

SHARON ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MINUTES OF WEDNESDAY, MAY 13, 2020

LOCATION OF MEETING: In compliance with the Governor's emergency declaration relative to the conduct of public meetings, the Town arranged to conduct board and committee meetings using Zoom video/audio conferencing in an effort to minimize the spread of COVID-19. Interested citizens received directions on how to attend the meeting remotely in the Agenda as posted on the ZBA website and the Town. This meeting was presented with the video and/or audio available for later broadcast. The Zoning Board of Appeals is focused on observing the spirit of the Open Meeting Law during this temporary emergency situation to assure accountability for the deliberations and actions of elected and appointed officials conducting the public's business.

A virtual meeting of the Sharon Zoning Board of Appeals was held on Wednesday, May 13, 2020, at 7:00 P.M. The following members were present as established by roll call: Abe Brahmachari, David Young, Joe Garber, Sam Reef, Steve Weiss and Steve Cohen. Mr. Brahmachari opened meeting noting Covid19 protocols per the Governor of MA and procedural ground rules.

7:00 PM- Sharon Standing Building Committee, 1 School Street, Case No. 1858, Library -- New Hearing

Present for the applicant were: Gordon Gladstone, Sharon Standing Building Committee; James DeVellis, PE, civil engineer, DeVellis Zrein Inc. (DZI), Foxboro, MA, Katherine Martin, project landscape architect, DZI, Foxboro, MA; Jeff Porter, Lerner Ladds Bartels (LLB) Architects, Worcester, MA; and R. Drayton Fair, Principal LLB Architects, Pawtucket, RI.

Also present: Lee Ann Amend, Library Director, Sharon, MA; Cheryl Weinstein, Chair, Sharon Public Library Board of Trustees, Sharon, MA

The applicant provided the following materials with application: Memorandum dated April 9, 2020, summarizing the Septic System design plans for the proposed library, a Drainage Report and Stormwater Management Plan dated April 14, 2020, from DZI, Inc.; architectural and plot plans originally dated March 25, 2020, and updated April 16, 2020, from DZI and LLB Architects.

Also additional/updated documents: Memorandum to ZBA from Gelerman and Cabral, LLC dated April 22, 2020, RE: One School Street – New Library Project

Mr. Brahmachari read the legal notice that appeared in the Times Advocate on April 29, 2020, and May 6, 2020; a letter from Kevin Davis, Agent of the Board of Health dated April 27, 2020; and a letter from John Thomas, Conservation Administrator, dated April 29, 2020.

Mr. Gladstone, Chair, Sharon Standing Building Committee introduced the library project representatives.

Mr. DeVellis, civil engineering, walked through site plans as submitted, referenced existing conditions and what they proposed, and then talk specifically about the different variance and special permit requirements. Site will be accessed from School Street and exit for site is onto North Main Street.

Mr. DeVellis showed 100 percent Design Development Drawings dated March 25, 2020 and then revised on April 16, 2020, with some survey clarifications. Existing conditions shows 38,293 square foot lot that

has been fully developed over the years. First as a two story school house and then as a single-story administrative building.

The proposed library is two stories, but design positions it as recessed into the ground to keep it low. Site access is a one-way drive around the library traveling from School Street to then exit onto North Main Street from the side. The Deborah Sampson statue will be relocated to this lot. In the back corner (north west) separated by fence there is a generator, dumpster, recycle area, and a transformer. Around site is a six-foot fence with steel posts.

No town sewerage, so on-site septic is needed. Mr. DeVellis said septic was over designed for the needs of the site because site is in groundwater protection district. Per state regulations a four-foot separation from the bottom of the system to groundwater is needed. Sharon requires a five-foot separation. This design is for seven feet above high ground water. Mr. DeVellis stated they also overdesigned for Percolation Tests. It takes two minutes per inch by Sharon requirements, but DZI designed for six minutes per inch.

