



TOWN OF  
**STONEHAM**  
MASSACHUSETTS  
Town Hall  
35 Central Street  
Stoneham, Massachusetts 02180  
**BOARD OF APPEALS**  
781-279-2695

**Stoneham Board of Appeals Minutes**  
**Thursday, January 27, 2022**  
**Town Hall Hearing Room**  
**6:00 PM**

Members of the Board present at the meeting: R. Michael Dufour, Vice Chairman Robert Saltzman, Chairman Tobin Shulman, Eric Rubin (entered meeting at 6:09PM), Kevin McLaughlin and Associate Members Lucas Brown and Mark Russell.

Also present: Kelen Araujo of Wood Partners, Rob Hanon, RWH Architects, Attorney Charles Houghton, Developer Shane Manfred, Attorney Steven Cicatelli, many abutters of 109 Elm Street-Patricia Kelly, Margaret Donovan, Terrence Dolan, James and John Sabbagh and James McKinnon.

The meeting was brought to order by Chairman Tobin Shulman at 6:05 PM. Mr. Shulman began the meeting by introducing the board members and associate members present and setting out the procedure to be followed and instructions for the public hearings.

First order of business is approval of minutes. Mr. Saltzman made a motion to accept the minutes dated December 16, 2021 which was seconded by Mr. McLaughlin. Roll call vote taken with Mr. Brown, Mr. McLaughlin, Mr. Saltzman and the Chair all voting in favor.

**Public Hearings:**

**5 Woodland Road (this public hearing is continued from the December 16, 2021 meeting)**

The legal notice was read into the record:

“You are hereby notified that the Stoneham Board of Appeals will hold a Public Hearing Thursday, December 16, 2021 at 6:00 P.M. in the Hearing Room of the Town Hall to hear all persons interested in the application made by Wood Partners, 91 Hartwell Road, Lexington, MA for a variance from the Stoneham Town Code Chapter 15, Zoning Bylaw, Section 6.7.5 *Prohibited Signs* at 5 Woodland Road, Stoneham, MA and/or for an appeal of the Building Commissioner’s order to remove the installed monument sign. A copy of the application and plan may be seen mornings except Fridays in the Board of Appeals Office and daily except Friday afternoon in the Office of the Town Clerk.”

The Chairman invites Kelen Araujo from Wood Partners to speak to the application on behalf of Alta Langwood LLC and the apartment building Alta Clara. Ms. Araujo explains that they are

seeking a variance for the off-premise sign. The new sign would be slightly smaller. She explains that they need visibility from Woodland Road to help prospective residents with locating the property as the apartments are set back from the road. The sign would also be made available to all full members of the Fellsway Association under the recorded easement agreement with the owner. Mr. Rubin enters the meeting at 6:09PM a few minutes after the public hearing has been opened. Mr. McLaughlin asks about the sign there right now and if they were taking it down. Ms. Araujo answers that they are coming back because of the Building Commissioner's order to remove the sign. Mr. Shulman works through the sequence of events - they applied for a building permit, they received the permit to build the sign and the sign was built. Then it was determined that the sign did not meet the zoning bylaw. Ms. Araujo agrees with all of this that the permit was issued in error. Mr. Shulman questions if the sign meets the requirements of the original permit. Ms. Araujo said that it met the sign requirements. It is stated that the sign in question is off-premise. Mr. Saltzman provides clarification of off-premise. Ms. Araujo mentions the easement agreement with the owner of the property. Mr. Brown asks if it was recorded and she responds in the affirmative. Mr. Saltzman questions whether the sign being off-premise was the only reason the Building Commissioner for removal of the sign. Ms. Araujo responds that off-premise was the only reason. Mr. Saltzman then inquires as to whether they made it known to the Building Commissioner that there was an easement. She states that they did not provide it in the original application but did so subsequent to that. Mr. Saltzman asks her to clarify that the sign otherwise conforms and Mr. Shulman asks if the only relief they are seeking is for the off-premise. Ms. Araujo states that is the case.

No members of the public were present to speak on the matter. Mr. Dufour made a motion to close the public hearing which was seconded by Mr. McLaughlin. A roll call vote was taken. All members present voted in favor (5-0). Mr. Brown voted in place of Mr. Rubin on this matter.

