

CASE 10-34  
Douglas and Judith Bajgot  
43 Brookdale Road

MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC HEARING  
SUDBURY BOARD OF APPEALS  
Monday, July 19, 2010

The Board consisted of:

Elizabeth T. Quirk, Chair; Nancy G. Rubenstein, Clerk; Stephen A. Garanin; Jonathan G. Gossels; and Benjamin D. Stevenson.

Notice was published in the *Sudbury Town Crier* on July 1 and July 8, 2010, posted, mailed and read at this hearing.

Ms. Quirk, as Chair, explained the requirements necessary to substantiate the granting of a special permit. She also explained that if anyone is not satisfied with the Board's decision, they have the right to appeal to Superior Court or Land Court within twenty days after the decision has been filed with the Town Clerk, and that possible other appeals may exist under current law.

Douglas Bajgot, applicant and owner of property, was present to request a special permit to construct a one-bay garage addition onto his house located at 43 Brookdale Road. Mr. Bajgot explained that his house sits on a nonconforming, trapezoid-shaped lot. The house currently has an attached single-bay garage. The proposed garage addition would attach next to it and a interior door would allow access between the two. Given the shape of the lot only the rear corner of the proposed garage would run into the setback, causing a deficiency of 3.7 feet. The front setback, which is non-conforming, would not be changing.

Ms. Quirk noted that ZBA records showed that a special permit was sought back in 2000 for an addition to the house which included a garage. Mr. Bajgot said that the 2000 project was an addition to the house. The project became overwhelming and he opted to only build the house addition at that time. Timing for the special permit expired in the meantime without the additional garage bay having been built.

Ms. Rubenstein pointed out that while the applicant was presenting a new design and new survey, a garage had been approved by the ZBA in 2000. Mr. Garanin said that he felt the garage would blend in well with the rest of the house.

No neighbors were present to speak on behalf of the project.

There being no further questions or comments from the Board or audience, the hearing was closed.

The following motion was made and seconded:

MOTION: "To grant Douglas and Judith Bajgot, applicants and owners of property, a Special Permit pursuant to Section 2420 of the Zoning Bylaws, to construct a garage addition measuring 12 feet wide by 26.2 feet deep on a nonconforming lot which will result in a side yard setback deficiency of 3.7 feet, property located at 43 Brookdale Road, Residential Zone A-1.

This Special Permit shall lapse if construction has not begun, except for good cause, within 12 months following the filing of the Special Permit approval, plus such time required to pursue or await the determination of an appeal under M.G.L., Chapter 40A, Section 17.”

VOTED: In favor: 5 (Unanimous) Opposed: 0

REASONS: The petitioners require a special permit due to the nonconforming nature of the property. The Board finds that the proposed garage, which will create a side yard setback deficiency, will not be substantially more nonconforming than the existing nonconformity to the neighborhood. A garage was approved in 2000, but never built. Given that the time had expired on the special permit a new permit is being sought. Given that a garage in the same location was previously approved and there were minimal changes proposed for this new garage the Board felt that it was appropriate issue a new special permit. No abutters were present to oppose the petition.

---

Elizabeth T. Quirk, Chair

---

Jonathan G. Gossels

---

Nancy G. Rubenstein, Clerk

---

Benjamin D. Stevenson

---

Stephen A. Garanin

CASE 10-35  
Chris and Alison Boland  
24 Haynes Road

MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC HEARING  
SUDBURY BOARD OF APPEALS  
Monday, July 19, 2010

The Board consisted of:

Elizabeth T. Quirk, Chair; Nancy G. Rubenstein, Clerk; Stephen A. Garanin; Jonathan G. Gossels; and Benjamin D. Stevenson.

Notice was published in the *Sudbury Town Crier* on July 1 and July 8, 2010, posted, mailed and read at this hearing.

Ms. Quirk, as Chair, explained the requirements necessary to substantiate the granting of a special permit. She also explained that if anyone is not satisfied with the Board's decision, they have the right to appeal to Superior Court or Land Court within twenty days after the decision has been filed with the Town Clerk, and that possible other appeals may exist under current law.

Chris and Alison Boland, applicants and owners of property, were present to request a special permit to create an 864 square foot accessory dwelling unit on the second floor of a two-car garage addition. Ms. Quirk asked about the interior living space which Mr. Boland said measured approximately 804 square feet.

