

**Webster Zoning Board of Appeals
Meeting Minutes – April 5, 2022**

A meeting of the Webster Zoning Board of Appeals was held on April 5, 2022 in the Board of Selectmen Meeting Room, Webster Town Hall, 350 Main Street, Webster, MA.

Present: Chairman Jason Piader, Vice Chairman Dan Cournoyer, Clerk Chris Daggett, and Members Mark Mason and Dan Fales.

Also Present: Ann Morgan, Director of Planning & Economic Development; Ted Tetreault, Building Commissioner; Kelly Lyman, Clerk.

1. Call to Order: Chairman Piader called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. He noted that the Board would be taking items out of order.

2. Action Items

a. Approval of Meeting Minutes

February 1, 2022 – Mr. Piader asked if there were any comments or edits. There were none. Motion to approve the meeting minutes of February 1, 2022 made by Mr. Cournoyer, seconded by Mr. Fales. Motion passed unanimously 5-0 by roll call vote: Mr. Mason - yes; Mr. Cournoyer - yes; Mr. Daggett - yes; Mr. Fales - yes; Mr. Piader - yes.

March 1, 2022 – Mr. Piader asked if there were any comments or edits. There were none. Motion to approve the meeting minutes of March 1, 2022 made by Mr. Cournoyer, seconded by Mr. Fales. Motion passed unanimously 5-0 by roll call vote: Mr. Mason - yes; Mr. Cournoyer - yes; Mr. Daggett - yes; Mr. Fales - yes; Mr. Piader - yes.

3. Public Hearings

b. Appeal Application - Aggrieved by Lack of Enforcement for the Minimum side Yard setback Requirement for a Shed located at 30 Point Pleasant Road; Melanie Amir, Trustee of the 2006 Point Pleasant Realty Trust. Site is located in the Lake Residential (LR) and Lake Watershed Protection (LWP) zoning districts.

Mr. Piader opened the public hearing. Mr. Daggett read the public hearing notice. Mr. Piader reviewed the protocol for the public hearing.

Mr. Piader asked that Mr. Tetreault present an overview. Mr. Tetreault noted that the issue of lack of enforcement does not apply for two reasons: the structure does not require a building permit and there was a pre-existing shed in that location. He noted that the new shed does have a different roof line. He asked the property owner to install a gutter to ensure that water does not go onto the abutting property. He noted that the owners had the right to replace the old structure because it was pre-existing.

Mr. Daggett asked for clarification as to what structure was under review. Ms. Morgan displayed a photo on the screen for all to see and noted the structure in question. Mr. Piader noted that there was a photo from 2019 which did not show the structure. Ms. Morgan presented aerial photos from 2013, 2015, and 2019 all showing the presence of the shed on the site.

Mr. Piader asked Mr. Tetreault which by-law the applicant was requesting to be enforced. Mr. Tetreault wasn't sure. He noted that the Applicant had called him and asked him to enforce the by-law and order

the property owner to remove it. He stated that he had informed the Applicant that the shed was replacing a pre-existing, non-conforming structure within two years which was within their rights. There was no enforcement that he could do. Ms. Morgan noted that the Applicant's attorney had indicated that they were seeking enforcement for the ten foot side yard setback requirement. Mr. Piader asked if the Board had any further questions for Mr. Tetreault. There were none.

