

CASE 10-18
Rosanna Woodmansee
105 Powers Road

MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC HEARING
SUDBURY BOARD OF APPEALS
Monday, March 22, 2010

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

Notice was published in the *Sudbury Town Crier* on March 4 and March 11, 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.

Ms. Woodmansee, applicant, was present to represent her application for a special permit under the provisions of Section 5500 of the Zoning Bylaws to allow a 954 square foot accessory dwelling unit in the lower level of her house located at 105 Powers Road. The apartment would be comprised of her existing basement, rather than a newly constructed unit. Given that the unit would be slightly larger than the allowed 850 square feet, Ms. Woodmansee was requesting relief from the size restriction in the bylaw. Now that her children are grown and no longer living at home Ms. Woodmansee is interested in renting the apartment to a single person in order to generate income so that she can continue to live in Sudbury.

Ms. Woodmansee has spoken with the Fire Chief and knows that she needs to install hardwired smoke detectors in the apartment. She has already installed a stove, refrigerator, sink, and a new bathroom. She said that there is ample parking in her driveway to accommodate a tenant.

She said that all direct abutters appear supportive of the project. The Board was in receipt of a March 6, 2010 letter of support from Tracy Stewart at 115 Powers Road, and an e-mail message dated March 8, 2010 from Cathy and Chuck Frissora at 106 Powers Road who are also in support of the plans. Susan Karon, 93 Powers Road, was in attendance to vouch for Ms. Woodmansee as being a thoughtful, quiet neighbor and the basement was beautifully done. She did not see any problem with the ZBA granting the permit.

Mr. Gossels said that he feels this proposal is an example of exactly why the accessory dwelling bylaw was written and he was comfortable with granting a waiver. Mr. Stevenson and Mr. Garanin both agreed.

Ms. Quirk asked Ms. Woodmansee whether or not she would be amenable to the standard criteria for accessory apartments and Ms. Woodmansee agreed.

Mr. Klofft pointed out that the public hearing notice had not provided the size of the accessory apartment and said that as a point of procedure the notice should be advertised publically again with the size noted. He said that the Board could conditionally approve the proposal and vote officially on the case at the next meeting of the Board on May 3. Additional fees for advertising would be waived.

Ms. Woodmansee then formally requested that the hearing be continued to May 3, 2010, the next meeting of the Board. Upon motion, the Board was in favor of continuing the hearing.

There were no further comments from the Board or audience. The hearing was continued to May 3, 2010.

Elizabeth T. Quirk, Chair

Jonathan G. Gossels

Nancy G. Rubenstein, Clerk

Jeffrey P. Klofft

Stephen A. Garanin

Benjamin D. Stevenson

CASE 10-19
Sudbury American Legion Post 191
676 Boston Post Road

MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC HEARING
SUDBURY BOARD OF APPEALS
Monday, March 22, 2010

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

Notice was published in the *Sudbury Town Crier* on March 4 and March 11, 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.

Spencer Goldstein, Commander of the Legion and President of the Sudbury American Legion Post 191 Corporation, was present as the applicant to request a renewal of Use Variance 08-5 to allow the continued use of the building and property located at 676 Boston Post Road as a private clubhouse and meeting hall. Mr. Goldstein said that the American Legion had been using the property as such for several years and noted that the permit has been renewed many times. Under his command he has been trying to ensure that the property looks well-kept and operations are running smoothly.

Ms. Quirk asked whether any complaints had been received from neighbors. Mr. Goldstein said that he had only received a complaint from his direct neighbor, at 684 Boston Post Road, because attendees at American Legion events sometimes park inappropriately in the abutting parking lot. He said that he tries to seek permission for use of the lot in advance of events.

To Mr. Goldstein's knowledge there have been no other complaints. He said that the building had recently been repainted and the fence barrier at Stone Road had been replaced. He also tries to maintain the grass to the extent possible. A Sudbury Boy Scout had recently fixed up stone walls at the property as part of his Eagle Scout project. And he said that he is trying to make the building unobtrusive and a quiet venue. He has also tried to be strong about people drinking too much and becoming acrimonious at events.

Mr. Gossels said that there have been issues at the property in the past but he has noticed that things have been better in past years.

Ms. Quirk asked whether any neighbors were present who wished to speak on the matter. Michael Griffin, 684 Boston Post Road, was present to request that the Board consider adding a

condition to the permit that would ensure that the American Legion submits requests for parking on neighbors' lots in writing in advance of special events. Ms. Quirk opined that the language of the requested condition seemed acceptable to be added to the decision.