When asked by Ms. Quirk who would occupy the space Mr. Boland said that they were creating the apartment for either his mother and step father who may not be able to keep their current home due to forced retirement, or for either one of their two grown children.

Mr. Gossels asked for an elevation view of the addition. Mr. Boland provided two architectural renderings and an interior floor plan of the garage in order to show how the apartment would be connected to the main house. In response to Mr. Gossels' concerns that the addition appeared to be too tall, Mr. Boland noted that the drawings he provided were somewhat outdated because in actuality the grade of the garage is three feet lower than the house. The roof ridge of the garage will not exceed the roof height of the house.

Mr. Stevenson asked about the apartment's entry location. Mr. Boland pointed to the interior floor plan and noted that there was a recessed breezeway with an entry leading to stairs and there was also a back egress.

It was the opinion of the Board that the proposed apartment was within the guidelines of the accessory apartment bylaw, however the only outstanding concern was with the height of the roof ridge. The Board discussed placing conditions within the decision to ensure that the height was appropriate.

No neighbors were present. There being no further questions or comments from the Board or audience, the hearing was closed.

The following motion was made and seconded:

MOTION: “To grant Chris and Alison Boland, applicants and owners of property, a Special Permit under the provisions of Section 5500 of the Zoning Bylaws in conformance with the application for the Special Permit dated June 9, 2010 and the plans submitted by the Applicants, to allow a 864 square foot Accessory Dwelling Unit for property located at 24 Haynes Road, Residential Zone A-1, as follows:

1. The Accessory Dwelling Unit shall be occupied by no more than four persons.
2. Adequate provision shall be made for the disposal of sewage, waste and drainage generated by the occupancy of the Accessory Dwelling Unit in accordance with all requirements of the Board of Health.
3. There shall be at least two off-street parking spaces for the principal dwelling unit and at least one off-street parking space for the Accessory Dwelling Unit.
4. The maximum height of the garage structure must not exceed the roof line of the existing house. If the garage will have a cupola added the height of the cupola must be at or lower than the 35 foot maximum height.
5. An updated drawing of the addition as it relates to the house will be submitted to the ZBA for the record.
6. The property owner shall file a sworn affidavit with the Town Clerk, with a copy to the Board of Appeals, certifying such occupancy is consistent with the Special Permit, every four (4) years.
7. This permit shall be recorded at the Middlesex South District Registry of Deeds prior to issuance of a building permit for the accessory dwelling unit.
8. This permit will automatically terminate upon the sale, transfer, or other change in ownership of the principal dwelling unit.”

VOTED: In favor: 5 (Unanimous) Opposed: 0

REASONS: The petitioners require a Special Permit to allow a single-family accessory dwelling unit. The Board finds that the petitioners have fulfilled the requirements of the Bylaw for the granting of a Special Permit.

---

Elizabeth T. Quirk, Chair

---

Jonathan G. Gossels

---

Nancy G. Rubenstein, Clerk

---

Benjamin D. Stevenson

---

Stephen A. Garanin

CASE 10-36  
Nancy Trehub  
55 Churchill Street

MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC HEARING  
SUDBURY BOARD OF APPEALS  
Monday, July 19, 2010

The Board consisted of:

Elizabeth T. Quirk, Chair; Nancy G. Rubenstein, Clerk; Stephen A. Garanin; Jonathan G. Gossels; and Benjamin D. Stevenson.

Notice was published in the *Sudbury Town Crier* on July 1 and July 8, 2010, posted, mailed and read at this hearing.

Ms. Quirk, as Chair, explained the requirements necessary to substantiate the granting of a special permit. She also explained that if anyone is not satisfied with the Board's decision, they have the right to appeal to Superior Court or Land Court within twenty days after the decision has been filed with the Town Clerk, and that possible other appeals may exist under current law.

Nancy Trehub, applicant and owner of the property, was present to request a special permit create an 840 square foot accessory dwelling unit in an addition to her house that is currently undergoing a complete renovation. The apartment would allow Ms. Trehub's mother to reside there and assist with the care of Ms. Trehub's son. Ms. Trehub said that she had no interest in renting the apartment to anyone other than her mother.

Ms. Trehub explained that that the entrance would be at the side of the house and the addition would not be taller than the second storey of the existing house. Heating and electricity would be shared with the main house.