Mr. Piader asked the Applicant or their representative to present the Appeal application to the Board. Attorney Henry Lane representing Melanie Amir, Applicant, was present. Mr. Lane stated that the issue at hand was that the property owners at 30 Point Pleasant Road had built a shed last year approximately 1 foot from the property line which does not meet the setback requirement of 10 feet. This shed is 9 feet too close to the property line which is a problem for a number of reasons. The roof slopes towards the Amir property. Whatever rain hits the roof immediately runs off on the Amir property. A gutter was installed about a week ago at the suggestion of the Building Inspector, which is appreciated, but the water just runs over land and ends up in the same place. The gutter doesn't solve the problem. And to exacerbate that annoyance, now that the shed is there, the property owners have now decided that this would be a great place to store their stuff. There's a wheelbarrow and debris and other stuff on the one foot between the shed and the property line. So now they (the Amirs) get the shed and debris and junk behind the shed on the property line all of which is now on the property line due to the fact that there's only 1 foot between the shed and the property line. It's just getting worse. The fundamental issue is the same. The by-laws require a 10 foot setback. The shed is one foot off the property line. It needs to move an additional nine feet. Mr. Lane stated that he did not know why this is an issue. He noted that Mr. Tetreault was correct in that the shed did not need a building permit but that's not an issue. You can't violate the zoning by-laws just because the structure does not need a building permit. Zoning is zoning. It doesn't matter how small the structure is - it can't be within 10 feet of the property line. That's your by-law. We didn't make it up. Mr. Piader asked how he would counter the respondent citing the two year period where they are allowed to replace a structure that was taken down. Mr. Lane stated that the shed that was originally there was taken down in 2018 and it was illegal as well. Mr. Lane stated that you don't get grandfathering rights by replacing an illegal shed with another illegal shed. He added that the old shed wasn't actually a full shed. It was more like a lean to, a three sided structure. That was a temporary structure built in 2018 and it was supposed to leave when the owner left which, unfortunately, did not happen. The current owner disposed of it and built a new shed. There are no grandfather rights there. It hasn't been there nearly long enough to get grandfather rights from zoning which requires at least 10 years. Mr. Piader asked if there were before and after photos. Mr. Lane stated that they do not have any photos of the previous shed. They have plenty of photos of the current shed and there's no dispute about where it is. They have a picture of it being built last year. Mr. Piader noted that they were getting to if they had replaced the old structure with a like structure and if she altered the structure - replacing a lean to with a shed. Mr. Lane stated that they have a picture of what was there before and built in 2018 which he shared with the Board. Ms. Morgan noted that the photo would have to be entered into the record. Mr. Piader asked if he had a picture of the current shed for the sake of comparison. Mr. Lane provided an additional photo.

Mr. Daggett asked if Mr. Lane had any documentation of the shed being built in 2018. Mr. Lane responded that it was basically the representation of the person who built it. He had asked the prior owner when they built the shed and was told 2018. Mr. Piader asked Ms. Morgan to display the aerial views discussed earlier. She displayed the photos submitted by the Building Commissioner. Mr. Piader noted that the 2013 aerial photos showed a structure in that location. Mr. Lane stated that he did not know what was there in 2013. Mr. Piader noted that it was possible that it was taken down in

between. Mr. Piader summarized his understanding of Mr. Lane's argument in that it was an illegal structure that wasn't grandfathered by being present over 20 years before it was taken down in 2018 and then replaced. For those reasons it should be taken down again. Mr. Lane responded that it is essentially the case.

Mr. Piader asked if there were any other questions from the Board. Mr. Fales asked when the new shed was put in. Mr. Lane responded the fall of 2021. Mr. Daggett asked how long the shed has to be there for it to be grandfathered. Mr. Lane responded at least 10 years. Mr. Daggett commented that there is a picture showing that there has been a structure there for at least 9 years. Mr. Lane stated that he wasn't sure what the Board had for information about that. Mr. Fales noted that the shed has, in theory, been there for a long time, possibly 9 years, and wanted to know why the issue was being raised now. Is it the slant of the roof? Mr. Lane responded that it's a bigger shed and now the roof slopes and the water runs off. Mr. Fales asked if the gutter fixed the issue of water run-off. Mr. Lane stated that it was hard to tell since it was just recently installed a couple of days ago.

Mr. Piader asked if the Board had any further questions. There were none. He asked if the owner of the property at 30 Point Pleasant Road would please speak to the matter. Karen Bartholomew stated that she has owned the property for about 17 years. She noted that the shed did not get larger, it got smaller and the roof line is pitched towards the property line. It's questionable if the insignificant amount of rainwater is negatively impacting the Applicant's property as there is a line of shrubs between the properties. She had installed a gutter with a downspout which directs the water into her yard. The water coming off that shed is negligible. You can count in gallons. She noted that she has a lot of shrubs as well. The downspout has been directed towards her property 100% to water her shrubs. She noted that she had contacted the Building Commissioner prior to swapping out the sheds and told him exactly what she was doing. She was told that she was okay to go forward because the new shed was not larger and that she was replacing within two years in the same location. Which is exactly what she did.