The second underground component on the site is a stormwater retention system. Water protection district requirement is to not increase peak runoff for a one-year storm event and not increase the peak runoff for a ten-year storm event. DZI designed it for a 100-year storm event (7 inches of rain can recharge back into the ground). Runoff is eliminated on three of the four sides; North Main Street side can carry runoff. Design contains ninety-five percent of runoff within the system.

Mr. DeVellis covered landscape plan noting trees along perimeter and around building. Plantings around the foundation, and second story leafy coverage. The first six feet on the bottom level is buffered by an opaque cedar fence along parking lot near School Street and along the abutter property on North Main Street. Lighting plan showed low lights that shine light onto the parking lot with zero spillage off of the site. He showed a colored rendering of the plantings and a sample of an artistic style fencing that will be put in with steel poles per the DPW's request.

Mr. DeVellis reviewed the Zoning Table (Assessor Map 101 Plot 47) from the cover sheet of 100% Design Development Drawings item by item. Chart showed the 'Required/Allowed' and the 'Provided.' He explained that there are two measurements for frontages because DPW suggested they report from both North Main St. and School St. for frontages.

Parking requirements don't exist specifically for a library. They worked with the Town to come up with 24,000 square feet x 6 per 1,000 as 41 spaces. And that six is one space per 600 sq. ft. for religious and public education to get 41 spaces. Different rule of thumb MPLC Board says 60 spaces and ITE says 63 spaces.

There are 30 on-site spaces and 42 off-site spaces in the High Street municipal lot to get to 72 total spaces. Ms. Amend, Library Director, confirmed that the municipal lot is usable space as well as street parking that has been used for library in past. Two handicap accessible spaces are included as well.

Mr. Fair said in 2016 they studied existing building. Town staff also did site search and determined there was no other available space in town. Survey of residents was compiled and submitted to the Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners. The existing building site was studied for an expansion, but with existing historic restrictions, the size of the building would not fit on that site.

Per Mr. Fair, in 2016 the Select Board suggested the One School Street site. It is close to the center of town, as suburban as it feels it's really an urban site. It's close to the commuter rail system, the center of town, and only one block from the existing library itself. There are parking issues, but in the grand scheme of the town of Sharon it is very walkable.

Mr. Fair noted that the plan tonight is very similar to the plan shown at Town meeting on May 6, 2019. He noted that they will be lowering the hill three or four feet for handicap accessibility, which keeps the building height below the 35-foot limit. The entrance to the building is in the back near the parking. Architectural details included in the design: clapboard and cedar shingles of fiber cement for low maintenance and the trim, Gable rooves, pergola, and landscaping harken back to the neighborhood. This land and lot has always been used for municipal purposes and the original school building was two stories high. The historic commission asked Mr. Fair to consider the Sharon Center School original building and the stucco-sided current building when designing.

Mr. Brahmachari asked the applicant's civil engineering team to explain reliefs being sought. Mr. DeVellis referred the Board to Dover Amendment Memorandum to ZBA submitted by Gelerman and Cabral, LLC, dated April 22, 2020, that it falls to the Zoning Board to provide variances or find the underlying zoning is reasonable and allow it to go forward. The things that don't meet the underlying zoning for consideration are: 1) minimum lot size within the groundwater protection district requires a special permit. It requires a 60,000 dwelling unit versus the 38,293 square foot provided; 2) variance needed for minimum front yard for 52 feet of 70 feet to North Main Street center line and 30 feet of the 50 feet to the School Street center line; 3) the percent of lot coverage in a residential B district is 76% coverage including the footprint of building and parking lot, and what is required is 25%, so variance needed; 4) a special permit for lot coverage in groundwater protection is 15% required and 76% percent provided in a residential B; 5) a special permit for natural vegetation requires 40% and they are starting out with 0%; 6) even though Board of Health reviewed and the septic meets all their requirements, it still needs ZBA approval because it is in a groundwater protection district. What is allowed is 6 gallons per day per 1,000, this allows 229 gallons, and they are proposing 1,281 gallons per day. What is allowed is equal to a two-bedroom house.

