

**ZOOM MEETING**

Not approved by member Lyle. She further stated in response to the hardship not being primarily a result of financial gain, however selling the home is financial gain. Granting the variance will alter the characteristics of the general area most of the

houses are set back, this will be closer to the street. This is a continuous stream and could have an effect on the wetlands and the environment.

Member Kearns does not comply with standard two financial gains. Three Kids LLC development company is a business and like any business making money is primary, so applying for the dimensional variance would provide greater financial gain the primary purpose for a profit organization. Compares current applicant to previous similar application whom were seeking variance to build single-family dwelling (also denied due to financial gain). Concern with standard three, the proposed house and associated structures would infringe on the required setback by 60 %, the home would be significantly different in character, to the rest of the homes in the neighborhood in regards to the closeness to the road. Vote No.

**Chairman:** Three to approve, two to reject application further denied.

**Attorney DeSisto** reads Judge Vogel findings and instructions. Finding of fact to support DEM required 20ft buffer zone. Reads Judge Vogel's decision, DEM requirements.

**Kearns:** does not consider based on speculation.

**Farhoumand:** Protecting the wetlands should take precedence over zoning regulations. Protecting the wetlands is more important than frontage relief. Should grant, rather than deny. Votes in support to approve.

**Ruggerio:** Feels we could not reject expert witnesses or to disregard the wetlands protection that exists, in support to approve.

**Kearns:** would reconsider negative vote, if we could consider condition from original motion several years ago which said they need to have concern with digging of soil if found to be contaminated.

**Chairman:** conditions of original application put on record. Adding to motion to approve, approval with condition from 2018 transcript. Incorporate original condition stated in transcript (pg 121/122).

**Motion to approve by Chairman DeAngelis,** Seconded member Ruggerio

Re-poll: member Farhoumand, member Kearns affirmative

Vice Chairman Lyle negative

4 affirmative -1 negative; motion granted variance has been granted.

**William King, 37 Olney Avenue, Lincoln, RI – Application for Dimensional Variance seeking side yard setback and height relief for a newly construction single family home located at 37 Olney Avenue, Lincoln, RI.**  
**AP 17, Lot 96                                      Zoned: RS- 12**

**Chairman DeAngelis:** Stated this application was originally heard in March and was granted a continuance for new plan submitted. Defer to Zoning Official Hervieux.

**Zoning Official Hervieux:** Foundation as built from developer, states if they bring grade up on the perimeter of house to a certain level it will eliminate a 35 feet height relief. Meaning now it will be below the 35 feet height maximum that is allowed in the district, which means they would not need height relief for this house. Would still need dimensional relief for the sides. Certain zones over 25 heights adds to side set back, this particular zone it is true and still needs set back relief.

**Chairman DeAngelis:** Put in record of calculations that are relevant to this dimensional variants request. Providing the grade is brought up to level, which reflects documents submitted. Chairman explains requests and measurement requirements. The front corner of the house on the northwest corner is 25.16 from the side property line and 30 feet is required, the applicant would need 4.84 feet of side relief on that northwest corner. The side of the house on the north side measures 24.89 feet from the side property line and 30 feet is required, which results in a request for 5.11 feet of side relief on the north side. Additionally, the front corner of the covered porch on the southwest corner is 24.95 feet from the side property line again 30 feet is required, resulting in a request for 5.05 feet of side relief on the southwest corner of the covered porch. The rear corner of the house on the southeast corner is 25.16 feet from the side property line and 30 feet is required, resulting in a request for 4.84 feet of side relief on the southeast corner. The chimney on the south side is 23.11 feet from the side, and 30 feet is required, the applicant is looking for 6.89 feet of side relief for the chimney on the south side, these are the amounts of requests for relief regarding the application providing that the grade is brought up to the level that is presented to Zoning Official Hervieux.

**Attorney John Shekarchi** recapped March original application.

Chairman clarified this is a new application based on revision of the calculations and the resolution of the height issue. Attorney Shekarchi agreed as long as previous testimonies are able to be used.

**Ed Pimentel:** Original relief required was brought down under 35 ft. and by doing so extinguished the height variances and also reduced the setbacks from 30ft to 25ft and extinguished three other setbacks.

**Chairman:** The front corner of house on northwest will no longer require relief.

Agreed by both Hervieux and Pimentel

Chairman: eliminate that, the north side of the house going to need recalculation of 0.11.