Mr. Piader asked her to confirm that she's owned the property since 2005 which is approximately 17 years to which she responded probably. He asked if there was a shed present at time she bought the property to which the answer was no. Mr. Piader noted that there was a picture from 2013 showing the shed in place and asked when it was built. Ms. Bartholomew stated that one of her tenant's built the shed sometime in 2011, 2012 or 2013. She couldn't say for sure but the historical maps clearly show the shed being present for a while. Mr. Piader asked about the size of the shed before and now. She stated that the previous shed was approximately 7 feet longer. She noted that old shed was not three sided. It was a four sided shed but didn't have a door. He asked about the depth of the shed. Ms. Bartholomew stated that the new shed is 5 feet smaller if not more.

Ms. Bartholomew asked to address some other things such as the wheelbarrow and debris which was allowed by the Chairman. She stated that if the neighbor wants them to move the wheelbarrow and cinder blocks she would do so but that those things are on her property. She stated that her yard is very tidy and that there isn't debris everywhere. She noted that the question of why now was raised earlier. She stated this is retaliatory. She was before the Board a few months ago regarding an issue relating to both her neighbors having filled in land. The shed has been there for 10 years at a minimum but it's a problem now due to retaliation. She noted that she made sure she was doing the right thing before she put the shed there.

Mr. Piader asked the Board if they had any questions for the owner of 30 Point Pleasant Road. There were none. He asked if anyone else present would like to make any comments. There were none. Mr. Piader invited Mr. Lane to make any closing remarks on behalf of his clients.

Mr. Lane stated that there wasn't much more to say as the case is fairly simple. If the owner wants to make some sort of defense based on some sort of statute of limitations, that's their burden. As it stands, it's an illegal shed. He doesn't believe that there's enough evidence to establish that it's been there a long enough period to establish a grandfathering right. He stated that the Board is bound to make its findings based on the evidence in hand which demonstrates that it is an illegal shed. Mr. Piader asked how the shed would be considered illegal in Webster. Mr. Lane stated anything that's within 10 feet of the boundary line. Mr. Piader why it wouldn't be grandfathered in as a pre-existing structure. Mr. Lane stated that there's no preponderance of evidence to prove that there was a shed there more than 10 years which is the burden of the land owner and not the Applicant. All the Applicant has to establish is that the shed currently violates. If there is a defense to that violation, that burden falls on the property owner. He stated that owner of the property did not provide any evidence establishing that there was a pre-existing shed there 10 years ago. Mr. Tetreault stated that an unpermitted structure does not have to be 10 feet from the property line and that it can be within 5 feet.

Mr. Piader asked if there were any further questions or comments from the Board. There were none.

Motion to close the public hearing for the appeal application for 30 Point Pleasant Road made by Mr. Cournoyer, seconded by Mr. Daggett. Motion passed unanimously 5-0 by roll call vote: Mr. Mason - yes; Mr. Cournoyer - yes; Mr. Daggett - yes; Mr. Fales - yes; Mr. Piader - yes.

- a. Variance Application - Relief from Minimum Lot Size Requirement - 39 Lincoln Street - New Realty Corp. (Applicant / Owner); Assessor ID 27-F-24.24. Site is located in a Multiple Family Residential (MFR) zoning district.

Mr. Piader opened the public hearing. Mr. Daggett read the public hearing notice. Paul Conger, Applicant, was present to discuss the application. He noted that he had received a variance to construct a two unit residential structure on the lot back in 2014 but that he never filed the decision with the Worcester District Registry of Deeds and the variance has lapsed. The current application shows the same plan approved in 2014 in that he still wants to construct a two unit residential structure. The plan meets all the setback requirements except minimum lot size. Mr. Piader asked if the lot size was similar to those in the neighborhood. Mr. Conger stated it was similar in that the average lot sizes in the area average between 8,000 and 12,000 square feet. His lot is 9,120 square feet.

Ms. Morgan reviewed the staff report. The site is located in a Multiple Family Residential (MFR) zoning district. The minimum lot size requirement for residential uses is 12,000 square feet for the first two units plus and an additional 6,000 square feet for every additional unit. This neighborhood is almost entirely residential consisting of two and three family houses. Originally there was a three family structure on the site. The structure burnt down sometime around 2010. The Board approved a variance for minimum lot size in 2014 to construct a two unit building on the site with parking. The Applicant failed to file the variance decision with the Worcester District Registry of Deeds as required by State law. The variance expired in 2015 as prescribed by State law. This is the same Applicant and same development proposal as approved in 2014. Ms. Morgan noted that the average lot size within 600 feet of the site is 9,559 square feet. There are a total of 100 lots within 600 feet of the site. Ninety seven (97) lots were used to determine the average. Three non-residential lots were eliminated from

the assessment - St. Joseph School / Church, Town of Webster Armory / Samuel Slater Experience, Town of Webster Athletic Field.