Mr. Saltzman states that it appears that it is a conforming sign in all respects. We are just permitting it to be there, allowing it by virtue of the easement with no precedent setting value of what's happening. He states that they should grant the relief. Efforts were made to give the petitioner an interest in that spot where the sign is. Mr. Saltzman makes a motion to grant the relief as submitted. Mr. Dufour asks that the sign conforms to our bylaws in all other ways? Mr. McLaughlin asks if the sign is lit and Ms. Araujo states that it is. Mr. McLaughlin seconded the motion made by Mr. Saltzman. A roll call vote was taken. All members present voted in favor (5-0). Mr. Brown voted in place of Mr. Rubin who had entered the meeting after the public hearing was opened.

## **9C Lincoln Street**

The legal notice was read into the record:

“You are hereby notified that the Stoneham Board of Appeals will hold a Public Hearing THURSDAY EVENING, January 27, 2022 at 6:00 p.m. in the Hearing Room, Town Hall to hear all persons interested in the application by Briarwood Capital, LLC, 15 Briarwood Lane, Burlington, MA to construct a 7' x 20' rear deck and a 4' x 11' front porch. The petitioner is requesting a variance at 9C Lincoln Street, Stoneham, Massachusetts of the Stoneham Town Code, Chapter 15, Section 5.2.1 Dimensional Requirements - The required front setback in residence B district is 15 feet. The proposed front porch is 3.7 feet from the front property line.

The required side setback in Residence B is 10 feet. The proposed side setback for the front porch and rear deck are 8.4 feet and 8.7 feet respectively. A plan filed with the petition by H-Star Engineering entitled "Plot Plan 9C Lincoln St. Stoneham, MA" dated December 2, 2021 and revised December 18, 2021 shows the proposed site. Plan may be seen mornings except Fridays in the Board of Appeals office and daily except Friday afternoon in the Town Clerk's office."

The Chairman invites the petitioner to speak on the matter and Rob Hanon of RWH Architect speaks for the applicant. He explains that they are seeking a variance for a two unit property under development. The structure is an existing nonconforming structure. The existing is 12.4 from the front lot line. The stairs are existing nonconforming and need to be brought to code. They needed to find a way to lengthen the stair and doing so pushed the stairs toward the front. The architect shows the property post changes with floor plan sheets as well as the existing structure and a site plan. The side is also too close but they are not making that any worse. Mr. Rubin mentions that the front porch gets completely enclosed and the two doors come out to the street. Mr. Hanon explains that the pictures are deceiving, they are really trying to make the front porch part of the volume of the house. Mr. McLaughlin also questions to get out there would be a need for a landing. So Mr. Hanon states that they'd like a four foot landing for the stairs. Mr. Shulman questions that the 3.7 feet would be to the last riser of the last stair coming off of the new landing? Mr. Hanon responds yes. Mr. McLaughlin asks about a third floor. Mr. Hanon states it will be a basement and first floor for one unit and the second floor and what was attic will be part of second unit. Mr. McLaughlin asks how many bedrooms and whether it would be condos. Mr. Hanon responds that it will be three bedrooms each and will be condos. It was previously a two unit rental.

No members of the public were present to speak on the matter. Mr. Dufour made a motion to close the public hearing which was seconded by Mr. McLaughlin. A roll call vote was taken. All members present voted in favor (5-0).

Mr. McLaughlin asks how people from the third floor get out of the apartment. There is a rear set of stairs. Tobin states that they will meet building code.

Mr. Dufour states he will make a motion that it is already nonconforming. This will not make it more nonconforming. They have to deal with the issue of the stairwell inside to come up to code. It's not a derogation of the intent of the bylaw and we should accept it. Mr. Shulman adds comment about the shape of the lot. Mr. McLaughlin seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. All members present voted in favor (5-0).

Mr. Shulman states that 109 Elm Street is next but begins reading the legal notice for 12 Coolidge Street as the Clerk forgot to renumber the legal notices after changing the order of the public hearings on the agenda.