**Lyle:** questions new application needed

**Solicitor DeSisto:** No need for new application as long as everybody has the revised plans in front of them and is comfortable with the calculations given by Zoning Official Hervieux and Pimentel.

**Chairman:** Reads calculation amounts needed for the request. Front corner of house northwest is no longer applicable. Going to need .11 feet of relief on the north side and the applicant is going to need .05 feet of side relief on southwest corner near covered porch. Agreed by Zoning Official Hervieux.

Chairman: South East corner no longer required. Correct. Chimney side, 1.89 feet required. Correct. Three areas of relief

### **Standards**

#### **Presented by Ed Pimentel**

Alter the grade somewhat and alleviating the height variance would extinguish the other variances and reduce others thereby met least relief necessary. By raising the grade would lower the appearance of the house even further and would alter the massive scale of the house and bring it into character with the surrounding homes.

**Farhoumand** questions wording “to be” questions going to be done in future.

Answered by Shekarchi, plan to elaborate calculations shown as a build of potential grading.

### **Questions:**

**Lyle:** supporting information of how the plan changed originally from how it was submitted to Zoning Official.

Chairman: In everyone’s packets, Zoning Official agreed plans were given to board members

**Chairman:** Reads into record technical review committee recommendation, indicated based on old information. TRC not aware of new information, new calculations reached between the town and applicant on the height. Agreed on by Zoning Official Hervieux. Continues to read TRC recommendation: For side yard and height relief on a newly constructed single -family house located at 37 Olney Avenue Lincoln, Rhode Island. The planning board recommends denial of these dimensional variances. During the building permit review stage of the Building Official noticed the possibility of the house being built over the maximum allowed building height. A note of question was documented in the building permit file and presented to the contractor and homeowner. The Director of Public Works also expressed a number of occurrences where he had to point out deficiencies in conditions during the construction of the house. The Planning Board feels that the application does not present the least relief needed. The applicant can reconstruct the roofing system which will eliminate the need for these dimensional variances, the Planning Board feels that the granting the dimensional variance will impair the intent and purpose of the zoning ordinance and the comprehensive plan.

**Moderator Potvin:** Has polled, four member of the public appears no one would like to speak regarding this application, Chairman puts into record.

No questions/ clarifications further.

**Vice Chair Lyle:** prepared, to make a motion to approve application. Hardship is due to the unique characteristics of the subject land, not to the general characteristics of the surrounding area and not due to the physical or economic disability of the applicant, it's for a newly built home. The hardship is not the result of any prior action of the applicant and does not result primarily from the desire to realize greater financial gain. Will not alter the general surrounding area and the request conforms with the purpose and intent of the Lincoln Zoning Ordinance and

Comprehensive Plan. The grading of the land will bring the house down, giving the effect of it not being a four level house. Dimensional variance is the hardship, more than any inconvenience. The applicant has worked with us and has now done more with the grading of the land and has some submitted that information to Zoning Official Hervieux.

As you reported for the covered porch the southwest corner of the residence he needs a .05 feet of relief the northerly side of the residents needs 0.11 feet of relief and for the chimney the southerly side of the residents, they need 1.89 of feet relief.

**Second by Chairman DeAngelis:** add condition that the height measurement needs to be approved by Zoning Official Hervieux or Building Official to ensure it does fall within the agreed grade level and final calculations to the roof height. Agreed by Vice Chair Lyle.

Clarified: reflective of documentation from 4/27/2021 and the note, in accompanying the documents and agreed upon to be finished in 60 days.

**Motion to approve:**

**Kearns:** Aye

**Spezzano:** Aye

**Ruggerio:** Aye

**Lyle:** Aye

**Chairman:** Aye

**Variance has been granted based on the discussed conditions**

**Waterloo Way, LLP, 3900 North West Second Avenue, Miami Florida –  
Application for Special Use Permit to locate a tattoo parlor inside an existing  
commercial property at 100 Higginson Avenue, Unit 1, in Lincoln RI.**

**AP 1 Lot 133**

**Zoned: MG-0.5**

**Chairman:** This application represents a request for a Special Use Permit to locate a tattoo parlor in an existing commercial building. The applicant proposes to operate a tattoo parlor in a commercial facility, which has several other service and recreational businesses. The property is located in the MG-0.5 zoning district. A tattoo parlor falls under section 260-14A of the zoning ordinance, which requires a Special Use Permit. The facility meets the parking requirements for this use. Facility does meet the parking requirements for this use. Falls within district representative Vice Chairperson Lyle. Voting on this application is Chairman DeAngelis, Vice Chairperson Lyle, member Ruggerio, member Kearns and member Spezzano

