



T O W N O F
S T O N E H A M
M A S S A C H U S E T T S
Town Hall
35 Central Street
Stoneham, Massachusetts 02180
BOARD OF APPEALS
781-279-2695

Stoneham Board of Appeals Minutes
Thursday, March 23, 2023
Town Hall Hearing Room
6:00 PM

Members of the Board present: R. Michael Dufour, Vice Chairman Robert Saltzman, Chairman Tobin Shulman, Eric Rubin, Kevin McLaughlin and Associate Member William Sullivan.

Also present: Town Clerk Maria Sagarino acting as Clerk to the Board of Appeals, Attorney Charles Houghton, Town Counsel Attorney Robert Galvin, Town Administrator Dennis Sheehan, Ellen McBride 30 Butler Ave and Peter Mahoney from Weiss Farm Apartments LLC

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 PM. Chairman Tobin Shulman opened the meeting by making introductions and explaining the procedure for the public hearings.

The Board discussed upcoming meeting dates. The next three meetings would be held on April 27, 2023, May 18, 2023 and June 22, 2023.

The Chair moved on to approval of minutes.

Mr. Saltzman made a motion to approve the minutes from February 16, 2023 which was seconded by Mr. McLaughlin. A roll call vote was taken. Mr. Sullivan, Mr. McLaughlin, Mr. Saltzman and Mr. Shulman voted in favor having been present at the meeting.

Attorney Houghton appeared before the Board to ask that a six month extension be granted on the decision for 3 Hillside Road. Mr. McLaughlin made a motion to approve the extension which was seconded by Mr. Rubin. All members present voted in favor 5-0.

Seeing all of the residents in the room, the Board took 26 Broadway out of turn. Attorney Houghton asked that the matter be continued as his land surveyor was away and he needed to have him present at the meeting. Mr. Houghton believes that it makes more sense to continue the hearing as opposed to starting and then stopping. He'd like to see it continued to April 27, 2023 at 6PM. Caroline Ferrari of 18 Broadway stated that she did not want a continuation as she flew in from Florida just for the meeting. Another resident stated that she had left work early to attend.

Mr. Dufour made a motion to continue 26 Broadway until April 27, 2023 at 6PM. Mr. Saltzman seconded. All members voted in favor 5-0.

Mr. Shulman read the legal notice for the first public hearing on 263 Main Street into the record as follows:

“You are hereby notified that the Stoneham Board of Appeals will hold a Public Hearing on Thursday, March 23, 2023 at 6:00 p.m. in the Hearing Room, Town Hall, 35 Central Street, Stoneham to hear all persons interested in the application by Millie Tran of Allure Lash & Beauty, 263 Main Street, Stoneham, Massachusetts to appeal the decision of the Building Commissioner denying the request to add micro blading at 263 Main Street, Stoneham, Massachusetts. In the denial letter, the Building Commissioner cites Stoneham Town Code, Chapter 15 Section 4.6 - Central Business District - Body Art is NOT an allowed use in the Central Business District. Body Art, as defined in Chapter 15, Section 2.1.7, is only allowed in the Commercial III District. The applicant contends that micro blading is not considered Body Art. The applicant requests that the Board of Appeals determine that the use of micro blading is an allowed use at the above mentioned location. A copy of the application may be seen daily except Friday afternoon in the Office of the Town Clerk.”

Tam Hau appeared to speak on behalf of Millie Tran the owner of Allure Lashes & Beauty. He explained that they are asking to be allowed to perform micro blading services at 263 Main Street. He explained that micro blading is a temporary type of tattoo. It is not permanent. It is cosmetic that is only applied to the eyebrow. The difference is that this goes through 2-3 layers of skin, so it fades in time. A permanent tattoo goes through 10-12 layers of skin and is permanent. Mr. Saltzman asked if that meant that the skin grows back and you are back where you started. Mr. Hau agreed and stated that the skin sheds off. Mr. Saltzman asked how long it lasts. Mr. Hau responded maybe a year to two at most. Mr. Saltzman asked what the shortest amount of time it might last. Mr. Hau stated 4-5 months.

Mr. Shulman opened it up to the public for comment. No one from the public was present to comment. Mr. Sullivan did mention that since this keeps coming up, it should be addressed with the Zoning Bylaw Review Committee and something should change. Mr. Dufour made a motion to close the public hearing which was seconded by Mr. Saltzman. All members present voted in favor 5-0.