Mr. Fair walked the Board through the interior floor plans. Program room that seats 100 is near main bathrooms and can be closed off to rest of library, so possibility of use even when library is closed. Archive space for town historical documents, large computer area, study rooms and offices along the perimeter are also accommodated on this floor. A reading room looks out to North Main Street. Upstairs are the adult collections and the library offices, three glass study spaces, a children's area with a story hour corner, an activity room, children's services, a two standard and one family restroom, tween area, and teen area. Teens have their own staff, media center, and a maker's space off the teen area and/or off the adult section as well. Off the juvenile/tween area there is a folding partition that can be used to separate off for computer classes and teen coding. Lastly in the corner to the left of the elevator there is a "business pod" that can be reserved for larger group study. There is a Library Director office, administrative mail room, and admin office to the south. There is a basement level that is not a full basement. It is a staff only area that has a staff room, technical services department, storage area for staff and book donations, restrooms for staff, and mechanical spaces. The total square footage for all three floors is just under 29,500 square feet. The current library is about 12,000 square feet.

Mr. Brahmachari stated that the purpose of the meeting is not for debate about a library or not. The ZBA looks at bulk and height of the building project on the site that it sits on. He reviewed ZBA application document dated April 13, 2020, and asked applicant if:

- 1) In the formal application to the Zoning Board, have they reviewed the plans with the building inspector? Jim DeVellis said they provided all the documents to Mr. Kent for a complete application.
- 2) Use Group and Applicability of Dover Amendment. Mr. Brahmachari noted that a lot of areas on the application form are left incomplete including Appendix A. Mr. Brahmachari asked if there is a code analysis for this project? Mr. Fair confirmed the code analysis of the building was done and included with the design development documents submitted to building committee and building inspector. Mr. Fair said building use falls under an A3 assembly building. Mr. Brahmachari wanted to know why Dover Amendment is brought up if building falls under assembly?
- 3) Hardships. Also Mr. Brahmachari said Board has specific tasks to review for a building project based on the site that it sits on. Variance is not a personal decision, a variance is issued when a hardship is presented, so he sought comment on the hardship from the applicant.
- 4) Appendix A of Zoning Application appear incomplete

Mr. Garber added:

- 5) ZBA must still apply reasonable test to the special permits and variances requested. Regarding the Dover Amendment, which paragraph applies to this building with regard to Chapter 40A, Section 3.?
- 6) Mr. Garber stated they need to confirm that there are no variances needed from the Board of Health.
- 7) The 42 municipal parking spaces in the town lot behind the Congregational Church are used for other entities in the town; what is the total capacity of the building and the number of spaces?
- 8) Is the septic designed for total capacity of the building? If building was at full occupancy, would the septic system handle it?
- 9) The lot cover ratio is five times over at 76%. Mr. Garber is concerned about increased traffic from School Street to Pleasant Street because it is a residential neighborhood. He thinks the entrance should be directly off North Main Street and the exit should be on to School Street with left-hand turn only onto to North Main Street.
- 10) Has there ever been a formal decision or guidance issued by the State for modification of the grant taking less money for a downsize building?
- 11) Was there ever a resolution to grant application errors? It was the State that limited it, or no variances needed? What has the state said about this? Do they even know?
- 12) Even if variances and special permits are issued, the likelihood of winning an appeal is unlikely. It might what is the court standing. Would also take a very long time in the courts. Might be longer than the grant allows?

Mr. Cohen wondered

13) about municipal lot and if a crosswalk would be provided. Will there be any enhanced traffic/pedestrian crossing plans?

14) Is natural vegetation 0% now? Mr. Fine answered that because it is 0% now, no way to have natural vegetation percentage increase there.

Mr. Young asked:

15) When exiting library will patrons be able to make a left onto N. Main Street or is it a right-hand turn only?