**Four standards read into record by Chairman DeAngelis:** The first standard is that the use is permitted in the exact subsection in the ordinances that it's permitted in. Standard two that the Special Use Permit meets all the criteria in the zoning ordinance such as parking and lighting and various use regulations. Standard three that the Special Use Permit will not alter the general character of the neighborhood. Standard four that the special use conforms with the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinances, those standards read into the record

**Attorney Shekarchi-** the applicant wishes to have a tattoo parlor business there and Mr. Pimentel has visited the site and he can quickly address the standards.

**Pimentel-** Visited site and noted there are several other entities that comply with parking. Full parking plan approved. 25 acres with light industrial facility. 473,000 square feet of usable gross floor area. Approximately 4750 (1% of the entire gross floor) will be occupied by this entity. It is situated in the appropriate location surrounded by other industrial/ commercial office uses and there is no residential use to be impacted. Size: 4,750 L shape.

**Standards reported by Pimentel:** One, It is allowed by Special Use Permit. Number two, there are no specific standards to the granting of this special use, follow up and make sure that we were dimensionally complying

Thirdly, was the character of the neighborhood once again I don't believe this is going to impact that particular neighborhood and finally was consistency with a Comprehensive Plan. Reviewed the Comprehensive Plan, paid specific attention to the land use elements in the economic development elements of the Lincoln Comprehensive Plan. It will benefit and generate the most tax dollars with sitting vacant mills and will offset the impact on the residential tax base. Reuse of the mill buildings in the Saylesville industrial park should be encouraged.

**Solicitor DeSisto** Licenses: will not need to provide tattoo license.

Tattoo parlors in Lincoln do not have special licensing requirements. Tattoo parlors have requirements at the State level from the Department of Health that they have to adhere to.

**Chairman** asks if board members have any questions or clarifications.

**Lyle:** permissible per 260-14? Where do tattoo parlors fall?

**Solicitor DeSisto: Answer:** under beauty

**Lyle:** Enough parking, 22 parking spaces wanted to confirm with employees and traffic there will be enough parking?

**Zoning Official Hervieux: Answer:** Parking is not an issue. Previous parking calculations have been completed with the go-kart facility. There's ample parking for this facility so this will be plenty of parking for this use. The parking plan is based on the entire building facility not individual units.

**Spezzano-** Company is located out of Miami Florida is that unusual?

**Attorney Shekarchi: Answer:** The owners are North Providence residents.

**Kearns-** What percentage of the development is built out?

**Zoning Official Hervieux- Answer:** 80 %. A large percent is used for storage, which requires very little parking

**TRC Report Read into record by Chairman DeAngelis:**

Members of the TRC review the submitted plans and applications seeking a Special Use Permit to locate a tattoo parlor inside an existing commercial property at 100 Higginson Avenue unit 1 in Lincoln, Rhode Island. This use is allowed, with a Special Use Permit. The Planning Board recommends approval of the Special Use Permit the proposed tattoo parlor will be located within a commercial facility that contains many other uses. The property has ample customer parking the Planning Board feels that the Special Use Permit will not alter the general character, of the surrounding area and will not impair the intent or purpose of the Lincoln Zoning Ordinances and Comprehensive Plan.

**Moderator Potvin:** If there is anyone who would like to speak please your raise hand at this time. There does not appear to be anyone wishing to speak

**Chairman:** Record indicates, it doesn't appear to be anybody. Virtually attending this virtual meeting this evening, who wishes to speak regarding this application?

**Lyle:** Prepared to make a motion to approve the application for Waterloo Way LLP 100 Higginson Avenue Unit number 1 (AP 1 lot 133) zoned MG- 05 to locate a tattoo parlor in the existing commercial building Special Use Permit. The use is permitted, and the exact subset section with a property in a MG- 05 zone, which is a commercial location. Per 260-14 we are classifying it under beauty service. Permit meets all the criteria and zoning ordinance such as parking lighting use regulations. Parking is ample based on full square footage of lot, lighting is certainly sufficient the building is in a commercial zone. That the Special Use Permit will not alter the general characteristics of the neighborhood. Based on Attorney Shekarchi and Mr. Pimentel's testimony this evening it's a minuscule square footage in comparison to the whole building square footage and it is in a commercial zone. The special use conforms with the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance, it is in a commercial location the fire department has approved safety approval.