Mr. Dufour made a motion to allow micro blading at that location. He stated that it is cosmetic in nature. Many people are using it for medical issues. Mr. Saltzman added that it is temporary and seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. All members voted in favor 5-0.

Mr. Shulman read the legal notice for 128C Main Street into the record:

“You are hereby notified that the Stoneham Board of Appeals will hold a Public Hearing Thursday evening, March 23, 2023 at 6:00 p.m. in the Hearing Room, Town Hall, 35 Central Street, Stoneham, Massachusetts to hear all persons interested in the application by BRC Construction Group LLC, 81R Bailey Road, Somerville, Massachusetts to construct a second floor balcony at 128C Main Street, Stoneham, Massachusetts which requires a variance of Stoneham Town Code Chapter 15, Section 5.2.1 Dimensional Requirements. The front setback required in Residence A is 20 feet. The proposed balcony is setback 12.8 feet off the front property line. A plot plan for 128C Main Street, Stoneham, MA by Thomas P. Bernardi, Professional Land Surveyor dated December 16, 2022 may be seen daily except Friday afternoon in the Office of the Town Clerk.”

The petitioner, Carlos Guerrero appeared before the Board on behalf of BRC Construction LLC. He was seeking a variance to build a balcony on the second story at 128C Main Street. Mr. Guerrero passed around a rendering and explained that they just want to put a balcony on the second floor.

Mr. McLaughlin asked if the second floor was part of a residence. Mr. Guerrero responded that it's all residence. Mr. Shulman asked if the house was staying a single family residence. Mr. Guerrero responded yes.

Mr. Shulman opened it up to the public for comment. No one from the public was present to comment. Mr. Saltzman made a motion to close the public hearing which was seconded by Mr. McLaughlin. All members voted in favor 5-0.

Mr. Saltzman made a motion to approve the petition. He stated that it is a great plan. It does not derogate from the intent of the bylaw and serves the public good. It is transforming the property. Mr. McLaughlin seconded. A roll call vote was taken. All five members voted in favor.

Mr. Shulman read the legal notice for 22 Cherry Avenue into the record as follows:

“You are hereby notified that the Stoneham Board of Appeals will hold a Public Hearing Thursday evening, March 23, 2023 at 6:00 p.m. in the Hearing Room, Town Hall, 35 Central Street, Stoneham, Massachusetts to hear all persons interested in the application by Ryan Angelo and Salina Martin, 22 Cherry Avenue, Stoneham, Massachusetts to finish the inside of the accessory building at 22 Cherry Avenue to be used as a habitable space. This requires a variance of Stoneham Town Code Chapter 15, Section 4.2.2.2. The accessory building is not to be used for resident purposes. The proposed use is for an office and a workshop. A plot plan for 22 Cherry Avenue, Stoneham, MA by Scott M. Cerrato, Professional Land Surveyor dated November 22, 2022 may be seen daily except Friday afternoon in the Office of the Town Clerk.”

Petitioners Ryan Angelo and Salina Martin appeared before the Board to discuss their application. Mr. Angelo explained that since the pandemic began in 2020 his job has been mainly remote. They have recently had a baby and turned the office into her bedroom. They are seeking a variance to allow their 10' x 12' shed to become an office and workshop. He further explains the structure describing how it was built, the floor joists and the insulation, etc. Mr. Shulman asked if it would have heat and Mr. Angelo stated that it would. Mr. Shulman asked if it had plumbing. Mr. Angelo stated that it would not. Mr. Shulman then asked if it had any facility for cooking. Mr. Angelo stated that it did not. Mr. Saltzman asked about sleeping quarters. Mr. Angelo stated there were not. Mr. Rubin inquired about the workshop component. He thought it sounded more like an office. Mr. Angelo agreed but explained he does little electronic projects.

Mr. Shulman opened the hearing up to the public. Carol Fontano, 20 Cherry Avenue spoke in support. As a direct abutter, she has no problem with the shed becoming an office. It won't impact the neighborhood at all.

Bob Wopperer, 19 Broadway commented against development of these accessory structures. Before you know it, it's a full blown apartment. Mr. Shulman explained that there could be conditions that it does not become a separate dwelling unit if it is approved.

Mr. Saltzman made a motion to close the public hearing which was seconded by Mr. McLaughlin. All members voted in favor 5-0.