Mr. Gossels asked about the square footage of the apartment as it related to the existing house. The house measures approximately 2,307 square feet, which if the apartment measures 840 square feet would make the apartment slightly greater than thirty percent of the house. Mr. Gossels felt that in this case, where the apartment would be used by family, the size could be waived. Mr. Garanin said that he felt the proposal was within reason and the addition would blend in with the existing house.

When asked whether or not Ms. Trehub had discussed her plans with her neighbors she said that she had and most appeared to be pleased that the house was being renovated.

Ms. Quirk asked whether any neighbors were present who wished to speak about the proposed project. Martha Coe, 14 Churchill Street, said that she had not seen any drawings of the house and asked to take a look at the plans. She then said that the plans looked nice and that she was supportive of the project.

There being no further questions or comments from the Board or audience, the hearing was closed.

The following motion was made and seconded:

MOTION: "To grant Nancy Trehub, applicant and owner of property, a Special Permit under the provisions of Section 5500 of the Zoning Bylaws in conformance with the application for the Special

Permit dated June 7, 2010 and the plans submitted by the Applicant, to allow an 840 square foot Accessory Dwelling Unit for property located at 55 Churchill Street, Residential Zone A-1, as follows:

1. The Accessory Dwelling Unit shall be occupied by no more than four persons.
2. Adequate provision shall be made for the disposal of sewage, waste and drainage generated by the occupancy of the Accessory Dwelling Unit in accordance with all requirements of the Board of Health.
3. There shall be at least two off-street parking spaces for the principal dwelling unit and at least one off-street parking space for the Accessory Dwelling Unit.
4. The property owner shall file a sworn affidavit with the Town Clerk, with a copy to the Board of Appeals, certifying such occupancy is consistent with the Special Permit, every four (4) years.
5. This permit shall be recorded at the Middlesex South District Registry of Deeds prior to issuance of a building permit for the accessory dwelling unit.
6. This permit will automatically terminate upon the sale, transfer, or other change in ownership of the principal dwelling unit.”

VOTED: In favor: 5 (Unanimous) Opposed: 0

REASONS: The petitioner requires a Special Permit to allow a single-family accessory dwelling unit. The Board finds that the petitioner has fulfilled the requirements of the Bylaw for the granting of a Special Permit.

---

Elizabeth T. Quirk, Chair

---

Jonathan G. Gossels

---

Nancy G. Rubenstein, Clerk

---

Benjamin D. Stevenson

---

Stephen A. Garanin

CASE 10-37  
Edward and Heather Houser  
24 Pelham Island Road

MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC HEARING  
SUDBURY BOARD OF APPEALS  
Monday, July 19, 2010

The Board consisted of:

Elizabeth T. Quirk, Chair; Nancy G. Rubenstein, Clerk; Stephen A. Garanin; Jonathan G. Gossels; and Benjamin D. Stevenson.

Notice was published in the *Sudbury Town Crier* on July 1 and July 8, 2010, posted, mailed and read at this hearing.

Ms. Quirk, as Chair, explained the requirements necessary to substantiate the granting of a special permit. She also explained that if anyone is not satisfied with the Board's decision, they have the right to appeal to Superior Court or Land Court within twenty days after the decision has been filed with the Town Clerk, and that possible other appeals may exist under current law.

Edward Houser, applicant and owner of the property, was present to request a special permit for an accessory dwelling unit to be created by combining a new 750 square foot addition with one existing bedroom already located at the front southwest corner of the home. Mr. Houser said that the space would be occupied by his parents. He said that he would live in the the right-hand side of the house and the second floor.

Mr. Houser then walked the Board through various floor plans submitted with his application. He noted that the addition was contained within the allowed setbacks and was positioned at the rear of the house.

Mr. Garanin asked whether there would be sufficient parking for the unit. The applicant said that there would be additional parking created off to the right of the house with a gravel surface.

Ms. Quirk asked whether there were any neighbors present who wished to speak.

John McMahon, 19 Pelham Island Road, said that he supports the proposal. He said that Mr. Houser is a good neighbor and the quality of his workmanship is also good as noted when Mr. Houser repaired Mr. McMahon's roof. He continued to say that Mr. Hauser is very sensitive to his neighbors and has "old world Sudbury values."

Charlie Werner, 36 Pelham Island Road, also said that he was supportive of the proposed accessory dwelling.

There being no further questions or comments from either the Board or audience, the hearing was closed.

