



TOWN OF NORTHBOROUGH Zoning Board of Appeals

Town Hall Offices • 63 Main Street • Northborough, MA 01532 • 508-393-5019 • 508-393-6996 Fax

Approved 10/23/18

Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting Minutes August 28, 2018

Members in attendance: Mark Rutan, Clerk; Fran Bakstran; Brad Blanchette; Paul Tagliaferri; Jeffrey Leland, Alternate

Members excused: Richard Rand, Chair

Others in attendance: Fred Litchfield, Town Engineer; Robert Frederico, Building Inspector; Attorney Marshall Gould; Kim DeBilio; Attorney Aaron Hutchins; Dimitrios Voyiatzis; Heather Dudko, American Sign; Attorney George Pember; Brady Otey, Tony & Sally Pini, Paul Garcia, America's Best Defense; Kerri Martinek

Acting Chair Mark Rutan called the meeting to order at 7:00PM.

Public Hearing to consider the petition of 318 Post Road Corp for a Variance/Special Permit/Special Permit with Site Plan Approval and a Special Permit, Groundwater Protection Overlay District, to allow the use of a dental practice in the building located at 318 Main Street, Map 47, Parcel 93

Marshall Gould appeared on behalf of the applicant. He introduced Dr. Lavana, who is currently practicing in a nearby town and is looking to open an office at 318 Main Street.

Attorney Gould explained that the project has been before the Groundwater Advisory Committee (GAC) and has been discussed multiple times with Fred Litchfield and Bob Frederico to address the various aspects of the building. He indicated that the use would be allowed by right if the building was not located within the groundwater (GW3) area. He explained that, when the project was before the GAC, Mr. Litchfield expressed a desire to ensure that all Material Safety Data Sheets (MSDS) for products used in the practice were provided, and he confirmed that they have been. He also indicated that a letter was provided as part of the application packet stating that there will be no adverse environmental impacts. He noted that the dental practice will be small, with no more than two dentists. Attorney Gould also noted that an expert in the dental field had reviewed pertinent information with Mr. Litchfield, who appeared to be satisfied. In addition, he stated that he had provided the brochure for the amalgam separator that will be used when metal is removed from the mouth to ensure that no mercury or silver will be going into the septic system. He explained that any body fluids resulting from procedures will be directed to a closed system, where they will be properly diluted. Attorney Gould explained that Massachusetts regulations are very strict for dentists as far as what they are allowed to put into the ground and the trash.

Attorney Gould commented that the building and property have been well maintained. He noted that the septic system was previously enlarged to accommodate up to 9,000 gallons per day, but use is currently expected to be no more than 6400 gallons per day. He indicated that there is sufficient parking, traffic flows are good, there is good access onto Route 20 and good sight lines.

Mr. Rutan noted that the applicant had appeared before the Groundwater Advisory Committee (GAC) on August 14th, and a comment letter (copy attached) was provided in which the GAC recommends approval with conditions as follows:

- This property is subject to previous ZBA case No. 13-10 regarding the expansion of the on-site septic system and all previous conditions shall remain in effect. This previous decision outlined a specific septic system loading table limiting the total flow to 9000 gallons per day which should now be updated to confirm the total flow of the building as currently occupied does not exceed the maximum allowed.
- The application indicates the dental office will be equipped with a digital X-ray system and this should be made a condition of any approval so as to limit the use of developer solution in the future should a change in dental offices happen.
- The application indicates the dental office will be equipped with an amalgam separation system which will be emptied once per month but no contracts were submitted and actual contracts with reporting documentation should be required as part of any approval.
- An as-built plan of the portion of the building including the dental office shall be submitted to the Town Engineer for review and approval prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy.

In response to a question from Ms. Bakstran about the use of amalgam, Dr. Lavana clarified that the amalgam is existing product removed from patients only and there is no new amalgam used in her practice. Mr. Rutan commented that there is no developer fluid used with digital x-rays.