16) Will water stream on property be protected per a resident's question that was forwarded to Board? Mr. Young was only asking because a resident had asked.

17) For perspective Mr. Young noted the lot is 0.9 acres and building is 29,000 square feet. Town hall is on 1.5 acres and is a little over 16,000 square feet.

Mr. Reef added:

18) That he seconded Mr. Garber's concern about the design being about five times the lot coverage.

19) He liked question about having exit not be onto North Main Street. He also wants to know if any traffic study was conducted for North Main Street effects?

20) Was there any outreach by the applicants to the abutters and/or direct abutters with regard to the potential size of what has been put forth in the plans? Any effort to alleviate concerns?

Mr. Brahmachari welcomed comments from the applicants with regard to Board member questions.

Mr. Fair responded that libraries are a Use Code A3, but it is certainly understood that a library is known as an educational building and serves an educational purpose. Dover Amendment Memorandum by Attorney Gelerman that was submitted to ZBA cited precedent, so he referred Board to that document. He read M.G.L. c. 40A, Sect. 3 containing the so-called "Dover Amendments," which exempts certain educational uses from certain local zoning requirements," and then read "A public, municipal library is considered an educational purpose on land owned by a subdivision of the commonwealth and, therefore, the use is allowed on any parcel of land regardless of use restrictions.

Mr. Fair noted a traffic study has been done for this site is available at the library. Ms. Weinstein summarized from Tom Houston, Professional Services Corporation's traffic report that in 2026 the Main Street/Billings/Depot Street intersection worst case scenario is more traffic but with acceptable delays; and Highland Rd./North Main Street/School Street intersections will have more traffic but with under one minute delays; and, the School Street/Pleasant Street will have no more traffic due to the library.

She also explained that entering from School Street turns people into the library and then back to North Main Street, so less problematic. Mr. Fair said in looking at concerns of going out on School Street, concern existed about headlights shining on houses. Designed as is, headlights will shine on the church.

Mr. Fair said he has not heard of any water stream on the site. Mr. DeVellis agreed and added that four registered soil tests did not show any concerns. And, reminded that their system is seven feet higher than estimated water table. Nothing in the soils indicated a stream.

Mr. Garber asked where modeling done. Mr. DeVellis said Soil maps showed C and D soil. First testing was where storm water is going to go, and then over where septic is going to go. Perk rate was 2 minutes per inch. The septic was designed for full capacity of 427 people. They designed system for double the full occupancy based on building code and assumption that every space was full of people all at one time. And Mr. DeVellis pointed out that BOH letter states septic system is fully compliant with state and local requirements.

Mr. Brahmachari reiterated that if the building code says it is an assembly building he has to look at the building as an A3 category unless he heard a convincing argument or rebuttal by the consulting team. Also, clarify if you can cite necessary hardship for the three variances for the board.

Per inquiries regarding septic, Mr. DeVellis said Kevin Davis prepared a memo on April 27, 2020, saying the septic system design is fully compliant with local and state regulations. And, the only requested variance with regard to septic design is relief from the zoning requirements due to the site being in the groundwater protection district.

Mr. Brahmachari explained that a variance is not approved easily unless you can show: a soil topography, hydrology, or geology related hardship as that is the standard procedure. He wants to hear from applicant why they are asking for a variance?

Mr. DeVellis said Zoning Board has the ability to look at this per Dover Amendment document. Clearly setbacks and lot coverage are over what is required, but the drainage system, septic system, architectural details all put together compared to what was there --a municipal use-- will not adversely affect the neighborhood.

Mr. Brahmachari defined special permit and variance: Special permit requires that intent of proposal is within the zoning code and project is not substantially more detrimental to the neighborhood. The variance is stricter and requires more explaining. He said, not to be taken personally, he likes a library.

- 21) But he is looking at proposed building that is a lot larger than the lot can hold, why? He wanted a convincing argument about what is the hardship, and why are you asking the ZBA to give you permission to build a building that is substantially larger than the lot can support.