**Member Ruggerio seconded the motion.**

**Kearns:** aye

**Spezzano:** aye

**Chairman:** aye

**Vice Chairperson Lyle:** aye

**Ruggerio:** aye

**Special Use Permit is granted.**

**Sean Gaughan, 6 Park Boulevard, Lincoln, RI – Application for Dimensional Variance seeking side and rear setback relief for the construction of an accessory dwelling unit at 6 Park Boulevard in Lincoln, RI.**

**AP 13, Lot 083   Zoned: RL-9**

**Chairman:** This application represents a request for a Dimensional Variance for the construction of an addition to an existing home. The applicant is proposing to remove an existing garage and shed and construct an addition in their place. The addition will be used for an accessory family dwelling unit. The proposed addition is 9.5' from the east side property line which 27.5' is required. Therefore, the applicant would need **18.0'** of east side relief for the proposed addition. The proposed addition is 25.6' from the rear property line which 27.5' is required. Therefore, the applicant would need **1.9'** of rear relief for the proposed addition. The existing house has some dimensional non-conformity. The existing house is 19.98' from the front property line on the Colonial Drive side which 25' is required. Therefore, the applicant would need **5.02'** of front relief on the Colonial Drive side of the existing house. The existing house is 22.39' from the front property line on the Park Blvd. side which 25' is required. Therefore, the applicant would need **2.61'** of front relief on the Park Blvd. side of the existing house. The property meets the lot coverage regulations even with the proposed addition.

**Sitting on the application Chairman DeAngelis, Vice Chairperson Lyle, member Kearns, member Ruggerio and member Farhoumand**

**5 standards read into record by Chairman DeAngelis**

1. Is there a hardship due to unique characteristics of land that is not any physical or economic disability.
2. Is that there's a hardship that results and it's not from any prior action of yourself, and it does not result from the desire to realize any greater financial gain.
3. Granting of the variance will not alter the general character of the neighborhood.
4. What is asked of the Board is reasonable and least relief necessary.
5. For a dimensional variance is there a hardship that's more than a mere inconvenience, which results in you needing this variance

Applicants introduced and testimonials. Applicants share what they have now and what they are looking to do as far as the addition. Existing- Two bedroom, one bath, colonial, proposing to build an in-law apartment attached to the house. Looking to take out garage and existing shed, asking for 18 inches. Have an existing breezeway, will not be knocking down breezeway, the breezeway will be entry way from existing house. Only logical place to build structure.

**Chairman:** Will be absence of garage as result? Addition will consist of bed, bath and living room.

**Applicants:** Correct

**Chairman:** Any questions?

**Farhoumand:** For Zoning Official Hervieux. Trying to show where building will be 9.5 property line, measure from overhang not the wall. Was it measured accurately?

**Zoning Official Hervieux:** Part of the primary structure, the setback is measured to the outside wall, the ordinance allows for one foot overhang into the setback for other features (windows etc.)

**Farhoumand:** Height shouldn't impact the setback?

**Zoning Official Hervieux:** No, due to relief given tonight, if get that.

**Chairman:** Any in-law houses in the neighborhood?

**Applicant Gaughan:** Many houses have made garages into living spaces and bump outs.

**Ruggerio:** What abuts east side?

**Gaughan:** Neighbor,

**Ruggerio:** so only going a foot more out from existing structure barrier?

**Gaughan:** Yes only going a foot out from the current structure

**Chairman** Any other questions?

**Chairman:** asks to explain further on family living in home, and number of cars that may be moving in and out.

**Gaughan:** Currently can only fit 2 cars in driveway, others park on street, parents will get rid of car before they move in so that won't be an issue when the structure is done. Will build a bigger driveway with the turnaround and will be able to fit six cars in the driveway if needed. Currently the kids drive up onto the lawn, which will turn into the driveway, there will be less cars than the amount of cars that are currently on the street.