Mr. Rubin stated that this is like micro blading and is another bylaw that should be looked at as times have changed from when the bylaw was adopted. Mr. Saltzman added that the application is for an office and a workshop. The relief that would be granted would be for an office and a workshop. It speaks for itself but there could be a condition in the decision. He added that 10 x 12 would be taught to live in. It would be like jail. Mr. Sullivan added that jail has a bathroom. Mr. Saltzman made motion to grant the relief for an office and workshop with the condition that there be no plumbing for a bathroom or a kitchen. Mr. Rubin seconded. A roll call vote was taken. All members voted in favor 5-0.

Mr. Shulman read the legal notice for 95 Maple Street into the record:

“You are hereby notified that the Stoneham Board of Appeals will hold a Public Hearing THURSDAY EVENING, March 23, 2023 at 6:00 p.m. in the Hearing Room, Town Hall to hear all persons interested in the application by 95 Maple Street Stoneham Property Owner, LLC with an address of 30 Speen Street, Framingham, MA 01701, to construct a 270 Unit apartment complex with amenities at 95 Maple Street, Stoneham, Massachusetts and to grant a variance of Section 4.23.5 (g) – Density Bonus – of the Town of Stoneham Zoning By-law which allows a maximum density in the Maple Street Residential Overlay District of 1 unit per 1,000 square feet of total land area (235 units), which the planning board may increase by 10%. The proposed number of units is 270 which is a 15% increase over the base unit density allowed. A plan filed with the petition by RJO’Connell & Associates, Inc. entitled “95 Maple Street, Stoneham, MA - Site Plan SP-1” dated February 22, 2023 shows the proposed building. Plan may be seen mornings except Fridays in the Board of Appeals office and daily except Friday afternoon in the Town Clerk’s office.”

Attorney Houghton appeared before the Board to seek a variance for 95 Maple Street for a second time. Time was running out on the original decision by the Board after a six month extension. Nothing has changed from the first application. It's the same exact project.

There were no members of the public present for comment. Mr. Saltzman made a motion to close the public hearing which was seconded by Mr. McLaughlin. All members voted in favor.

Mr. Rubin made a motion to grant the relief for the same reasons as the first approval with the same conditions. Mr. McLaughlin seconded. A roll call vote was taken. All members present voted in favor 5-0.

The Chair moved onto the final agenda item, a discussion and vote on Notice of Project Change by Weiss Farm Apartments, LLC pursuant to 760 CMR 56.05(11). As an abutter, Mr. Rubin recused himself for this portion of the meeting and sat in the audience. Mr. Shulman invited Mr. Sullivan to sit in on the discussion. Town Counsel Robert Galvin was present and Mr. Shulman

invited him to speak on the matter. He began by stating that the Board has a request from Weiss Farm Apartments LLC to modify the existing final comprehensive permit which was the subject of a decision by the Superior Court on August 4, 2022. There was no further appeal of that decision although there were discussions back and forth of whether there would be an appeal. There has been a lot of discussion on how you construct the project in accordance with the final decision by the Superior Court which affirmed the Housing Appeals Committee (HAC) decision. There have been some discussions by and between the Town and the developer of Weiss Farm Apartments LLC regarding changes to the project. Amongst the changes that have been discussed were a reduction in units from 259 to 229 units and they proposed some other modifications which clarify some aspects of the comprehensive permit as modified by the HAC. They have had some discussion with Town officials and negotiated a reduction in some of the fees. The Board is being asked to issue an amended decision. Mr. Galvin went on to say they thought they could go back to Superior Court and in light of the discussions get them to issue an amended decision. After further consideration, including discussions with the Attorney General's Office, counsel for the developer and himself, they determined the appropriate way for the applicant to propose these changes is to bring it back to the ZBA and proceed with what's in front of the Board. The applicant must come before the Board and make the argument that the changes being proposed are not substantial. There are regulations to give some guidance and examples of what is substantial and not substantial.

Mr. Galvin explained that there are some regulatory factors that concern a reduction in units which is not a substantial change. There are some other changes where the developer offered to do work not required under the HAC decision including a left hand turn lane on Franklin Street. They would gain the left hand turn lane by using some of their land to widen Franklin Street.

Mr. Galvin stated there are a number of smaller aspects changed. The most significant is the proposed fees. He believes that they are not a substantial change. The Board has twenty days to act on the request. If you determine these are insubstantial changes, the permit is automatically amended and they have to build it in accordance with the plans and permit changes proposed. If the Board finds the changes are substantial there is a very limited appellate process. The applicant can go back to the Housing Appeals Committee and challenge the Board's finding that it is a substantial change and there's an expedited review. If the Board doesn't agree to this amendment it is likely that the developer will move forward with the original 259 unit project. Mr. Galvin continued to explain that they will have a final order of conditions that must be addressed. This has been extended. There is still an appeal pending with Weiss Farm Inc. They had served a motion for a judgement. If this permit is amended by the ZBA that case would be dismissed as agreed upon.