Mr. Garber reiterated his request to know if there was ever a resolution to grant application errors from the state? And, has there ever been a formal decision or guidance from the state for taking less money for the grant? Mr. Weinstein said MBPLC? state? are aware of controversy over grant and they are planning to word their application better to avoid these types of mistakes in the future, but they have no issue with our application, granting our grant, and there are no problems with the state on that. Ms. Amend agreed and added that when the application was submitted, in order to get any of approvals through zoning board, you have to have all of these forms, site plans, and diagrams ready to go for approval for your review. At that point in the application process they hadn't gotten approval from the town or a debt exclusion either, so state doesn't expect you to have it. At that time, they weren't even sure if they were going forward with the project. Ms. Weinstein responded to question regarding would state do a smaller grant, and explained that in 2014 they identified what Sharon's specific needs are in a

library, and that is what draws the size of the building. The state will only give money if the size of the building is suitable to your town. Ms. Amend explained that current population and population in 20 years is the municipal project driver for size.

Mr. Garber then asked, given everything can be read electronically, why so much space? Ms. Weinstein said 71 percent of town voters voted to have a new library. Libraries now offer a lot more than books including classes, study work, not just taking out books. It's an environment that is reinventing itself.

22) Will the library representatives put it in writing that the state is okay with the application errors? Ms. Weinstein and Ms. Amend both expect that the state would be willing to document that the state is okay with it. Ms. Amend added that it isn't even an error, as the form is for additions and other requests, too.

Ms. Weinstein said the size has to be this size to get state funding and, also, they are looking for relief from residential zoning because this isn't a residential building. The original Carnegie building had seven columns supporting it. In the 60s and 70s five of the seven support beams were removed and now there are temporary supports. To repair the current library estimate, the estimate is \$11.1 million and the repaired library would have 20% less usable space than currently due to ADA.

Current library is on 0.33 acre and has no parking spots at all. The new building will have 30 onsite spots, so 30 times the amount they have now and the building is not 30 times larger. The staff will still park in the 42 municipal spots behind the Congregational Church where they park now.

Mr. Garber said current library building needs to be fixed because it is a town asset. Ms. Weinstein explained that the use of a library has a different load requirement than the use of other buildings. Library needs 150 pound per square foot load requirement whereas offices (doesn't remember exactly) are 80, homes might be 40, so the cost to renovate is much less costly if it is not going to be a library.

Mr. Brahmachari reviewed which Board member questions need response from design development team and then opened up discussion to townspeople assembled on Zoom.

Ruth Bekerman-Rodau, 17 Schools Street, expressed strong support for a library for the town, doesn't think current library meets the needs of the town, and would be thrilled to live next door to the library. Although many towns allow municipal buildings to go around the zoning measurements, Sharon historically does not. If the Dover Amendment doesn't apply, what is the hardship? She doesn't agree with previous comment that Sharon is an urban environment. Current building overwhelms the lot. Ms. Bekerman-Rodau said many abutters went to the meetings early on and spoke about the building size being too large, but they were told that there was absolutely nothing that could be done. She spoke with Lauren Straighter, person at funding organization for the grant in charge of Sharon grants, and she explicitly said 'there is no specific size this library has to be in order for them to give us a grant based on population, programming, etc.'. We the town came up with wants and desires, and then came up with a size. Ms. Bekerman-Rodau is most concerned about 15% allowance to lot coverage going to a 75% lot coverage. Lastly, if Dover does apply and if the ZBA does the balancing test and decides that the impact to the educational programming outweighs the impact to the street, the neighbors, the town, this will reduce the ZBA's future capacity to argue that the residential character of other town neighborhoods needs to be preserved.