**Chairman:** Read into the record TRC report. Members of the technical review committee reviewed the submitted plans and application seeking side and rear relief for the construction of an accessory family dwelling unit at 6 Park Boulevard in Lincoln. The proposed addition will be located, where the existing garage is. The Planning Board recommends approval of these dimensional variances. The proposed location of the accessory family dwelling unit will not disturb the existing functionality of the residents. Planning Board feels that the application presents the least relief needed. The Planning Board fields that granting additional variances will not impair the intent or purpose of the Zoning Ordinance nor the Comprehensive Plan.

**Moderator Potvin:** There is one person in the attendee list, if they would like to speak please raise your hand. It does not appear they want to speak.

**Chairman:** let the record indicate that there are no members of the public who wish to speak regarding this application.

**Farhoumand ready to prepare a motion.**

Applicant is asking for 18 foot of relief on the east side of the house. Right now there is a shed 10.53 feet away from the property line and the new portion of the building constructed will be about 9.5 feet, applicant is looking for 18 feet up relief on the east side. On the North side, the back side of the proposed addition they are asking for a 1.9 foot relief. On the front corner of the existing house is 19.98 feet away from the property line, on the Colonial Drive side asking for a 5.02 feet of relief and in front of the house, on the Park Boulevard side that asking for the 2.61 feet relief. Based on the list that we have, as far as what the needs to be met number one is the hardship from which the applicant seeks relief must be due to the unique

characteristics of the subject land or structure and not due to the general characteristics of the surrounding area and it's not due to an economic hardship of the applicant. The second requirement is the hardship, is not the result of any prior action of the applicant and does not result primarily from the desire of the applicant to realize greater financial gain. Number three is the granting of this variance must not alter the general character of the surrounding area or impair the intent or purpose of the Lincoln Zoning Ordinance or Lincoln Comprehensive Plan. Number four is the relief requested is the least really necessary and the hardship amounts to more than a mere inconvenience. I believe that that this application meets all of those five criteria, and I make a motion to it approve it

**Chairman:** seconded motion, adds to standard one. Based on testimony and plans provided and what is allowed to be built this is the only logical place to build the addition. The hardship is that the applicant have elderly parents, who need care. Similar houses throughout neighborhood and will fit in surrounding area. This is a measure of reasonableness; the size of dwelling is reasonable for two adults to live comfortably in.

**Farhoumand:** plans do not show driveway to be constructed.

**Chairman:** Condition attached to variance indicating driveway will be reworked to accommodate more than 2 vehicles.

**Lyle-** aye

**Kearns-**aye

**Ruggerio-** aye

**Farhoumand** aye

**Addition has been granted with conditions.**

**Omar Paulino, 194 Althea Street Providence, RI – Application for Dimensional Variance for lot area relief for two-family residential home located at 109-111 Lonsdale Main Street, Lincoln, RI.**

**AP 5, Lot 10**

**Zoned: RG-7**

This application represents a request for a Dimensional Variance for lot area for a two family residential use. The applicant has a unique situation. The property was once a four family residential. A former owner reduced the four family to a single family through building permits. However, the property was set up and used as a side-by-side two family residential after that permit. The current owner wishes to legalize the second unit. This property is in the RG-7 zoning district, which allows for two family residential as long as the property has 8,500 square feet of land area. This property has 5,227 square feet of land area which 8,500 are required for a two family residential. Therefore, the applicant would need **3,273 square feet** of lot coverage relief for a two family use. The plan shows that the property can handle the required 4 off street parking spaces, two per unit.

**Sitting on the application Chairman DeAngelis, Vice Chairperson Lyle, member Kearns, member Ruggerio and member Farhoumand**

**Chairman** Applicant introduced and testimonials.

Read into record standards for dimensional variance: lot coverage relief.

**5 standards read into record by Chairman DeAngelis**

1. Is there a hardship due to unique characteristics of land that is not any physical or economic disability.
2. Is that there's a hardship that results and it's not from any prior action of yourself, and it does not result from the desire to realize any greater financial gain.
3. Granting of the variance will not alter the character of the neighborhood and conforms with zoning ordinance.
4. What is asked of the Board is reasonable and least relief necessary.
5. For a dimensional variance is, is there a hardship that's more than an inconvenience, which results in you needing this variance

The property was purchased in 2009, as a foreclosed bank owned side by side duplex, two tenants existing in the property as two separate units. Applicant has been taxed as a two family since purchased in 2009. Applicant applied for building permit and was informed there was a change prior to his 2009 purchase in 2001. The house had been turned from 4 family to single family and was not informed of change. Continued to operate as two family since purchase. Did not take any actions to convert property to a two family it has been this way since purchase and did not take any actions to change to 3 family or 4 family, which it was originally zoned for. The entire street is side- by- side duplexes. Requesting to utilize the property, as it presently existed when it was purchased in 2009. Not requesting to expand relief or use. Is looking to legalize as 2 family not making change of structure, and not looking to gain financial gain. Property could not realistically be converted into a single family residence it is built as a side by side duplex structure, would be only single family on street.