### **109 Elm Street**

*Represented by Charles Houghton*

The legal notice was read into the record:

“You are hereby notified that the Stoneham Board of Appeals will hold a Public Hearing THURSDAY EVENING, January 27, 2022 at 6:00 p.m. in the Hearing Room, Town Hall to hear all persons interested in the application by ADMANFRED LLC OF 12 Wickham Road, Winchester, Massachusetts for the conversion of the existing dwelling at 109 Elm Street, Stoneham, Massachusetts to accommodate an additional dwelling unit. Section 4.2.3.1 requires a variance and Section 4.2.3.1 (b) requires a variance of lot size for a two-family dwelling in Residence A. The required lot size is 20,000 square feet and the proposed lot size is 16,142 square feet. The proposed two-unit dwelling is also in violation of Section 4.2.3.1 (e) (3) which requires that the addition must be in the rear or side yard and not be visible from the street and not be more than ten (10) percent of the original floor area. The proposed two-story addition is visible from the street and is in excess of ten (10) percent of the original floor area. Additionally, the required side setback in Residence A is 10 feet and the proposed setback is 3.4 feet and the required front setback in Residence A is 20 feet and the proposed front setback is 18.2 feet. A plan filed with the petition by Benchmark Survey dated December 29, 2021 entitled “Plan of Land Showing Proposed Addition 109 Elm Street, Stoneham, MA” shows the proposed two-family. Plan may be seen mornings except Fridays in the Board of Appeals office and daily except Friday afternoon in the Town Clerk's Office.”

The Chairman invites Attorney Houghton to speak to the application. Mr. Houghton passes photos to the Board showing the property. He begins by giving some background of his client purchasing the property in foreclosure last year. They have been working on plans to make it work as a two unit condominium. This is the fourth version of the plan. The units are side by side. They would renovate the existing unit and adding an additional unit beside it. They ran into a few issues when they started to design it. The first issue is an easement that runs through the property for water and sewer for the house at 10 Penny Lane. It's a very old easement with no dimensions shown. We are proposing to change what is there by dimensioning it. They will do 15 feet. They had John's Sewer come in and take the line out of the house at 10 Penny Lane and followed it out. We know where the pipe is so we don't put any buildings over the pipe. The plan shows parking on the left hand side. This proposal requires five parking spaces. Two for original and three for additional unit. We added a sixth parking space. The lot is 17,415 square feet. We are proposing to remove a rear section of existing building and removing the existing garages along with some pavement in the back. The neighbor in the rear has a very small lot of about 4400 square feet. They are proposing to give the neighbor 1273 square feet. The idea is to renovate the existing structure that is in deplorable state. It needs a lot of work to bring it up to livable conditions. The hardship is the structure itself which needs a tremendous amount of work. The proposed addition would be on the easterly side to not interfere with water and sewer line. This will be nice and add value to the neighborhood. As far as detriment to public good this will be an improvement to the neighborhood, what is there now is a detriment. As to derogation of the intent of the bylaw, it's not far off. We could be closer if we didn't give 1273 square feet to the neighbor.

Mr. Dufour asks about access to the parking spaces. Will it be from Elm Street? Will there be landscaping or screening? Mr. Houghton says that there will be a six foot stockade fence where the neighbor is. Nothing near Penny Lane. Mr. Saltzman asks if any of present structure will be saved. Mr. Houghton states that it is not a tear down but a lot of work. It's a complete gut job. Mr. Shulman states that you'll keep frame and foundation. Mr. Houghton will have a

professional engineer check the plan for runoff. DPW will require that. There should be less pavement.

Mr. Shulman will open it to the public. He continues to read two letters into the record. The first from Laurie Freitas, 49 Penny Lane as follows:

*“This letter is in regard to the Public Hearing taking place on Thursday, January 27, 2022, which I am unable to attend. I am a resident of Penny Lane and I’m writing in response to the appeal that has been filed for construction at 109 Elm Street. I have concerns with the proposed project plan as it would require several overrides to meet the current zoning regulations of this lot. To begin with, the lot is not large enough to accommodate the additional unit as proposed and this poses both safety and aesthetic issues for the residents of Penny Lane.*

*One concern is the proposed six car garage which does not adhere to the required front setback from Elm Street. There may be a line-of-sight issue for cars pulling out of Penny Lane onto Elm Street. Additionally, I worry about the overall aesthetics of an apartment-like garage at the end of Penny Lane and feel this type of structure does not keep with the character of our open and residential street of single-family homes.*

*The town has determined the proper setbacks and lot sizes for specific dwellings, none of which are met in this proposed plan. In addition to safety, the town’s established bylaws were devised to contribute to the maintenance of “open space” that the residents of Stoneham expected to enjoy when they purchased their homes. I ask that you please consider these points and do not approve the plan at 109 Elm Street as it is laid out. Thank you for your time and consideration.”*

Mr. Shulman read a second email that was received from Priscilla Gottwald, 106 Elm Street. It read as follows:

*“Unfortunately, I am unable to attend tonight’s meeting as I am helping out my daughter who has just delivered twin daughters in California.*