In response to questions from Mr. Blanchette about the storage tank for the amalgam separator, Dr. Lavana explained that the system is located in an auxiliary room onsite and will be cleaned and emptied at the end of each day. In response to a question from Mr. Blanchette, Mr. Litchfield confirmed that the existing septic system is up to code and has been properly maintained. He noted that the board had previously granted a variance to allow the septic system to be expanded over what the Groundwater bylaw allows. He stated that he had concerns about the liquid from the amalgam separator and any adverse to the septic system, but documentation has been provided and he is comfortable that there will not be.

Ms. Bakstran questioned the sufficiency of the capacity of the existing septic system. Attorney Gould explained that calculations were done that conclude that, at 100 percent occupancy, the expected use is 6,391 gallons per day.

In response to questions from Mark Rutan about staffing for the practice, Dr. Lavana indicated that she plans to utilize up to two hygienists and the space can accommodate one more dentist.

Fran Bakstran made a motion to close the hearing. Jeffrey Leland seconded; motion carries by unanimous vote.

Public Hearing to consider the petition of Kim DeBilio for a Variance/Special Permit to allow a proposed garage to be located 13 feet within a side setback on the property located at 34 John Edward Drive, Map 62, Parcel 18

Ms. DeBilio stated that she has lived in the home for 8 years and is seeking approval to build an attached, 24' x 24' garage on the existing driveway. She explained that the existing configuration is problematic and makes it difficult to maneuver into the existing garage. She indicated that, with the proposed garage, it will be easy to drive down the driveway and straight into the garage, but the new garage will encroach 13 feet into the side yard setback.

Ms. Bakstran noted that the existing garage requires a 90-degree turn and asked if the proposed garage is the approximate width of the driveway. Ms. DeBilio stated that it is approximately one foot wider.

Mr. Blanchette asked if the design will be similar to the pictures provided or if there will be a second floor. Ms. DeBilio stated that it will only be a 2-car garage.

In response to a question from Ms. Bakstran about whether the driveway is within the setback, Mr. Frederico explained that driveways are not required to comply with setbacks but noted that the driveway will likely not expand beyond what currently exists.

In response to a question from Mr. Rutan about the location of the septic system, Ms. DeBilio stated that it is located on the other side of the house.

Mr. Litchfield indicated that he had not provided a comment letter to the board, but if a variance is granted the applicant will be required to appear before the Conservation Commission because the work is within 200 feet of the brook in the back.

Mr. Rutan asked about abutter notifications. Mr. Litchfield confirmed that abutters were notified as required and Mr. Blanchette noted that the board had received a letter from abutters voicing support of the project.

Brad Blanchette made a motion to close the hearing. Fran Bakstran seconded; motion carries by unanimous vote.

Public Hearing to consider the petition of Dimitrios Voyiatzis for a Variance/Special Permit/Special Permit with Site Plan Approval, to allow the use of a personal karate training/development business, to be run by a proposed tenant, in the vacant unit next to the Hillside Grille restaurant, on the property located at 73-79 West Main Street, Map 63, Parcel 11

Attorney Aaron Hutchins, representing Mr. Voyiatzis, discussed the proposal to open a karate studio in the vacant space in the building. He noted that no work will be done to the exterior of the building and all construction will be limited to the interior, with plumbing and electrical work recently completed. He discussed the issue of parking, which services two buildings on the site. He indicated that the application packet provides some details and he also has photographs illustrating parking lot use during various time periods. He stated that the busiest time is expected to be around 5PM or 6PM when the fitness studio next door holds classes and the Hillside Grille's dinner business is at its peak. He commented that he does not believe that the entire lot will be full, but it will be busier than what has been customary over the past several years during which portions of the building have been vacant.

In response to a question from Mark Rutan about client use, it was noted that classes for children are at 4PM and adult use takes place at 6:30PM and later. Currently, the school is located in Shrewsbury and has enrollment of approximately 34 kids and 95 adults. Given that much of the enrollment involves multiple members of the same family, it is anticipated that shared vehicles and carpools will limit the number of vehicles using the parking lot.