Mr. Klofft noted that the letter that is to be distributed to neighbors continues to be sent out past the required deadline. Mr. Goldstein acknowledged that the latest letters did go out late.

Mr. Quirk asked Mr. Goldstein whether or not the existing conditions were considered suitable. Mr. Goldstein said that the American Legion would like to have a larger sign for their property. Mr. Gossels said that Mr. Goldstein should follow Sudbury's Sign Bylaw when obtaining a new sign.

Mr. Goldstein also noted that the the old conditions did not provide for any exterior storage. He said that he had spoken with the Building Inspector, Jim Kelly, about requirements for a storage shed that could house lawn mowers and other maintenance equipment, along with their barbeque grill. The Board felt that a shed would be reasonable as long as it was in conformance with the bylaws and had been approved by the Design Review Board.

Mr. Goldstein also requested the addition of one other outdoor event per year for a membership event.

He also wanted the lighting condition amended to include a provision for a light on the American Flag. The Board agreed as long as the light was installed by following the federal and local guidelines for lighting of a flag and as long as the neighbors were not impacted by the light and it did not cause a safety hazard for motorists.

There were no further comments from the Board or audience. The hearing was closed.

The following motion was made and seconded:

MOTION: "To grant the Sudbury American Legion Post 191, Inc., applicant, renewal of Use Variance 08-5, granted under the provisions of Section 2250, Appendix A,C, Use 24 of the Zoning Bylaws to use the building and property as a private clubhouse and meeting hall, property located at 676 Boston Post Road, Residential Zone A-1, provided that:

1. There shall be no parking on Boston Post Road or Stone Road by those using the building, and there shall be no traffic hazard as defined by the Police Chief.
2. All off-street parking is to be on the westerly side of the property. The five-foot wide buffer between the parking area and rear lot line shall be maintained and shall consist of a low retaining wall at the rear of the parking area with suitable plantings within the buffer area.

3. Any parking on abutters' property by anyone present at the American Legion, during a special event or otherwise, must be subject to prior written approval by the abutter in each instance. Requests to any abutter should be made at least 48 hours in advance.
4. The barrier constructed to prevent parking on Stone Road shall be properly maintained.
5. There shall be no illuminated signs on the property.
6. One sign that conforms to the Town of Sudbury's sign bylaw will be allowed.
7. One storage shed that conforms to Sudbury's bylaw and that is subject to the approval of the Design Review Board will be allowed. No exterior rubbish bin (dumpster) will be allowed.
8. There shall be no organized outdoor activities on the property, except for the following four occasions: Memorial Day, July 4th, and Veterans Day, plus one additional outdoor event per year.
9. There shall be no exterior floodlights on the property except one single motion sensor light to illuminate the parking area and one single light to illuminate an American Flag. The light for the flag shall be situated and maintained in accordance with federal laws and guidelines for lighting of a flag. Both of the lights shall be located so as not to shine toward abutting residences or into the public way thus creating a safety hazard.
10. No nuisances shall be created **and abutters must be contacted by written letter, with a copy to the Board of Appeals, three months prior to renewal, to solicit complaints or areas of concern.**
11. This Use Variance is non-transferable and shall not run with the land and shall be limited to expire on March 22, 2012. The Board will consider renewal upon receipt of proper application on or before that date."

VOTED: In favor: 6 (unanimous) Opposed: 0

REASONS: The petitioner seeks renewal of a use variance to continue using the building and property as a clubhouse and private meeting house. Recognizing that this use is in a residential zone and has in the past been the subject of complaints from the neighbors, the Board feels strongly that lines of communication between this facility and the neighbors should be kept open as an attempt to head off any problems which may arise. The Board finds that a two year renewal term for this use variance is appropriate and stressed the importance of complying with Condition 10 prior to any subsequent renewal.

Elizabeth T. Quirk, Chair

Jonathan G. Gossels

Nancy G. Rubenstein, Clerk

Jeffrey P. Klofft

Stephen A. Garanin

Benjamin D. Stevenson

CASE 10-20
Ray Bachand
60 Nobscot Road

MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC HEARING
SUDBURY BOARD OF APPEALS
Monday, March 22, 2010

The Board consisted of:

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

Notice was published in the *Sudbury Town Crier* on March 4 and March 11, 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.

Mr. Bachand, applicant and owner of the property, was present to request a renewal of special permit 07-2 to allow continued use of one of his barns for his home business, specifically for the sale of antique and reproduction furniture and accessories.