*We, Fredrick and Priscilla Gottwald, 106 Elm Street, have been direct abutters of the property at 109 Elm Street for almost 42 years. The new owners have requested to convert this one-family dwelling into a two-family dwelling.*

*We are not in favor of this request for several reasons:*

- 1. Residential A is designated for one-family dwellings.*
- 2. The lot is not big enough to accommodate a two-family.*
  - a. I am concerned after looking at Benchmark Survey’s Plan of Land that this lot’s square footage, which is not nearly the required 20,000 square feet, may be further reduced by the owner either selling or giving part of this existing 16,142 square feet to the direct abutter, Patricia M. Kelly, at 10 Penny Lane.*
- 3. The addition will be quite visible and intrusive on this corner lot, both on Elm Street and Penny Lane. By-laws request that an addition be “hidden” in the rear or side of the existing building. Also, the addition is more than 10% of the current dwelling, against the by-laws.*

4. *The plan does not meet the setbacks, which further adds to the lack of space for a two-family on this lot.*

*Further, I am confident the Board is aware of the construction projects that have been ongoing on Elm Street for almost a year now. Elm Street residents and the residents on the residential roads adjacent to it have been subjected to many inconveniences, re-routing of traffic, detours, early morning construction sounds. I'm sure I speak for most of us affected that we are hoping for a new road, new sidewalks and curbing and improvements to this well-traveled road.*

*I do not think squishing an addition to accommodate an LLC's profit when that LLC will most likely sell and care less about an eyesore they will leave behind is not in any of our best interest. And it does not add to our desire for a beautification project on Elm Street. The current dwelling could be renovated and sold as a one family for a profit and leave the greenery of this lot alone.*

*You may think these objections odd coming from the owners of a two-family at 106 Elm Street. You will recall that I had applied for one variance requesting my current lot of 25,000 square feet be sub-divided into two lots, one at 12,000 square feet, the other at 13,000. We lacked the required 100 foot road frontage for two new one-family dwellings, which would have complied with Residential A construction requirements. We had 75 and 73 foot frontages, we thought plenty since all the other homes on the even side of Elm are only 50 and 55 feet. But, we were only approved 3-2. We were later approved to replace our current two-family to a new two-family, it was grandfathered. But, it was cost prohibitive and we wined up making renovations to the existing dwelling. Not what we wanted, but Plan B.*

*So I ask that you be consistent in not approving the ADMANFRED LLC proposal, have them go back to the drawing board, Plan B, and work with the current dwelling, making it a one-family we can all be proud to welcome to the neighborhood. We wish we could have added two!!"*

The Chairman asks Mr. Houghton if he cares to respond. Mr. Houghton explains that it was designed to leave the current house which is way over on the easterly side. There's a whole lot of room on the other side. This doesn't lack frontage. There is a building right now in total disrepair. It will be an improvement to the neighborhood. None of the work on Elm Street has anything to do with this project. Mr. Saltzman mentions the first letter referenced a six car garage. He asks if there will be a six car garage. Mr. Houghton answers no. There will be six spaces for parking. There will be no garage.

Attorney Steven Cicatelli appears representing Patricia Kelly the direct abutter at 10 Penny Lane. He would like to express their opposition to the granting of the variances. What is being proposed is a second structure being described as an addition. Residence A allows for an addition to a structure under certain parameters which have not been met. Does a hardship exist under Chapter 40A Section 10? Have the requirements been met. He would submit that they have not. Mr. Houghton's client is a developer who bought a property at foreclosure. He knew that he was buying a property in very poor condition. He knew he was purchasing a tenanted foreclosure and would have an issue with an eviction. The hardship was self-created, self-induced. It is not a basis for a section 10 hardship. There is nothing with the shape, soil or topography. It does derogate from the intent and purpose of the bylaw. It is a doubling in size. It's over by 90%. It's a second building not an addition. A parking lot is being created that is

presently grass. You are creating something more suited to residence B. The easement from 1938 that we have would place the line right under the proposed buildings. The easement is to gain access to the pipes. What is the width of the easement? Mr. Cicatelli spoke to Brett Gonsalves and asked what the proper spacing should be between the water and sewer lines. He stated 10 feet. Mr. Cicatelli states that the structure cannot be built without a release of the easement.