Attorney Hutchins noted that the application packet includes a paragraph that addresses the available parking stalls and the anticipated needs for the karate school, and voiced his opinion that there is ample parking for what is expected. He also suggested that the owner of the karate school would not invest in relocating his business here if he had any concerns about parking. In response to questions from Mr. Rutan about business operations (showers onsite, food service, etc.), it was noted that there are no locker rooms proposed.

Ms. Bakstran voiced concerns about loud music interfering with diners at the restaurant next door. Attorney Hutchins indicated that the music volume will not be excessive and noted that there is a tenant space between the karate school and the restaurant. In response to a question from Jeff Leland, Mr. Voyiatzis indicated that there will be office space on the second floor that will be used by the karate school.

Ms. Bakstran asked if there were any calculations done to determine the appropriate number of parking spaces and if what is provided is adequate. Mr. Frederico voiced his opinion that it is reasonably sufficient, especially given the staggered times when clients will be coming and going.

Mr. Rutan asked about weekend hours, and it was explained that the school will operate on Saturday mornings only.

Brad Blanchette made a motion to close the hearing; Jeffrey Leland seconded; motion carries by unanimous vote.

Public Hearing to consider the petition of American Sign, Inc. for a Variance/Special Permit to allow a proposed wall sign to be more than the maximum allowed 100 square feet in area, (196 square feet), that will take the place of an existing 10-foot by 10-foot sign on the front of the Home Sense store located at 1,000 Shops Way, (1000-9116) Map 106, Parcel 7

Heather Dudko appeared on behalf of American Sign to discuss a request to replace an existing 10' x 10' wall sign with a 14' x 14' wall sign for a new tenant (HomeSense) in the plaza. She noted that the Industrial District allows for a 200 square foot sign but the plaza was rezoned to Highway Business that only allows signage to be a maximum of 100 square feet.

Ms. Dudko noted that, due to the size of the façade, the applicant is seeking to increase the dimension of the sign to make it more visible and better scaled. She provided a rendering to illustrate the difference (4 foot increase around the entire perimeter) between the existing and proposed signage and suggested that a 14' x 14' sign is more appropriate.

In response to questions from Mr. Blanchette about hours of operation and illumination of the sign, Ms. Dudko commented that hours will likely be 9AM to 9PM, similar to typical retail stores, and the sign will be internally lit.

In response to a request for clarification of the bylaw relative to the size of signs from Ms. Bakstran, Mr. Frederico explained that the size of the sign is dictated by the use variance that was granted when the development went in. He also noted that the sign cannot be more than 1/3 of the total wall dimension.

Jeffrey Leland made a motion to close the hearing. Fran Bakstran seconded; motion carries by unanimous vote.

Public Hearing to consider the petition of Brady I. Otey for Variances/Special Permit/Special Permit with Site Plan Approval/Special Permit, Groundwater Protection Overlay District, to allow the renovation of an existing single-family home to a two-family home on the property located at 19 East Main Street, Map 53, Parcel 101

Attorney George Pember appeared on behalf of Brady Otey, who was also in attendance to address any questions. Mr. Pember noted that the house had been used as a 2-family house for many years but because it was most recently used as a single family house for a number of years, the applicant cannot claim grandfather protection so must seek a variance. He explained that the applicant had purchased the property with the belief that there was room for as many as 5 bedrooms but, based on discussion about groundwater, plans were changed and the proposal now is for the construction of a duplex with a total of 3 bedrooms; one unit with a single bedroom and the second with 2 bedrooms. He reiterated that there is a potential for 5 bedrooms and the septic system is appropriately sized for that, but that is not the intention.

Attorney Pember noted that there will be no changes to the footprint of the structure, and the only exterior change may be to the parking so town staff had requested that the plans show the possible future expansion in the event a larger parking area is needed for future occupants. Plans showing the existing and proposed conditions, including the floorplan layout, were shared with the board.

Mr. Rutan requested confirmation that there will be no changes to the envelope of the house. Attorney Pember confirmed that both the footprint and envelope will remain the same.