The following motion was made and seconded:

MOTION: "To grant Edward and Heather Houser, applicants and owners of property, a Special Permit under the provisions of Section 5500 of the Zoning Bylaws in conformance with the application for the Special Permit dated June 15, 2010 and the plans submitted by the Applicants, to allow an Accessory

Dwelling Unit that is no greater than 850 square feet for property located at 24 Pelham Island Road, Residential Zone A-1, as follows:

1. The Accessory Dwelling Unit shall be occupied by no more than four persons.
2. Adequate provision shall be made for the disposal of sewage, waste and drainage generated by the occupancy of the Accessory Dwelling Unit in accordance with all requirements of the Board of Health.
3. There shall be at least two off-street parking spaces for the principal dwelling unit and at least one off-street parking space for the Accessory Dwelling Unit.
4. The property owner shall file a sworn affidavit with the Town Clerk, with a copy to the Board of Appeals, certifying such occupancy is consistent with the Special Permit, every four (4) years.
5. This permit shall be recorded at the Middlesex South District Registry of Deeds prior to issuance of a building permit for the accessory dwelling unit.
6. This permit will automatically terminate upon the sale, transfer, or other change in ownership of the principal dwelling unit.”

VOTED: In favor: 5 (Unanimous) Opposed: 0

REASONS: The petitioners require a Special Permit to allow a single-family accessory dwelling unit. The Board finds that the petitioners have fulfilled the requirements of the Bylaw for the granting of a Special Permit.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Elizabeth T. Quirk, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jonathan G. Gossels

\_\_\_\_\_  
Nancy G. Rubenstein, Clerk

\_\_\_\_\_  
Benjamin D. Stevenson

\_\_\_\_\_  
Stephen A. Garanin

\_\_\_\_\_



CASE 10-38  
Stephanie Moore  
4 Dawson Drive

MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC HEARING  
SUDBURY BOARD OF APPEALS  
Monday, July 19, 2010

The Board consisted of:

Elizabeth T. Quirk, Chair; Nancy G. Rubenstein, Clerk; Stephen A. Garanin; Jonathan G. Gossels; and Benjamin D. Stevenson.

Notice was published in the *Sudbury Town Crier* on July 1 and July 8, 2010, posted, mailed and read at this hearing.

Ms. Quirk, as Chair, explained the requirements necessary to substantiate the granting of a special permit. She also explained that if anyone is not satisfied with the Board's decision, they have the right to appeal to Superior Court or Land Court within twenty days after the decision has been filed with the Town Clerk, and that possible other appeals may exist under current law.

Stephanie Moore, applicant, and Susan Berry, the owner of the property at 4 Dawson Drive, were present to request a special permit for a 648 square foot accessory dwelling unit to be located in the property's existing great room that would be expanded and converted into the apartment. The homeowners plan to move into the apartment while the remainder of the house would be occupied by the owner's son and daughter-in-law.

Ms. Berry asked whether the size requested could be increased to 850 square feet should additional room be necessary, however the Board explained that due to legal requirements for public notice it could not be increased without additional notice and another hearing.

Mr. Gossels commented that the drawings provided were well-done and provided a clear view of the plan. He said, however, that because the drawings include two doorways on the front façade the plans read as if this were a two-family house, something that the bylaw discourages.

Ms. Berry said that several of the homes on the street have two entrances on their fronts and she felt that this plan was similar to existing homes in the neighborhood.

Mr. Stevenson asked whether or not there was a rear entrance. Ms. Moore answered that there is a deck in the back with an entrance already. She noted that many accessory apartments are being used for people who are aging in place and so having to walk around the property to enter the building could be difficult.

Ms. Rubenstein suggested that the style and location of the door appear to be the main issues. Because the second door is centered with a stairway and side lights it looks like a main entrance. She said that if the door were moved over slightly it might read more like a side door.

Mr. Garanin suggested that the door be moved to the side of the house. Ms. Moore argued that with the location of the driveway on the other side of the house it could be difficult to go farther to access the door entry. Mr. Garanin said he felt that there was no reason why the door could not be moved and suggested that the applicant come back before the board with an alternate proposal.

Jim Kelly, the Building Inspector, noted that the language of the bylaws does not specifically prohibit two doors on the front of the building. Mr. Gossels and Mr. Garanin stated that the plan reads like a two-family house with the second door as is.

Ms. Rubenstein again suggested shifting the door over. Mr. Gossels added that the door should be altered to look like a subordinate door rather than a second main door.