Mr. Shane Manfred the current owner and developer of the property responds. As far as hardship you take a risk buying a property not knowing. It took months to evict Mrs. Pacy. The property was a mess. Ms. Kelly helped us during the eviction. At the time Ms. Kelly was in favor of what was being done. It was getting challenging to come up with a design. He had texted Ms. Kelly to ask her if he should give up. She responded to his text that he should continue and not give up. He has changed the design three times so far and there is no satisfying her. She is getting \$50,000 worth of land for free. Mr. Saltzman asks about the petition referencing a lot size of 16,142 square feet and what Attorney Cicatelli referenced is 17,810. So Ms. Kelly would receive the difference in square footage? What is the status right now? We said we would give her 1200 square feet. She wanted a guarantee that there would be no structure and that cannot be done. Mr. Saltzman asks if the property has been conveyed. The answer is no so they have 17,810 square feet right now that can be considered.

Margaret Donovan an abutter at 20 Penny Lane is next to speak. She states that she has lived with this mess for a long time and Shane has bought it and started cleaning up. She is so excited to see the project clean the property up and make it habitable.

Pat Kelly, 10 Penny Lane states that the land has come up four times prior and has been shut down four times prior. Shane offered the space in the back but I was going to pay for it. We did not agree in the end so he changed the plans. She has no information at all. She hired Steven Cicatelli because she is a single woman by herself. She offered to let John's Drains onto her property but was not told that they needed to go into her house. He changed the water and sewer coming from Penny Lane. He had John's Sewer come in to find out where the lines were. She was previously told the pipes were in a different location. She is very concerned. He has not worked with the neighbors. He has done everything in his power to intimidate. Mr. Shulman asks if the easement that exists is to her benefit. She answers that it is. She then explains that his property was built as the family house and her small home at 10 Penny Lane was built later by the children for the parents to move into. The grass area used to be a tennis court. Mr. Manfred responds to Ms. Kelly and discusses the conversations surrounding them trying to come to an agreement on the square footage she would be given. He explains the different easements and trying to move the sewer lines to a different area. Mr. Shulman tries to get back on track. Mr. Cicatelli comments again that his client and Mr. Manfred could not come to an agreement and that is client Ms. Kelly does not support the project. Terrence Dolan of 55 Penny Lane speaks to the variances that are being sought. He gives history of the house and says he was concerned about run-off and the elevation. He shouldn't make a two family in Residence A. He thinks that it should be continued. Mr. Saltzman proposes that they continue to the next hearing date in February to allow for the Board to visit the site. Mr. Dolan appreciates that and wants to make sure people are notified. Mr. Saltzman reminds him that their meetings are posted. Mr. Dolan said that he wanted to applaud Mrs. Gottwald and Ms. Freitas for submitting their letters. Mr. Dolan thinks that the developer has the skills to bring the house back to its former glory.

Attorney Houghton said that it's fine if the Board wants to continue but he has spent a lot of time on this. The existing house is over the lot line but they are removing a piece to make it 3.4. They reduced the square footage to be helpful. They are willing to try to work but it doesn't work as a single.

Mr. Shulman thinks that being on the land would be worth it. He believes a continuation and a site visit would be valuable to the Board if they are amenable. The Board discusses dates. March 3, 2022 at 6PM for the regular meeting and February 17, 2022 at 4:30PM for a site visit.

James Sabbagh, 111 Elm Street speaks to an agreement he had with the former owner Mr. Pacy to allow a fence that had been placed on their property. He has asked Mr. Manfred to remove the fence and it has not been removed. He also mentions that he cut down some trees that belonged to them. Mr. Houghton explains that the trees were on Mr. Manfred's side of the fence and he believed them to be on his property. Mr. Manfred explains that they had broken limbs that were hanging over Mrs. Donovan's shed. He didn't understand about the agreement he had about the fence. He understands that now that it is clean without the junk that it would look better without the fence. John Sabbagh, 111 Elm Street states that there was no confusion. He knew that he was cutting down their trees. James McKinnon, 110 Elm Street agrees with everyone against the project. He doesn't want a two family in a single family zone.

Mr. Saltzman made a motion to continue the public hearing to March 3, 2022 at 6PM with a site visit on February 17, 2022 at 4:30PM which was seconded by Mr. Rubin. A roll call vote was taken. All members present voted in favor (5-0).