Ms. Bakstran noted that several variances are being sought and asked if the relief from frontage is necessary because the applicant is looking to modify the use. Attorney Pember confirmed this to be the case, and noted that this variance would not be needed if the house was to remain a single family dwelling. In response to a question from Mr. Blanchette about the use history of the house, Mr. Otey voiced his understanding that it was originally built as a 2-family home but was recently used as a single family home and was rezoned as such, though the exact timing of that is unknown. Attorney Pember explained that he had tried to research this but was not able to obtain much more clarity.

Joan Bertonazzi, 7 Verjuniel Avenue, identified herself as an abutter who has lived in her 2-family home for 40 years, and noted that the subject property has been used as a single family home during the time that she has lived in the neighborhood. Attorney Pember commented that the information from the assessor's offices does not confirm that to be the fact and reiterated that it was assessed as a 2-family home for a number of years.

In response to a question from Mr. Rutan about construction, Mr. Otey indicated that his father's construction company will be doing the work. Mr. Rutan also asked about the configuration of the previous and proposed 2-family home. Mr. Otey stated that the layout of the house dictates that the dwellings be divided up and down and not front and back.

Ms. Bakstran asked about the information obtained from the assessor's office that was provided to the board. Mr. Litchfield explained that it appears that the home was assessed as a 2-family dwelling most recently between 1993 and 1999.

Mr. Blanchette asked if the units will be rented or sold. Mr. Otey indicated that they will be rented.

Ms. Bakstran asked about parking requirements for multi-family homes. Mr. Frederico voiced his opinion that the parking is sufficient. Mr. Rutan noted that the parking expansion is not shown on the diagram. Attorney Pember indicated that the plan dated today shows the potential expansion of the parking area. Mr. Litchfield confirmed that he has received a copy of the latest plan. In response to a question from Ms. Bakstran about impervious cover, Mr. Litchfield noted that the revised plan was reviewed and a comment letter was provided to the board.

Mr. Rutan noted that the Groundwater Advisory Committee had provided a comment letter recommending approval with the following conditions:

- This project as submitted does not include any computations necessary to verify it meets the requirements of section 07-0 10 D (3) (c) [6] which states a Special Permit may be granted for two-family and multifamily residential development on lots of at least twenty thousand (20,000) square feet, such that the increase in post-development net runoff shall not exceed existing conditions by more than fifteen percent (15%) or such that the impervious cover of the building lot is increased over the existing conditions by no more than fifteen percent (15%). The existing lot has an area of 17,206 square-feet.
- Section 07-0 10 D (3) (c) [6] also states a Special Permit may be granted for two-family and multifamily residential development on lots of at least twenty thousand (20,000) square feet provided any on-site sewage disposal is less than or equal to two hundred twenty (220) gallons per day per ten thousand (10,000) square feet of lot area. The plans and application indicate the project is to be connected to an existing septic system but no information regarding the size is provided.
- The application does indicate the impervious cover is not proposed to be increased over the existing condition however there does not appear to be adequate parking and some additional impervious cover will be required which should be shown on a proper site plan and submitted prior to any approval of a variance or special permit.
- The application indicates the existing home was previously a two family home but the documentation as to when that occurred is unclear.

Mr. Rutan noted that the information has subsequently been provided.

- A request for a variance from required lot area is typically not recommended for approval unless the project is connected to Town sewer which this project is not and sewer is not proposed to be extended to this property in the near future by the Town however applicant is proposing deed restriction limiting the number of bedrooms to a total of three and the committee found that to be an acceptable reason for recommending approval.

Mr. Rutan stated that the letter also noted that Attorney Pember did submit a statement indicating that the property will be used for residential purposes and, as such, there will be no hazardous or toxic materials used or stored on the property other than typical household cleaning products. In addition, he also delivered a revised site plan earlier today that indicates the increase in impervious cover if additional parking is required. However, the letter stated that the plan has the same date as the previous plan and is not stamped so it cannot be considered a proper site plan. Mr. Litchfield confirmed that the plan is dated August 27, 2018 so there is a way to distinguish between the two plans.