Mr. Saltzman asked if the Board approved the change as insubstantial is it all over. There are no other actions, no other permits or boards. Mr. Galvin stated that they would still have to come up with final construction plans and outstanding issues with the final order of conditions for the Conservation Commission. Monthly reporting with a monitor. They would be working toward a final set of plans to apply for the building permit.

Mr. Shulman asked if the HAC decision for the 259 units which was affirmed by the Superior Court is the one they are looking to change. Mr. Shulman just wanted to be clear on what they'd be changing from and to. Mr. Shulman continued to say as a technical matter if they were to find this is an insubstantial change that becomes the revise permit. He wondered about the building

code that was about to change. Mr. Galvin stated that they have to comply with all state Mr. Sullivan added that three stories and below are residential above three is commercial which changes in July. It would be the building code at the time that they apply for the building permit.

Mr. Sullivan asks about number 9 in the agreement speaking to peer review consultant. Mr. Sullivan asked if we had someone and who is it. Mr. Galvin responded that the Town would hire someone. They've discussed a couple of names and they would hire someone. Mr. Sullivan asked who would hire that person and who would they be working for. Mr. Galvin stated that they'd be working for the Board of Appeals. Mr. Sullivan moved on to item number thirteen which speaks to the Board of Appeals ensuring that the building permit would be done with due diligence within 45 days. Mr. Sullivan would like to know what authority the Board of Appeals has over the Building Department. Mr. Galvin responded none. Mr. Sullivan stated that they have no jurisdiction for that. Mr. Galvin explained that we have to use reasonable efforts to have the building permit within 45 days. He further explained that it was one of the reasons that \$50,000 was allocated for peer review, so that the Building Commissioner would have additional resources to help. Mr. Sullivan wanted to know if anyone asked the Building Commissioner if 45 days was a good time frame was for her. Mr. Sheehan admitted that they hadn't had that conversation. Mr. Sullivan sees that as pointless. Mr. Galvin added that there is generally an expectation of a 30 day turn around with a building permit application. Mr. Sullivan doesn't disagree but stated that if the Building Commissioner were to find a mistake or something missing that could trigger another 30 days even if that is unlikely to happen. Mr. Galvin said it is very customary with a project to have an outside consultant. He continued to explain when they were talking to the applicant there was an initial discussion about \$25,000 but they realized that wasn't sufficient and that was increased to \$50,000.

Mr. Sullivan also questioned number 19 which speaks to storm water management report. He asked if that was the same report listed in number 18. Mr. Galvin believe it was the same report. It was referenced in the final order of conditions.

Mr. Sullivan stated that number 48 gives them three years after the comprehensive permit is finalized. Why is that? Mr. Galvin responded that it is customary to give them three years. If they weren't complete in three years they would come back with an insubstantial change and ask for more time. Mr. Sullivan adds that it actually says time to commence, so his understanding is that they have three years to start construction. He added that part six says that it becomes final when the building permit is issued. So once the building permit is issued why do they need three years to start? Mr. Sullivan is confused. Mr. Galvin stated that he can't answer that question. This is what was requested by the developer.

Mr. Sullivan moves on to article 5 and asked if the Conservation Commission was on board with dismissing the lawsuit. Mr. Galvin stated that it has been discussed but he's not sure if anything had been agreed to at this point.

Mr. Sullivan moves on to his biggest problem with the agreement, number 42. He would agree with it if a, c and d were struck which would just leave \$400,000 for water mitigation. He'd be okay with that. He'd like them to pay all other fees that would be required of any other developer when building a project. Mr. Sheehan explained that in the agreement there is a cap on some of the fees. That was discussed during negotiations to reduce the number of units. It was understood if those caps were removed then they would probably withdraw the request for

an insubstantial change and move forward with the 259 units as approved. Peter Mahoney from John Corcoran & Company, the developer for Weiss Farm Apartments LLC, does state if there were any appeal that they would move forward with 259 units. Mr. Sullivan stated that \$150,000 for building permit fees that would probably come out to a million dollars. Mr. Sullivan asked if that \$150,000 is a deal breaker. Mr. Mahoney responded that anything that deviates from the insubstantial change request would be a deal breaker causing them to move forward with the 259 units. Mr. Sullivan believes they're not giving us anything here. Mr. Mahoney disagrees. He believes they've given a lot with the reduction of units.