Amy Baldwin 32 Pleasant Street, felt it was a poor plan for the lot. There will be a loss of privacy to many of the abutters. When Ms. Baldwin made a change their property they were told by DPW that they didn't need a permit, but to consider the neighborhood. Also, she believes there will be a five-time increase in traffic on School Street, she can follow upon this. And, finally, past municipal buildings on this spot weren't of this size and/or open until 9 PM at night.

Ms. Weinstein said in talking about the size, this project was in front of the town meeting twice in 2014. And 2015 was spent conducting surveys to try to get the size. Originally planned to use current 0.33-acre lot site for a project about the same size as it is now. Only because of the Historical Commission was this not able to happen. At that time there were no comments by any abutters or anything at any town meeting in 2016 about it being too large for the then smaller suggested lot. Regarding height of the project, the land is going to be leveled and also, the original building was a two-story building.

Judith Bookbinder, 738 Mountain Street, a Sharon resident since 1973, has seen three or four proposals funding a new library shot down to her great chagrin. A library speaks about the values and character of a town and should be a resource for children on up. Also 71% of the voters supported the new library. She pointed out that the town has granted zoning variances before for six twelve-story buildings for a private facility in a rural area despite all of the neighbors' concerns about blasting, private well contamination, etc. So, the town has no problem altering zoning and granting variances. She understands neighbor's disappointment, but they did choose to buy homes within one block of the center at Post Office Square and lots adjoining a municipal building directly.

Mike Freeman, 66 North Main Street, lot directly north of proposed location. Their Property abuts the location on two sides. If variance is approved, there would be significant impact to the privacy, enjoyment, and safety of the property on him and his family because of the location of the building and the parking lot. Parking lot exit close to his property. Residential B lot should not be used for this purpose. He is focused on the 15% lot coverage allowed and design being five times the size allowed. He also stated he believed the library trustees were negligent because they were working with professional architects for several years, but didn't consider the 15% rule and the 75% lot coverage. This required variance was never specifically mentioned at the town meeting or vote. The library trustees filled out an application to MA Board of library commissioners that is on sharonpubliclibrary.org to apply for grant. In section A pg. 49 of this application the library trustees a "variance for this property is required for minor setbacks" and under Section C page 451 noting what variances may be required, the library trustees wrote "None" on their application for the \$7.5 million dollar grant to the state. He believes zoning requested tonight should be denied.

Heidi Sadler, 10 School Street, lives across the street from the proposed parking lot and is concerned about living in the shadow of a 30,000-square-foot structure. She objected to the zoning variances requested. She agreed with comments from Ms. Beckerman-Rodau and Mr. Freeman regarding the serious zoning concerns and hopes important privacy, aesthetic, environmental, and septic concerns will be considered.

Colin Van Dyke, 23 Pleasant Street wanted clarification as to whether the Dover Memorandum was written on behalf of the applicant or to the ZBA? Mr. Brahmachari confirmed he has read the letter and he read it as an advisory to the ZBA from Town counsel about various variances being sought. Mr. Brahmachari clarified that he cannot answer to whether it was on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Garber added that the letter was directly to the ZBA and not the other way around.

Michael Berkley, 39 Pleasant Street, said he previously submitted a letter to ZBA from a bunch of neighbors. Tonight he wants to address a different issue, the memorandum from Gelerman and Cabral. The zoning relief requested for 1 School St. is outrageous. The library trustees, standing building committee, and town counsel are all aware the proposed building is too large for the lot and they are attempting to use Dover Amendment to have the ZBA ignore the egregious request they are making. The cited examples in the memo were all educational institutions (college campuses) and already established historic residential neighborhoods, unlike current project. Even if ZBA accepts Town counsel's argument, the exceptions from zoning are not absolute. The burden remains with the standing building committee. He feels applicant has not shown hardship. The library was given 25 lots in town, but instead chose this lot. In 2017, the library trustees in his view willfully misrepresented the variances needed. He invited all ZBA members to visit the neighborhood and consider a building 175 percent of the size of the current building. These are not minor property setbacks from what is allowed and will change fundamental character of their neighborhood. HE urges board to deny variance and special permits. He wants the neighbors to be alerted to the decision as soon as possible.