In response to a question from Ms. Bakstran about the size of the two dwelling units, Mr. Otey estimated that the first floor unit will be approximately 1,000 square feet and the second unit will be about 1,500 square feet.

Mr. Rutan asked if there are any issues with the age and/or condition of the existing septic system. Mr. Litchfield noted that Mr. Pember has indicated that the septic system is a new system but the plan did not indicate that.

Mr. Frederico discussed parking and noted that 1½ spaces are required for the 1 bedroom dwelling and 2 spaces are required for the 2 bedroom unit, for a total of 4 spaces required for the project.

Ms. Bertonazzi indicated that most of the questions and concerns she had have been addressed and she has no issues with the proposal.

Kerri Martinek, identified herself as a member of the Planning Board but emphasized that she is not speaking on their behalf. She noted that the property borders the Residential C zone which allows for two family use, but voiced her opinion that the project is not in substantial harmony with the Master Plan as was stated in the application. She referenced discussion at the recent Town Meeting in which town residents clearly indicated that they are not interested in seeing an increase in two-family housing in town.

Fran Bakstran made a motion to close the hearing. Jeffrey Leland seconded; motion carries by unanimous vote.

Public Hearing to consider the petition of E & G Home Improvement, LLC, for Variances/Special Permit/Special Permit with Site Plan Approval/ Special Permit, Groundwater Protection Overlay District, to allow the renovation of an existing single-family home to a 2-family home on the property located at 343 Hudson Street, Map 30, Parcel 18

Attorney George Pember appeared on behalf of the applicant, and introduced Hugo Correa who is the driving force behind the project. He noted that, similar to the house on East Main Street, the use history for this house is also uncertain. He noted that information he located at the assessor's offices confirmed that the home was previously assessed as a multi-family dwelling but he could not ascertain whether it was a 2-family or more. He commented that the assessor's records for this property are even worse than those for the project he previously presented.

Attorney Pember noted that the house was originally built in the year 1800, and is currently in atrocious condition following years of neglect. He stated that, when Mr. Correa purchased the home, it quickly became apparent that the amount of work needed is substantially more than originally thought. Because of the extreme amount of work needed, his client believes that it needs to be a 2-family house in order for the project to work. He

explained that this house is going to require a change in the footprint. He noted that the applicant has already made tremendous improvements to the property and will continue to do so, and the impact to the groundwater will be greatly reduced based on the applicant's plans.

Mr. Frederico explained that the applicant originally came to the Building Department with plans to renovate the dwelling as a single family home with a substantial number of bedrooms but decided to modify his plans after he started work. He commented that, at this point, the house has literally been reengineered from the inside out, far in excess of what is typically seen in a single family renovation. He stated that the applicant has invested so much to make the building sound, which is why he is now before the board seeking approval for a 2-family.

Mr. Correa discussed the layout, conditions, and work done to date on the property which includes:

- Cement and pavement in various areas on the property were removed and replaced with grass.
- A new area to be used for parking was identified.
- A cesspool was removed and the house was connected to town sewer.
- Cement covering an abandoned pool was removed, the pool was filled in and grass was planted.
- Previous oil service was terminated and replaced with gas

Mr. Correa reiterated his proposal to develop a 2-family house, with each unit to be 1700 square feet, and emphasized that the work will be an improvement that will positively impact the town and the neighborhood. He noted that the house across the street is a 2-family, and there are condominiums nearby. He stated that the house currently has 6 bedrooms that will be maintained, with 3 bedrooms planned for each unit.

In response to a question from Mark Rutan about the basement, Mr. Correa stated that the basement will be accessible to both units. Mr. Rutan also asked if parking is to be off of Overlook Park Road. Mr. Correa confirmed that it will be, and noted that access off Hudson Street is too dangerous.

Ms. Bakstran asked if the existing garage and shed will remain. Mr. Correa indicated that the 2 car garage will remain and will be split to provide one space for each dwelling unit, but the shed has been removed.