Ms. Quirk asked whether any complaints had been received from neighbors. Mr. Bachand said that he was not aware of any complaints from neighbors and noted that much of the land surrounding his property was currently being developed so neighbors have yet to move in.

When asked whether the conditions were satisfactory, Mr. Bachand said that he would like to post a second sign on Old Framingham Road at the alternate entrance to his property. It was suggested that he apply to the Zoning Board for a secondary sign using a sign application, which also would be subject to review by the Design Review Board. Mr. Bachand agreed to submit a sign application at a later date.

The Board then discussed extending the renewal term to five years.

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

The following motion was made and seconded:

MOTION: "To grant Ray Bachand, owner of property, renewal of Special Permit 07-2, granted under the provisions of Section 2340 of the Zoning Bylaws, to conduct a Home Business, specifically for the sale of antique and reproduction furniture and accessories from a barn on the property located at 60 Nobscot Road, Residential Zone C-1, provided that

1. The use must be clearly incidental and secondary to the use of the premises for residential purposes.
2. Hours of operation are limited to 10:00 a.m. – 8:00 p.m., seven days a week.
3. There will be no more than one employee other than the residents of the premises.
4. All parking is to be off-street and limited to four spaces.
5. A sign will be allowed which conforms to the provisions of the Sign Bylaw.
6. No flags or banners relating to the business shall be displayed on the premises.
7. There will be no exterior storage of business materials or equipment, including the parking of commercial vehicles. All furniture production will be conducted indoors.
8. This permit is non-transferable and will expire in five (5) years on March 22, 2015, and the Board will consider renewal upon receipt of proper application on or before that date.”

VOTED: In favor: 6 (unanimous) Opposed: 0

REASONS: The petitioner requires a Special Permit to operate a Home Business consisting of the sale of antique and reproduction furniture. The property on which the business is located is comprised of more than 60,000 s.f. and the business is conducted in one of the barns on the property. The Board finds that the use is in an appropriate location, is not detrimental to the neighborhood, and will not by its presence significantly alter the character of the zoning district. Adequate and appropriate facilities have been provided for proper operation. Further, the nature of the business will not cause it to be detrimental or offensive to the adjoining zoning districts and neighboring properties, nor will it cause any traffic congestion in the area. The Board finds the use to be in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the Bylaw.

Elizabeth T. Quirk, Chair

Jonathan G. Gossels

Nancy G. Rubenstein, Clerk

Jeffrey P. Klofft

Stephen A. Garanin

Benjamin D. Stevenson

CASE 10-21
Susan Steele
11 Old Garrison Road

MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC HEARING
SUDBURY BOARD OF APPEALS
Monday, March 22, 2010

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

Notice was published in the *Sudbury Town Crier* on March 4 and March 11, 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.

Ms. Steele, applicant and owner of the property, was present to present a petition for a special permit to conduct a home business, specifically for a therapeutic massage and alternate healing practice.

Ms. Steele said that she would anticipate up to five clients per day beginning at 8:00 a.m. and perhaps having one client appointment in the evening hours. The Board discussed 8:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. for hours of operation to allow flexibility with appointments.

Ms. Steele said that there was ample room in the driveway for parking and understood that there could be no more than two cars in the driveway at one time. She did not plan to hire any employees. At this time there were no plans for signage but she understood that signage would have to comply with the sign bylaws.

When asked whether or not she had spoken with her neighbors about the business proposal, Ms. Steele said that she had. While only one had expressed reservations she felt the neighbor's concerns had been alleviated in the end.

The Board then discussed a one-year renewal term as is typical for first special permits.

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

The following motion was made and seconded:

MOTION: "To grant Susan Steele, applicant and owner of property, a Special Permit, granted under the provisions of Section 2340 of the Zoning Bylaws, to conduct a Home Business, specifically for a therapeutic massage and alternate healing practice, property located at 11 Old Garrison Road, Wayside Inn Historic Preservation Zone, subject to the following:

1. Hours of operation will be Monday-Saturday, 8:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m.
2. All parking will be located in the driveway on the property. No on-street parking will be allowed.
3. No more than two client vehicles will be parked on the premises at any one time.
4. No more than one employee, other than the residents of the premises, will be allowed.
5. Any sign identifying the operation must comply with Section 3200 of the Sign Bylaw.
6. No more than five (5) clients per week, associated with this business will be allowed.
7. This permit is non-transferable and will expire in one year on March 22, 2011, and the Board will consider renewal upon receipt of proper application on or before that date."