Mr. Piader asked if the Applicant could do other things with the lot if the variance was denied. Mr. Conger noted that the lot size is large enough for a single family structure but that he would prefer to develop the two units which is consistent with the neighborhood and is an allowed use in the MFR zoning district. The lot originally had a three family structure on it before it burnt down in 2010. Ms. Morgan noted that she had reviewed the submitted plan with the Building Commissioner who confirmed that it was the same plan submitted and approved by the Board in 2014. Mr. Piader asked if the development of the lot as a two unit multi-family structure would cause excessive noise, dust or debris to which the answer was no.

Mr. Piader asked the Board if they had any further questions. There were none. Mr. Piader asked if there was anyone else in attendance who would like to make comment or ask questions. There were none.

Motion to close the public hearing and instruct staff to draft a decision made by Mr. Cournoyer, seconded by Mr. Fales. Motion passed unanimously 5-0 by roll call vote: Mr. Mason - yes; Mr. Cournoyer - yes; Mr. Daggett - yes; Mr. Fales - yes; Mr. Piader - yes.

2. Action Item

- b. Draft Decision: Variance Application – Relief from Front Yard and Side Yard Setback Requirements – 92 Point Breeze Road - David Chappell (Applicant), Cynthia Ostowski (Owner); Assessor ID 46-A-42-0.

Ms. Morgan provided an overview of the draft decision. She noted the decision combines both the front yard and side yard variance requests. The Board could choose to separate the two decisions into two separate documents. Mr. Piader asked the Board if there was any objection to combining the two decisions into one document. There were none.

The Board reviewed Findings F1 through F8. Mr. Piader asked if there were any edits. There were none. Motion to approve Findings F1 through F8 as drafted mad by Mr. Daggett, seconded by Mr. Cournoyer. Mr. Piader asked if there was any discussion. There was none. Motion passed unanimously, 5-0 by roll call vote: Mr. Daggett - yes; Mr. Cournoyer - yes; Mr. Mason - yes; Mr. Fales - yes; Mr. Piader - yes.

The Board reviewed Finding F9: Unique Site Conditions. Mr. Piader noted that there would be two votes on this Finding as both a side yard and front yard setback variance is under consideration.

Front Yard Setback - Mr. Piader found that the topography in the form of the significant slope at the rear of the lot forces the placement of the proposed shed within the front yard setback five feet from the front lot line. There were no other findings made by the Board.

Motion to find that the Applicant has demonstrated that there are unique site conditions relating to the proposed five foot front yard setback made by Mr. Cournoyer, seconded by Mr. Fales. Mr. Piader asked if there were any comments or discussion on the motion. There was none. Motion

passed unanimously 5-0 by roll call vote: Mr. Daggett – yes; Mr. Cournoyer – yes; Mr. Mason – yes; Mr. Fales - yes; Mr. Piader – yes.

Side Yard Setback: Mr. Piader found that the proposed location of the shed was stated to be most convenient and aesthetically pleasing by the Applicant and that there is additional space to shift the shed without violating the required setback. He found that, based on these two facts, the request not qualify as a unique site condition. Mr. Daggett disagreed noting that he is familiar with the area and the layout of the lot in question. Moving the shed ten feet from the side lot line will cause the Applicant to lose full use of the driveway due to the contour of the land. Allowing the shed to be four feet from the side yard lot line is less impactful. Mr. Cournoyer agreed. There were no other findings made by the Board.

Motion to find that the Applicant has demonstrated that there are unique site conditions relating to the proposed four foot side yard setback made by Mr. Cournoyer, seconded by Mr. Fales. Mr. Piader asked if there were any comments or discussion on the motion. There were none. Motion passed 4-1 by roll call vote: Mr. Daggett – yes; Mr. Cournoyer – yes; Mr. Mason – yes; Mr. Fales - yes; Mr. Piader – no

The Board reviewed Finding F10 - Hardship.