**Chairman** paused for clarification and questions from board members.

**Kearns:** questioned regarding converting to a one family at one point.

**Levesque:** an application was made to change it from a four unit to a one unit in 2001 by one of the prior owners, that application wasn't on record (it was never recorded in a deed or a mortgage) when Paulino purchased the property its current use had been a two family.

**Kearns** questioned if it has ever been used as a single family in its existence?

**Applicant answered:** when purchased it was a side-by-side duplex with two kitchens, and four bathrooms

**Kearns:** questioned why there was never anything recorded in historic archives to understand what happened there

**Zoning Official Hervieux:** Permit to convert 4 to a single, no inspections were done, no record was kept. This is an old mill house.

Process which someone would reduce occupancy of structure would only require building permit.

**Applicant:** There are four meters, one active meter and two electric panels on house. It is being treated a two unit, with two separate families. There are two gas meters, two electric panels. Was looking to separate electric bills. Being taxed as a two family, according to the vision quest it's taxed as a two family. Applicant is no longer living there.

**Question on homestead** exemption based on what the home is being recognized as by the town.

**Lyle:** town is recognizing as a duplex

**Solicitor DeSisto:** this isn't something that is so called self-created hardship. This is something where the property owned came to the building as it was.

In 2009 the house was being sold as a side-by-side duplex. It was marketed as a duplex and the bank was selling it as so.

Questions:

**Farhoumand:** Are you planning on selling in near future?

Applicant answered in two years, looking to prepare for selling if need be.

**Farhoumand:** Where are the two parking spaces?

Lonsdale Main driveway is paved, Front Street driveway is not paved. There is an opening from Front Street.

Home was bought under the intention that it was a side-by-side duplex. If to were sold it would be sold in the same conditions as it was bought.

**Chairman:** Read into record from the TRC report. TRC reviewed the submitted plans and application seeking lot area relief for a two family residential home located at 109 -111 Lonsdale Main Street Lincoln. (The town is recognizing the house as 109-111 Lonsdale Main). The applicant is not proposing any new construction according to the applicant a previous owner through permits converted the House from a four family to a single family residence, the House remain physically set up as a two family home. His application is to reestablish the

House as a two family home. The Planning Board recommends approval of this dimensional variances the Planning Board feels that the application presents the least relief needed and it's consistent with the surrounding neighborhood. The Planning Board feels that granting the dimensional variance will not impair the intent or purpose of the zoning ordinance nor the comprehensive plan.

**Chairman** asks Moderator is there is anyone that would like to speak

**Denise:** There is no one in the audience

**Chairman:** Let the record show there is no one from the audience who wishes to speak in regards to this application.

**Farhoumand:** Proceeds with motion. Applicant is not going to change the physical aspect of home, but to have town recognize home as two family not single. Asking for relief of 3192 square feet, need to have 8500 but only have 5,227 at the moment. The hardship must be due to unique characteristics and not due to general surroundings. Applicant bought property in 2009 believing it was a two family. It is not to gain greater financial gain the home was bought in 2009 as a two unit. The two is recognizing the home as a two family. Granting of this variance must not alter the general character of the surrounding area or impair the intent the intent or purpose of the link and zoning ordinance for the Lincoln Comprehensive Plan. From testimonies, most properties in the area are multi families and duplexes. The relief requested is not only the least but the only relief. The hardship amounts to more than more inconvenience and it is uneconomical and impractical to change the construct of the home to a single family.

**Motion to approve with one condition,** to inform tax assessors that he is no longer living there to understand the homestead tax relief. To correct future tax bill.

**Second motion by member Kearns**

**Ruggerio-** aye

**Lyle-**aye

**Kearns-**aye

**Farhoumand-**aye

**Chairman DeAngelis-** aye

**Property could now be formally recognized as a two unit .**

**Motion to adjourn made by Vice Chairperson Lyle and seconded by member Kearns. All present voted in favor.**