VOTED: In favor: 6 (unanimous) Opposed: 0

REASONS: The petitioner seeks a special permit for a therapeutic massage and alternate healing practice on the premises. The Board finds that the proposed operation satisfies the requirement for a Special Permit Home Business. It is in an appropriate location and does not exhibit any exterior indication of its presence. Adequate and appropriate facilities have been provided for proper operation. No abutters were present to oppose renewal. Therefore, the Board finds a one year renewable period to be appropriate for this case.

Elizabeth T. Quirk, Chair

Jonathan G. Gossels

Nancy G. Rubenstein, Clerk

Jeffrey P. Klofft

Stephen A. Garanin

Benjamin D. Stevenson

CASE 10-22
Derek and Siobhan Acheson
82 Hemlock Road

MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC HEARING
SUDBURY BOARD OF APPEALS
Monday, March 22, 2010

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

Notice was published in the *Sudbury Town Crier* on March 4 and March 11, 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.

Derek Acheson, applicant and owner of the property, was present to represent a petition for a special permit to raise up to eight chickens on his property located at 82 Hemlock Road. Mr. Acheson said that there would be no roosters on the premises.

Mr. Gossels asked Mr. Acheson to clarify the location of the coop. Mr. Acheson said that the coop, which would be approximately 8'x4'x5' in size, would be located about five to ten feet from the back property line. He noted that there was a swimming pool in his yard that is surrounded by a fence and there is also a chain-link fence surrounding the perimeter of the property. Mr. Gossels said that the coop should be located the maximum distance from his neighbors as possible.

As to concerns about odor associated with the coop, Mr. Acheson said that he would be using six inches of litter, or woodchips, in the coop that would be changed once or twice a month. He would dispose of the litter off-site.

As to screening, Mr. Acheson said that he would be planting six foot pines in addition to trees already in the area, but noted that the coop would be fairly visible in the winter months. Mr. Gossels was not comfortable with only vegetative screening and suggested that two sections of a privacy fence be required to conceal the back corner where the coop would be. There were no plans to light the coop at night.

Mr. Acheson agreed to the condition that no eggs, chickens, or chicken products may be sold from the property.

The Board then discussed a one-year renewal term to allow for review.

Ms. Quirk asked whether any neighbors were present who had any concerns.

Jack Kaiser, 66 Willow Road, said that he was concerned about any odor from the chickens and, noting that there are fisher cats and rats near the wetlands, also wondered whether or not the chickens would attract predatory animals. Mr. Acheson said that the coop will be predator-proof and said that he also owned a dog that would help keep animals away. He also reminded the Board that he did have a fence surrounding his yard. Mr. Kaiser said that he also feels that Mr. Acheson's back yard is fairly private, but just wanted to ask the question for the record.

Ms. Quirk reminded the neighbor that the renewal term would be one year, so that in one year's time should there be any concerns he should bring them to the Board at that point for review.

There were no further comments from the Board or audience. The hearing was closed.

The following motion was made and seconded:

MOTION: "To grant Derek Acheson, applicant and owner of property, a Special Permit granted under the provisions of Section 2313 of the Zoning Bylaws, to raise chickens on the premises, property located at 82 Hemlock Road, Residential Zone A-1, subject to the following:

1. The chickens shall not become a nuisance.
2. The maximum number of chickens allowed on the property is eight. No roosters shall be kept on the premises.
3. The chicken coop may be no greater than 8'x4'x5' in size.
4. The chicken coop must be screened with fencing.
5. There shall be no lighting of the chicken coop.
6. Disposal of waste litter shall be off-site.
7. No commercial activity consisting of the sale of eggs, chickens, or chicken products will be allowed on the property.
8. This permit is non-transferable and will expire in one year on March 22, 2011, and the Board will consider renewal upon receipt of proper application on or before that date."

VOTED: In favor: 6 Opposed: 0

REASONS: The petitioners seek a special permit to raise chickens on the premises. The use is allowed in all districts by Special Permit from the Board of Appeals. The Board finds the use to be in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the Bylaw. The coop will be situated in an appropriate location and should not be detrimental to the neighborhood, nor will its presence significantly alter the character of the zoning district. The coop will not be visible from Hemlock Road. The animals are restricted to the area as shown in the plot plan which is made part of this decision to ensure that the use will not be offensive to the neighboring properties. Adequate and appropriate facilities will be provided for proper maintenance. The Board finds that a one-year renewal period will allow for review.