Front Yard Setback: Mr. Piader finds that the requested front yard setback of five feet is a result of the topographical constraints on the site which would require a significant financial investment to move it further back onto the lot and therefore a financial hardship. There were no other findings made by the Board.

Motion to find that the Applicant has demonstrated hardship with regards to the requested five foot front yard setback made by Cournoyer, seconded by Mr. Fales. Mr. Piader asked if there were any comments or discussion on the motion. There were none. Motion passed unanimously, 5-0 by roll call vote: Mr. Daggett – yes; Mr. Cournoyer – yes; Mr. Mason – yes; Mr. Fales - yes; Mr. Piader – yes.

Side Yard Setback: Mr. Piader found that there is no hardship as the room on the existing asphalt area to move the shed further away from the side lot line and be in compliance with the ten foot requirement. Mr. Cournoyer stated that the moving it further away from the side lot line would require additional grading which creates a financial hardship. There were no other findings made by the Board.

Motion to find that the Applicant has demonstrated hardship with regards to the requested four foot side yard setback made by Cournoyer, seconded by Mr. Fales. Mr. Piader asked if there were any comments or discussion on the motion. There were none. Motion passed 4-1 by roll call vote: Mr. Daggett – yes; Mr. Cournoyer – yes; Mr. Mason – yes; Mr. Fales - yes; Mr. Piader – no.

The Board reviewed Finding F11 - Public Good. Mr. Piader stated that he didn't think it was necessary to separate the two variance requests into two separate motions for Finding F11 or F12 given the nature of the criteria. There were no objections.

Mr. Piader finds the requested five foot front yard setback and four foot side yard setback will not be a substantial detriment to the public good because it doesn't create any noise, dust, debris, or other circumstances that would create a public nuisance. There were no other findings made by the Board.

Motion to find that there is not substantial detriment to the public good made by Cournoyer, seconded by Fales. Mr. Piader asked if there were any comments or discussion on the motion. There were none. Motion passed unanimously 5-0 by roll call vote: Mr. Daggett – yes; Mr. Cournoyer – yes; Mr. Mason – yes; Mr. Fales - yes; Mr. Piader – yes.

The Board reviewed Finding F12 - Zoning. Mr. Piader finds the requested five foot front yard setback and the requested four foot side yard setback do not create a substantial detriment to the public good because it is an allowed use. No other findings were made by the Board.

Motion to find that the four foot side yard and five foot front yard setback requests do not nullify or substantially derogate from the intent and purpose of the Zoning By-law made by Cournoyer, seconded by Fales. Mr. Piader asked if there were any comments or discussion on the motion. There were none. Motion passed unanimously 5-0 by roll call vote: Mr. Daggett – yes; Mr. Cournoyer – yes; Mr. Mason – yes; Mr. Fales - yes; Mr. Piader – yes.

Mr. Piader stated that he would prefer to have individual votes for each of the variance requests. There were no objections. Ms. Morgan provided an overview of draft conditions should the Board vote to grant one or both variances.

Front Yard Setback Variance: Motion to **GRANT the VARIANCE with CONDITIONS for a Variance to Allow a Five Foot Front Yard Setback** based on information received throughout the public hearing the FINDINGS stated herein made by Mr. Cournoyer, seconded by Mr. Fales. Mr. Piader asked if there were any comments or discussion on the motion. There were none. Motion passed unanimously 5-0 by roll call vote: Mr. Daggett – yes; Mr. Cournoyer – yes; Mr. Mason – yes; Mr. Fales - yes; Mr. Piader – yes.

Side Yard Setback Variance: Motion to **GRANT the VARIANCE with CONDITIONS for a Variance to Allow a Four Foot Side Yard Setback** based on information received throughout the public hearing the FINDINGS stated herein made by Mr. Cournoyer, seconded by Mr. Fales. Mr. Piader asked if there were any comments or discussion on the motion. There were none. Motion passed 4-1 by roll call vote: Mr. Daggett – yes; Mr. Cournoyer – yes; Mr. Mason – yes; Mr. Fales - yes; Mr. Piader – no.

