

Jennifer Christy

received  
4.3.24

**From:** Sergio Modigliani <smodig@rcn.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 3, 2024 12:05 PM  
**To:** Weisman Hugh  
**Cc:** Christy Jennifer; Osnoss Richard  
**Subject:** Re: Our Call Today

②

Hugh:

Re **Definitions:**

1. It appears you agree with using “natural” grade, not “finished”, but you were silent on it.

2. Use of “mean”:

“Mean” is defined as **the same as** “average”; see:

<https://www.verywellmind.com/how-to-identify-and-calculate-the-mean-median-or-mode-2795785>

Therefore, using “mean” is not a different result than your using “average”, but “average” does not conform to the pre-existing language of 2.7, which states “mean”. My point was only to stay with the words we have been using all along.

(Incidentally, your example of the house with the 10’ corner drop being at 6’ for the mean is, I believe, incorrect. You add the 4 corners and divide by 4,  $2+2+2+10= 16/4 = 4'$ ).

3. Alternatives:

I do not support use of a percentage and do recommend you choose a fixed number. I agree the Planning Board, in your reported consensus about what “...most fairly reflected what the intent was...” may well be correct, but just how fine a point do you really want to put on this issue? I think we are at the level of splitting hairs over a nuance which in its practical application has little bearing on the character of the Town. And, why then use a 5 or 10 level percentage jump when you could use 100? It’s all pretty arbitrary.

It reminds me of the situation where we agree that diversification of an investment portfolio is good way to reduce risk, but does that mean we need 5 categories - or 50 - to achieve *reasonable* results?

Having toiled with interpreting and applying Zoning By-Laws in many jurisdictions, I am a strong proponent of the KISS principle.

Regards,

Sergio Modigliani, Architect  
T: 617.823.3384  
[smodig@rcn.com](mailto:smodig@rcn.com)