Elizabeth T. Quirk, Chair

Jonathan G. Gossels

Nancy G. Rubenstein, Clerk

Jeffrey P. Klofft

Stephen A. Garanin

Benjamin D. Stevenson

CASE 10-23
Peter Cramer and Ada Vassilovski
40 Singletary Lane

MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC HEARING
SUDBURY BOARD OF APPEALS
Monday, March 22, 2010

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

Notice was published in the *Sudbury Town Crier* on March 4 and March 11, 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.

Mr. Cramer, applicant and owner of the property, was present to represent a petition for a special permit to raise up to twelve chickens in a 6'x8' coop on his property located at 40 Singletary Lane. Mr. Cramer said that there would be no roosters on the premises. He also had brought a model of the coop to share with the Board.

Mr. Cramer said that he lives on a corner lot and is in the process of landscaping his property for additional privacy with evergreens and rhododendron at the perimeter along the back hill and between his house and #18 Winsor Road. The landscaping would also help shield the chicken coop.

As to litter disposal, Mr. Cramer was planning on composting the litter on site in an area where he already has an exposed compost pile and composting pallets. He has not received any complaints from neighbors about his current compost pile. He did say, however, that the compost pile may be moved closer to the coop, in which case it would be closer to the neighbors.

Ms. Rubenstein wondered whether the compost pile would then attract predators. If that were the case then Mr. Cramer would have to cover the compost.

Mr. Cramer said that he wanted to install a low-watt light inside the coop to assist the hens with laying during the winter months. According to his research on chickens, hens need about 14 hours of light per day to lay eggs.

Ms. Rubenstein noted that there is a bus stop nearby and asked the applicant whether the chickens might be an attraction for the children waiting for the bus and therefore might present any safety concerns. Mr. Cramer did not think that would be a problem and said that he was

hoping he could enlist some of the children to help take care of the chickens while his family was away on vacation. He also noted that there would be a perimeter fence around the chicken coop.

Mr. Stevenson said that he felt the plan was well thought out.

Ms. Quirk asked whether any neighbors were present who had concerns.

Peter Maxon, 18 Winsor Road, said that he was fine with the plans however he did have concerns about odors from composting of the chicken waste. He also was concerned about the noise the chickens might make early in the morning at the time of egg collection. He understands that the permit will have a one-year renewal term and will come back to the Board with any complaints at that time should there be any problems. Mr. Cramer said that he does have a screened porch in the back yard near the coop and so will also want to keep any odor from the chickens under control.

There were no further comments from the Board or audience. The hearing was closed.

The following motion was made and seconded:

MOTION: "To grant Peter Cramer and Ada Vassilovski, applicants and owners of the property, a Special Permit granted under the provisions of Section 2313 of the Zoning Bylaws, to raise chickens on the premises, property located at 40 Singletary Lane, Residential Zone A-1, subject to the following:

1. The chickens shall not become a nuisance.
2. The maximum number of chickens allowed on the property is twelve. No roosters shall be kept on the premises.
3. The chicken coop may be no greater than 6'x6' in size. The total footprint will measure 10'x12'.
4. The chicken coop must be screened with vegetative screening along Winsor Road and between the coop and abutting property at 18 Winsor Road.
5. One low-watt light will be allowed on the chicken coop.
6. Composting of waste litter shall be allowed on-site, provided that odor does not become a nuisance.
7. No commercial activity consisting of the sale of eggs, chickens, or chicken products will be allowed on the property.

8. This permit is non-transferable and will expire in one year on March 22, 2011, and the Board will consider renewal upon receipt of proper application on or before that date.”

VOTED: In favor: 6 Opposed: 0

REASONS: The petitioners seek a special permit to raise chickens on the premises. The use is allowed in all districts by Special Permit from the Board of Appeals. The Board finds the use to be in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the Bylaw. The coop will be situated in an appropriate location and should not be detrimental to the neighborhood, nor will its presence significantly alter the character of the zoning district. The coop will not be visible from Winsor Road. The animals are restricted to the area as shown in the plot plan which is made part of this decision to ensure that the use will not be offensive to the neighboring properties. Adequate and appropriate facilities will be provided for proper maintenance. The Board finds that a one-year renewal period will allow for review.

Elizabeth T. Quirk, Chair

Jonathan G. Gossels

Nancy G. Rubenstein, Clerk

Jeffrey P. Klofft

Stephen A. Garanin

Benjamin D. Stevenson