Ms. Baldwin added that it will not be leveled as shown in picture, but rather will still be elevated significantly above the other properties.

Sarah Graff, 242 Edgehill Road, said she doesn't think most townspeople are aware of this meeting, mainly neighbors here with exception of one speaker. And she added that 70- and 80- plus percent of the town voted for the new library at the town meeting and the town election last year and she doesn't feel what is being represented here tonight is represented to how the town feels. She agrees zoning isn't absolute. The proposed lot seemed to be the only buildable place near the center of town, there is a church across the street, it is only one block from the current public library. The current library is on 90% of the lot and this, at 70% coverage. She feels architects fit it into the residential character of the neighborhood. She asked Board to not let the opinions of a few neighborhood people dictate the will of a majority of the people in town.

Ms. Weinstein pointed out that the library trustees are there to represent the town, and they are not doing what they want personally. Select Board gave them this lot which is nearly three times the size of the current lot, they didn't have option of Town Hall land. Everyone is trying to do the best they can for the town. Ms. Weinstein seriously doubts there was any malfeasance. Zoning isn't absolute. It's only one block from current public library, and a new library there was to be on over 90 percent of the lot. Yes, it's one block away and it is a different zoning, but she feels architects have fit it into the neighborhood.

Elizabeth Kassab, 29 Crest Road, agreed with Sarah Graff, we are not hearing from the 70- to 80-percent of people who voted for this project at town meeting and on the ballot. In 2016 she was on a focus group for the library and the group discussion and sentiment was that the library should be kept in the center of town. She pointed out that there was discussion about how neighborhood could change by moving the library one block away, but we haven't heard how not having the library in the center of town would affect the town. Having the library in center of town was one of reasons she moved to center of town.

Mr. Brahmachari reminded everyone that the agenda is posted 48 hours or more before the meeting and that this is not 'whether or not' there will be a building project, but ZBA doesn't consider that it is a library specifically. Mr. Garber questioned using large lot by the Deborah Sampson tennis courts and doesn't think the center of town has to be the spot for the library.

Ruth Freeman, 66 North Main St., said everyone in the neighborhood wants a library in that spot, but it is only the size that is a problem.

Cheryl Weinstein, responded to Mr. Garber's suggestion of the East Foxboro Street site, but that is owned by the schools. Every other site was either conservation, wetlands, tiny, etc., there was not one other property when looking with the engineering department.

Bob Levin, Vice Chair, Board of Trustees, Sharon Public Library, corrected Ms. Weinstein and said the Deborah Sampson property is controlled by recreation department and the federal government and is for municipal recreational use only. They looked seriously at every piece of property in the town. They would've loved to stay in building, but a problem with no parking, and state and local historical commissions wouldn't approve it. They had multiple meetings at the library, the town hall, the rec center. They are an elected, unpaid group. He has been working on this for 20 years. They wanted a rear of the building library at the Wilbur School and would have been 25,000 square feet. The size has been 25,000 square feet since the 1980s. No one is trying to deceive anybody. The square footage coverage by the building itself is about 35% site coverage on the property.

Mr. Brahmachari directed the applicant to the list of questions from the board members and comments from the various residents. Options for applicant are to respond to questions tonight and have a vote, or to continue the case and have the design team weigh in and come back.

Mr. Gladstone requested continuance to June 10, 2020. Ms. Schustek will email continuance form to him for signature.

Mr. Brahmachari made a motion to approve the minutes from Wednesday, April 29, 2020. Mr. Garber seconded. Board voted 5-0-0- to approve the minutes. Mr. Weiss abstained from voting because he was not present for the April 29, 2020 meeting.

It was moved, seconded, and voted to adjourn.

The meeting adjourned at 10:07 P.M.

Respectfully submitted

Approved: June 10, 2020