Ms. Aimee Chambers, Director of Planning gave an overview of the proposed and stated that no letter had been received from the NRZ.

Statement of Hardship

“The existing regulations create unnecessary difficulty for existing [and new] businesses to rebrand.”

The applicant, Mr. Jeffrey Perez along with Mr. Carlos Mouta were present they addressed the Board. There were no questions, comments or testimony from the public and the Public Hearing was closed.

Commissioner Phyllis Airey made a **MOTION** to **GRANT** the variance, Seconded by Commissioner Cabral. The Board voted as follows: Commissioner Phyllis Airey- Yes; Commissioner Amy Bergquist- Yes; Chair Stephanie Johnson- No; Commissioner Jonathan Cabral- Yes; Commissioner William Kemp- Yes. The Variance was **GRANTED** by a **4-1** vote.

Reason: The low grade of the property and the tower location makes it hard to identify the supermarket

III. Minutes

September 1, 2020 -Held

IV. EXECUTIVE SESSION

Attorney Richard Vassallo discussed the Board’s decision regarding 71 Mansfield Street

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Stephanie Johnson adjourned the meeting at 11:29 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted by:

Vanessa Walton, Executive Assistant