Ms. Quirk noted that it was not the ZBA's job to redesign the plan at the hearing, and suggested that the applicant come back to the ZBA with a revised application. Application fees would be waived. She told the applicant that it was the Board's opinion that the plans for the apartment were scaled well, however the issues with the door need to be reworked prior to approval.

Ms. Berry then requested that the application for the Special Permit for an accessory dwelling be withdrawn without prejudice.

There being no further questions or comments from either the Board or audience, the hearing was closed.

The following motion was made and seconded:

MOTION: "To accept a request from the Applicant to withdraw Case 10-38 without prejudice."

(Request for a Special Permit for an accessory dwelling, 4 Dawson Drive)

VOTED: In favor: 5 (Unanimous) Opposed: 0

REASONS: Relying on the information submitted, it is the determination of this Board that the location of the entrance would impact the appearance of the single-family home and therefore conflict with the intent of Accessory Apartment Bylaw.

---

Elizabeth T. Quirk, Chair

---

Jonathan G. Gossels

---

Nancy G. Rubenstein, Clerk

---

Benjamin D. Stevenson

---

Stephen A. Garanin

CASE 10-39  
Joe Jowkar and Marta Redjaee  
10 Crestview Circle

MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC HEARING  
SUDBURY BOARD OF APPEALS  
Monday, July 19, 2010

The Board consisted of:  
Elizabeth T. Quirk, Chair; Nancy G. Rubenstein, Clerk; Stephen A. Garanin; Jonathan G. Gossels; and Benjamin D. Stevenson.

Notice was published in the *Sudbury Town Crier* on July 1 and July 8, 2010, posted, mailed and read at this hearing.

Ms. Quirk, as Chair, explained the requirements necessary to substantiate the granting of a special permit. She also explained that if anyone is not satisfied with the Board's decision, they have the right to appeal to Superior Court or Land Court within twenty days after the decision has been filed with the Town Clerk, and that possible other appeals may exist under current law.

Joe Jowkar, applicant and owner of the property, and his attorney Robert Landry were present to request a special permit create an 932 square foot accessory dwelling unit in the basement of Mr. Jowkar's house. The application was the second submitted for the proposed apartment although slightly smaller. The previous application, Case 10-24, was withdrawn without prejudice at a hearing held on May 3, 2010.

Mr. Landry submitted to the Board a memorandum in support of the application, which the Board then reviewed. He said that a waiver was being sought for the additional square footage that the apartment would require given its location in the existing basement space. He said that he felt the application was proposed in the spirit of the bylaw. It would provide alternate housing for future tenant which would not exceed four people. The proposed apartment would have minimal impact on the neighborhood because the space already exists and no changes to the exterior would be required. He said that the bylaw allows size waivers and he believes this proposal would be a good candidate. The total number of bedrooms in the home would not be increasing. There is off-street parking not more than two cars deep. The proposal is also impacts Mr. Jowkar's and Ms. Redjaee's finances.

Mr. Landry walked the Board through the floor plans. He said that total living space measures 2,989 square feet. In comparison with other accessory apartments Mr. Landry said that this proposal is within the scope of recent appeals for accessory apartments. The dimensions and measurements have been verified by the Building Department.

Ms. Quirk said that she was fine with the proposed size because it is contained within the existing structure. Due to its layout she did not feel that it made sense to wall off any portion of the basement space in order to reduce the square footage.

Mr. Gossels agreed.

Mr. Garanin said that he was at first taken aback by the proposed size of the apartment. After reading a memo from the Planning Board dated July 14, 2010, with their opinions about the intent of the accessory apartment bylaw, he felt that he better understood the proposal.

There were no neighbors present to speak about the project. There being no further questions or comments from the Board or audience, the hearing was closed.

The following motion was made and seconded:

MOTION: "To grant Joe Jowkar and Marta Redjaee, applicants and owners of property, a Special Permit under the provisions of Section 5500 of the Zoning Bylaws in conformance with the application for the Special Permit dated June 21, 2010 and the plans submitted by the Applicants, to allow a 932 square foot Accessory Dwelling Unit for property located at 10 Crestview Circle, Residential Zone A-1, as follows:

1. The Accessory Dwelling Unit shall be occupied by no more than four persons.
2. Adequate provision shall be made for the disposal of sewage, waste and drainage generated by the occupancy of the Accessory Dwelling Unit in accordance with all requirements of the Board of Health.
3. There shall be at least two off-street parking spaces for the principal dwelling unit and at least one off-street parking space for the Accessory Dwelling Unit.
4. The property owner shall file a sworn affidavit with the Town Clerk, with a copy to the Board of Appeals, certifying such occupancy is consistent with the Special Permit, every four (4) years.
5. This permit shall be recorded at the Middlesex South District Registry of Deeds prior to issuance of a building permit for the accessory dwelling unit.
6. This permit will automatically terminate upon the sale, transfer, or other change in ownership of the principal dwelling unit."