Mr. Dufour stated that the biggest thing on his mind is the reduction in the permit fees to the Town. That's very substantial. Mr. Dufour believes Mr. Sullivan has some accurate numbers since he works in the building department. The Town is losing a lot of money with the reduction in fees. While Mr. Sullivan is looking for some paperwork to add to what Mr. Dufour is saying, Mr. Tobin asked if permit fees were addressed in the HAC decision. Did it include any description of the building permit fees? Mr. Galvin responded no. Fees were not specified. Mr. Shulman clarifies that that means they could apply for the 259 units and pay whatever the building permit fees for that would be and Mr. Galvin agrees. Mr. Saltzman added that number 42 specifies what they would give the Town and it would be \$800,000. Mr. Galvin added without this agreement there wouldn't be the \$400,000 for water mitigation or \$50,000 for consulting.

Getting back to Mr. Sullivan, he stated that the HAC decision shows the project total as \$57,960,000. He used that number when estimating the building permit fees. He asked Mr. Mahoney if that is accurate. Mr. Mahoney responded that they have to go over plans and it could go up or down. Mr. Sullivan suspects it's more likely to have gone up. Mr. Sullivan state that depending if the building permit fees are calculated at the rate before or after they were increased, they would be 754,000-870,000. That is strictly building permit fees, it doesn't include electrical or plumbing and gas. It doesn't include whatever fees DPW charges or the Fire Department. Again he added that he doesn't believe there's much difference between 229 and 259 units. It's negligible at that site.

Mr. Sullivan asked about number 20 and the 75 feet of property for a left hand turn lane which also states that it will be restriped. Mr. Sullivan wanted to know where the property comes in. Mr. Galvin explained that there is a layout of Franklin Street that is wider than the existing pavement. The full width of the layout is not wide enough to create this additional lane. The additional width is not coming from any Town property, it's coming from the Weiss Farm property. They will be creating additional paved width for the turning lane. They will be restriping after reconstructing part of the road. Mr. Sullivan stated that it doesn't say that specifically [that they are using their property to widen the road]. Mr. Mahoney added that for the most part the restriping is done within the existing curb to curb layout which was the same plan that the Board saw years ago which was reviewed by the Board's peer review consultant. The land Mr. Galvin talked about is very nominal in front of their property.

Mr. Saltzman stated that the choice is between what the developer proposed that first night in the Town Hall Auditorium years ago or a reduction of thirty units with funding for water mitigation minus a top floor on two of the buildings nearest to Franklin Street. It's been a long time to get to this place. The vote essentially is whether this is an insubstantial change? Mr. Galvin agreed that it is the only question the Board has to answer. Mr. Shulman believes when put that way, it's

a simple choice. Personally, he would rather see fewer units rather than more. Mr. Saltzman added that if you're looking at thirty more units, if you have four people in each one, that's an extra 120 people and cars using Franklin Street. Mr. Saltzman would have preferred under 200 units.

Mr. McLaughlin talked about the building permit fees being \$150,000 instead of what Mr. Sullivan indicated they should be and it bothers him. Mr. Dufour agreed and wanted to go back to that subject. He asked about the \$754,000-\$870,000 that Mr. Sullivan mentioned and clarified that it did not include electrical, plumbing, gas or anything else. He went on to say with this cap of \$150,000 that would be all the Town would get for fees. Mr. Sullivan added that they would be giving us \$400,000 for water. He would give them credit where credit is due, but he'd rather get the mitigation and strike everything else. Mr. Sheehan added that Cheryl Noble was given a copy of the agreement to look over so she should have seen the 45 days. Mr. Sullivan said that was a question more than anything. There is only one thing in there that is a deal breaker for him. The Board knows how he feels. It hasn't changed since day 1.

Ellen McBride, 30 Butler Ave asked if the Board would open the meeting up for questions. Mr. Shulman answered that they would and invited her up. Ms. McBride had been Co-Chair of Conservation and had sat on the Commission for 16 years, recently resigned. She wanted to clarify something publicly. The \$400,000 referenced in item number 42 was incorrectly represented to the Board. She believed that the Board was told that it would take \$200,000 to mitigate the water issues. She acknowledges that Mr. Sheehan is nodding, so she knows he knows this. She continued to say that they were never told this, but two engineers on the Conservation Commission have said that \$400,000 would not come close to correcting the flooding issues at Weiss Farm. It might address finding out what the problem is, but right now, we do not know what the problem is.