## **12 Coolidge Street**

*Represented by Charles Houghton*

The legal notice was read into the record:

“You are hereby notified that the Stoneham Board of Appeals will hold a Public Hearing THURSDAY EVENING, January 27, 2022 at 6:00 p.m. in the Hearing Room, Town Hall to hear all persons interested in the application by William J. Raczkowski, Jr. and Marisa Raczkowski of 12 Coolidge Street, Stoneham, Massachusetts for the conversion of the existing dwelling at 12 Coolidge Street, Stoneham, Massachusetts to accommodate an additional dwelling unit which requires a variance of Section 4.2.3.1 and Section 4.2.3.1 (b) requires a variance of lot size for a two-family dwelling in Residence A. The required lot size is 20,000 square feet and the proposed lot size is 7,372 square feet. The proposed two-unit dwelling is also in violation of Section 4.2.3.1 (e) (3) which requires that the addition must be in the rear or side yard and not be visible from the street and not be more than ten (10) percent of the original floor area. The proposed two-story addition is visible from the street and is more than ten (10) percent of the original floor area. Additionally, Section 5.21 requires a front setback in Residence A of 20 feet. The proposed addition is 19.4 feet from the front property line and the proposed 4' x 6' landing and stair are 9.8' from the front property line. A plan filed with the petition by Benchmark Survey dated 10/25/2021 entitled “Plan of Land Showing Proposed Addition 12 Coolidge Street, Stoneham, MA” shows the proposed duplex. Plan may be seen mornings except Fridays in the Board of Appeals office and daily except Friday afternoon in the Town Clerk's Office.”

Mr. Houghton is invited to speak and points out that the family is present and no neighbors. This property is in both Residence A & Residence B. About 25% of this lot is Residence B. They will be removing a pool and building an addition for the two daughters to live in. They are both teachers who want to continue to live at home but have their own space making the house a duplex. He presents the architectural plans and elevations. There is a two family beside it and behind it. It's a mix of ones and twos in an older neighborhood. The bylaw with the 10%, there is no project that can be 10%. To put the addition in the rear makes no sense. You want to make it fit and look like it belongs in the neighborhood. Nobody is here, there is no detriment. It does not derogate from the intent and purpose. If there was a little more square footage in the B it would be okay but it's mostly in A. The hardship is to the structure. The lot is what it is. To make the lot coverage comply, we took away the pool. Steve DeFina representing Phoenix Architects runs through the elevations and plans for the project. He explains a shared mudroom and both units. Mr. Shulman inquires about the door into the shared mudroom and the unit doors on either side. Mr. DeFina explains that they wanted to keep a certain aesthetic in the front with one front door.

There were no questions from the Board and no members of the public were present for comment. Mr. Saltzman made a motion to close the public hearing which was seconded by Mr. McLaughlin. A roll call vote was taken. All members present voted in favor (5-0).

Before deliberation, Mr. Shulman commented that he personally appreciated the full package presented by the architect and commended the architect in making the effort to have it look like a single family home and keeping one front door. Mr. Rubin mentions that the mudroom is just amazing. He agrees with Mr. Shulmans comments about the presentation and in keeping the look of a single family home.

Mr. Rubin made a motion to grant the variance based upon the hardship of the lot, that it doesn't derogate from the intent of the bylaw and it will serve the public good and be a great addition for the neighbors. Mr. Saltzman seconded. A roll call vote was taken. All members present voted in favor (5-0).

Mr. Dufour made a motion to adjourn which was seconded by Mr. Rubin. A roll call vote was taken. All members present voted in favor (5-0).

Meeting adjourned at 7:43PM.

Documents and other exhibits used by the Board of Appeals during this meeting to be made part of the official record but not attached to these minutes:

A plan by Allen & Major Associates, Inc. for 3-5 Woodland Road  
A plan by H-Star Engineering entitled "Plot Plan 9C Lincoln St. Stoneham, MA" dated December 2, 2021 and revised December 18, 2021

A plan by Benchmark Survey dated December 29, 2021 entitled "Plan of Land Showing Proposed Addition 109 Elm Street, Stoneham, MA" shows the proposed two-family.

Letters from Priscilla Gottwald, 106 Elm Street and Laurie Freitas, 49 Penny Lane in opposition.

Rendering and floor plans by Michienzi Drafting & Design Titled Elm Street Stoneham Preliminary 04

A plan by Benchmark Survey dated 10/25/2021 entitled “Plan of Land Showing Proposed Addition 12 Coolidge Street, Stoneham, MA” shows the proposed duplex.

Elevations and floor plans provided by Phoenix Architects for 12 Coolidge Street