Motion to direct Ann Morgan, Director of Planning & Economic Development, to sign the Decision on behalf of the Board made by Mr. Cournoyer, seconded by Mr. Fales. Mr. Piader asked if there were any comments or discussion on the motion. There were none. Motion passed unanimously 5-0 by roll call vote: Mr. Daggett – yes; Mr. Cournoyer – yes; Mr. Mason – yes; Mr. Fales - yes; Mr. Piader – yes

4. Next Meeting Date: The next meeting will be held on Tuesday, May 3, 2022 at Webster Town Hall.

5. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn the meeting made by Mr. Cournoyer, seconded by Mr. Fales. The motion passed unanimously 5-0 by roll call vote: Mr. Daggett - yes; Mr. Mason - yes; Mr. Fales - yes; Mr. Cournoyer – yes; Mr. Piader - yes. The meeting was adjourned at 6:51 p.m.


Chris Daggett, Clerk

5/3/22
Date

EXHIBITS

- Public Hearing 3A - Variance Application – Relief from Front Yard and Side Yard Setback Requirements – David Chappell (Applicant), Cynthia Ostowski (Owner).
 - Application packet submitted and stamped by the Town Clerk on March 3, 2022; includes the following documents:
 - Average Front Yard Setback within a 600 ft. Radius; dated March 2, 2022; 4 pages.
 - Certified Abutters List; dated March 2, 2022 and received March 3, 2022; 4 pages.
 - Deed; submitted on March 3, 2022; 2 pages.
 - Form; Application for Variance; dated March 2, 2022 and received on March 3, 2022; 4 pages.
 - Plot Plan; prepared by H.S. & T. Group, Inc.; dated March 1, 2022 and received on March 3, 2022; 1 page.
 - Town of Webster Zoning Board of Appeals Public Hearing Notice; stamped by the Town Clerk on March 10, 2022; 1 page.
 - Correspondence; Comments submitted by The Town of Webster Police Department; dated and received March 15, 2022; 1 page.
 - Correspondence; Comments submitted by the Town of Webster Health Department; dated and received March 15, 2022; 1 page.
 - Correspondence; Comments submitted by the Town of Webster Water and Sewer Department; dated and received March 15, 2022; 1 page.
 - Correspondence; Comments submitted by the Town of Webster Building Department; dated and received March 16, 2022; 1 page.
 - Correspondence; Comments submitted by the Conservation Department, dated and received March 17, 2022; 1 page.
 - Correspondence; Comments submitted by the Town of Webster Highway Department, dated and received March 17, 2022; 1 page.
 - Correspondence; Comments submitted by the Town of Webster Water and Sewer Department, dated and received March 17, 2022; 1 page.
 - Correspondence; Memorandum to the Zoning Board of Appeals from Ann Morgan, Director of Planning & Economic Development and Ted Tetreault, Building Commissioner/Zoning Enforcement Officer; dated March 31, 2022; 5 pages.
- Public Hearing 3B: Appeal Application - Aggrieved by Lack of Enforcement for the Minimum side Yard setback Requirement for a Shed located at 30 Point Pleasant Road; Melanie Amir, Trustee of the 2006 Point Pleasant Realty Trust.
 - Application packet submitted and stamped by the Town Clerk on February 28, 2022; includes the following documents:
 - Application Overview; submitted by Henry J. Lane; dated November 16, 2021 and received February 28, 2022; 3 pages.
 - Certified Abutters List; dated February 14, 2022; 3 pages.
 - Form; Variance Application; dated February 24, 2022 and received February 28, 2022; 2 pages.
 - Site Photos; Webster GIS Map; dated March 1, 2022 and received March 2, 2022; color; 3 pages.

- Town of Webster Zoning Board of Appeals Public Hearing Notice; stamped by Town Clerk on March 10, 2022; 1 page.
- Correspondence; Comments submitted by the Town of Webster Health Department; dated and received March 15, 2022; 1 page.
- Correspondence; Comments submitted by the Town of Webster Fire Department; dated and received March 16, 2022; 1 page.
- Correspondence; Comments submitted by the Town of Webster Building Department; dated and received March 15, 2022; 1 page.
- Correspondence; Comments submitted by the Town of Webster Highway Department; dated and received March 16, 2022; 1 page.
- Correspondence; Comments submitted by the Town of Conservation Department; dated and received March 17, 2022; 1 page.
- Aerial Photograph submitted by Building Commissioner at the April 5, 2022 public hearing; color, 8 1/2 x 11"; 1 page.
- Photos submitted by Applicant at the April 5, 2022 public hearing; color, 8 1/2 x 11"; 2 pages.