VOTED: In favor: 5 (Unanimous) Opposed: 0

REASONS: The petitioner requires a Special Permit to allow a single-family accessory dwelling unit. The Board finds that the petitioner has fulfilled the requirements of the Bylaw for the granting of a Special Permit.

---

Elizabeth T. Quirk, Chair

---

Jonathan G. Gossels

---

Nancy G. Rubenstein, Clerk

---

Benjamin D. Stevenson

---

Stephen A. Garanin

CASE 10-40  
Chance and Mary Parker  
288 Maynard Road

MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC HEARING  
SUDBURY BOARD OF APPEALS  
Monday, July 19, 2010

The Board consisted of:

Elizabeth T. Quirk, Chair; Nancy G. Rubenstein, Clerk; Stephen A. Garanin; Jonathan G. Gossels; and Benjamin D. Stevenson.

Notice was published in the *Sudbury Town Crier* on July 1 and July 8, 2010, posted, mailed and read at this hearing.

Ms. Quirk, as Chair, explained the requirements necessary to substantiate the granting of a special permit. She also explained that if anyone is not satisfied with the Board's decision, they have the right to appeal to Superior Court or Land Court within twenty days after the decision has been filed with the Town Clerk, and that possible other appeals may exist under current law.

Chance Parker, applicant and owner of the property, was present to request a special permit create an 859 square foot accessory dwelling unit in an addition on his house at 288 Maynard Road. He explained that the new addition would be located at the rear of his property and would include a garage plus the accessory apartment. He said that he and his wife intend to live in the apartment and rent out the main house.

The height of the addition would be the maximum allowed at 35 feet. Photo illustrations were provided. When asked by the Board whether or not his house was visible from the street Mr. Parker noted that due to the significant front setback and with the house being built into a hill surrounded by woods only the top of the gable would perhaps be seen from the road.

The Board discussed the fact that the apartment would be only slightly larger than the bylaws require and because there is little visibility from the street there would be little impact on the neighbors.

No neighbors were present to speak about the proposed project. There being no further questions or comments from the Board or audience, the hearing was closed.

The following motion was made and seconded:

MOTION: "To grant Chance and Mary Parker, applicants and owners of property, a Special Permit under the provisions of Section 5500 of the Zoning Bylaws in conformance with the application for the Special Permit dated June 23, 2010 and the plans submitted by the Applicants, to allow a 859 square foot Accessory Dwelling Unit for property located at 288 Maynard Road, Residential Zone A-1, as follows:

1. The Accessory Dwelling Unit shall be occupied by no more than four persons.
2. Adequate provision shall be made for the disposal of sewage, waste and drainage generated by the occupancy of the Accessory Dwelling Unit in accordance with all requirements of the Board of Health.

CASE 10-40  
Chance and Mary Parker  
288 Maynard Road

3. There shall be at least two off-street parking spaces for the principal dwelling unit and at least one off-street parking space for the Accessory Dwelling Unit.
4. The property owner shall file a sworn affidavit with the Town Clerk, with a copy to the Board of Appeals, certifying such occupancy is consistent with the Special Permit, every four (4) years.
5. This permit shall be recorded at the Middlesex South District Registry of Deeds prior to issuance of a building permit for the accessory dwelling unit.
6. This permit will automatically terminate upon the sale, transfer, or other change in ownership of the principal dwelling unit.”

VOTED: In favor: 5 (Unanimous) Opposed: 0

REASONS: The petitioner requires a Special Permit to allow a single-family accessory dwelling unit. The Board finds that the petitioner has fulfilled the requirements of the Bylaw for the granting of a Special Permit.

---

Elizabeth T. Quirk, Chair

---

Jonathan G. Gossels

---

Nancy G. Rubenstein, Clerk

---

Benjamin D. Stevenson

---

Stephen A. Garanin