Ms. McBride wanted to know, after fighting for 9 years for the 259 units and winning all litigation and getting approval, why the applicant would ask for the reduction and not build the 259 units. Mr. Mahoney responded that they wanted to move forward in an amicable fashion rather than butting heads. We give some stuff, the Town gives some stuff and we move forward and not be fighting.

Next Ms. McBride mentioned a conversation she had with a statewide stormwater management person at DEP. She was told that The Town of Stoneham has the authority to require the project to conform to the MS4 regulations adopted after this application was initially brought to the Town. Why when we have the ability to have stricter regulations wouldn't we do that? The part of Stoneham that floods the most is this area. Why wouldn't we impose these stricter regulations? Mr. Shulman asked what the mechanism for that would be. Ms. McBride said the Town should enforce this, particularly the Stormwater Board, as it already went to Conservation. Mr. Shulman points out that neither option before the Board, the 229 or 259 units, factor in what Ms. McBride has brought up. Mr. Saltzman added that one proposal has \$400,000 for water mitigation. It won't totally mitigate the problem but it's a start. Mr. Saltzman doesn't believe it's important to be discussing this now in this setting as this board is trying to make this decision. Ms. McBride mentioned that there hadn't been any conversation publicly for at least 5 years.

The pump hasn't worked in years and water has spread and spread, Ms. McBride would like to know if a new delineation can be requested. Ms. McBride asked about the Final Order of Conditions and whether it addressed the pump. Mr. Mahoney stated that the pump and the weir dam are included in the superseding order of conditions and that is what they will work off of. Mr. Galvin tells Ms. McBride that Chapter 11A subsection 3 c) Stormwater deems them exempt from our Stormwater bylaw. He also stated that they would go by the Stormwater in place at the time of the application. Ms. McBride is concerned because the originally it was the 8-10 acres in the middle. She wanted to know what happens when they start doing work on the pump and the weir dam. Should they get a new notice of intent for this work? Mr. Shulman doesn't think it is relevant for this meeting.

Cindy Hemenway, 14 Fells Road, would like to know if \$400,000 is not enough to mitigate the water issue, who makes up the difference? Mr. Galvin stated that at the HAC, if the Town's infrastructure is not adequate, the Town has to solve the problem, not the developer.

Mr. Shulman brings it back to the two options the Board is looking at tonight.

Ms. McBride wanted to be clear that when the pump ran there was no flooding. When the ditches downstream are cleaned out there's no flooding. The developer's property would be the cause of the problem. Mr. Shulman cautions her because earlier she stated that we don't know what the problem is. Ms. McBride clarified that we know that the source of the water is from that property. The water collects there and has nowhere to go.

Mr. Shulman doesn't know how much more discussion there is to be had.

At this point, Mr. Saltzman made a motion that the Board determines that the proposed modification by the applicant is an insubstantial change to the project. Mr. Shulman reminds that the motion is in the affirmative so it isn't confusing as to what a yes or no vote means. Mr. Sullivan seconded the motion. Mr. Sullivan would like to amend the motion. He would find it insubstantial if item 42 were struck. Mr. Galvin stated that in his opinion he'd believe it to be a substantial change. Mr. Shulman suggested to keep it clean, leave the motion as Mr. Saltzman made it.

A roll call vote was taken on Mr. Saltzman's motion which was seconded by Mr. Sullivan. Mr. Sullivan, Mr. McLaughlin and Mr. Dufour voted against. Mr. Saltzman and Mr. Shulman voted in favor. The motion does not carry.

A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Saltzman and seconded by Mr. Dufour. The meeting adjourned at 7:33PM.

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:

Plot plan for 128C Main Street, Stoneham, MA by Thomas P. Bernardi, Professional Land Surveyor dated December 16, 2022

Plot plan for 22 Cherry Avenue, Stoneham, MA by Scott M. Cerrato, Professional Land Surveyor dated November 22, 2022

A plan by RJ O'Connell & Associates, Inc. entitled "95 Maple Street, Stoneham, MA - Site Plan SP-1" dated February 22, 2023

Town of Stoneham, Zoning Board of Appeals, Final Comprehensive Permit
Applicant: Weiss Farm Apartments, LLC
Decision Date: January 26, 2023

Respectfully submitted:

Maria Sagarino
Town Clerk