In response to a question from Mr. Blanchette about the current and proposed living area, Mr. Correa noted that the existing house is 3,000 square feet and the proposal is to construct two, 1700 square foot units. He indicated that a small, 400 square foot addition will be necessary to provide for appropriate access to the two units.

Mr. Rutan noted that the Groundwater Advisory Committee (GAC) had provided a comment letter (copy attached) recommending approval with the following conditions:

- This project as submitted does not include any computations necessary to verify it meets the requirements of section 07-0 10 D (3) (b) [2] which states a Special Permit may be granted for two-family and multifamily residential development on lots of at least twenty thousand (40,000) square feet, such that the increase in post-development net runoff shall not exceed existing conditions by more than fifteen percent (15%) or such that the impervious cover of the building lot is increased over the existing

conditions by no more than fifteen percent (15%). The existing lot has an area of 21,346 square-feet. Calculations should be submitted prior to the approval of a variance or special permit.

- Section 07-0 10 D (3) (b) [2] also states that a Special Permit may be granted for two-family and multifamily residential development on lots of at least forty thousand (40,000) square feet provided any on-site sewage disposal is less than or equal to one hundred ten (110) gallons per day per ten thousand (10,000) square feet of lot area. The property has recently been connected to Town sewer, water and gas including the removal of an existing home heating fuel tanks and the committee found this to be an acceptable reason for recommending approval.
- The application does indicate the impervious cover will be reduced but no plan has yet been submitted to verify how that will be accomplished nor how much impervious cover currently exists on site. A plan showing all existing and proposed impervious cover shall be submitted prior to an approval of a variance or special permit.
- The application indicates the existing home was previously a two family home but no documentation as to when that occurred is provided.
- The application indicates the existing home had two dangerous entrances onto Solomon Pond Road and Hudson Street which were eliminated but no plan was provided to indicate how the site would be accessed and a plan showing proper egress should be submitted prior to any approval of variance or special permit. It is also unclear what rights and/or ownership exist within Overlook Park and this should be confirmed on the required site plan.
- A request for a variance for lot area required is typically not recommended for approval unless the project is connected to Town sewer which this project is but there are significant questions that could be answered with a proper site plan and the associated calculations.

After the GAC meeting, Attorney Pember submitted a statement indicating that the property will be used for residential purposes and, as such, no harmful toxic or hazardous materials will be used or store onsite. The GAC letter also stipulates that, without the information required on the site plan, the hearing should be continued to allow the applicant to provide the adequate site plan. Attorney Pember confirmed that the applicant has no issue with continuing the hearing.

In response to a question from Mr. Rutan about any access problems onto Overlook Park Drive, Attorney Pember indicated that it is a private way. Mr. Litchfield voiced his assumption that there are access rights, but they are unclear.

Ms. Bakstran noted that the Building Inspector's comment letter indicates that the project needs to go before the Design Review Committee (DRC). Attorney Pember explained that the applicant is required to go before the Planning Board for a special permit, but a variance is needed before he can do so. He noted that his client will discuss the project with the DRC once these approvals have been obtained.

Mr. Frederico questioned the history of the land. Attorney Pember reiterated that the records at the assessor's office are quite poor and it is difficult to determine. Mr. Litchfield stated that it is unclear how much land area

goes with the property. He noted that at one point it appears that there was an acre but it is unclear when the lot was divided. He indicated that the records now list the property as a 21,000 square foot lot.

Ms. Bakstran commented that it is hard to believe that a bank would provide financing without more accurate information. She also voiced her opinion that this will be a tremendous improvement, and spoke in favor of the proposal since the duplexes are not of excessive size like we have recently seen and were the cause for concerns.

Brad Blanchette made a motion to continue the hearing to September 25, 2018. Fran Bakstran seconded; motion carries by unanimous vote.

Acting Chair Mark Rutan noted that Jeffrey Leland will be a voting member for all hearings given the absence of Chair Richard Rand.

DECISIONS:

1,000 Shops Way, (1000-9116) – Ms. Bakstran indicated that she is not in favor of approval as she believes the sign will be too big and the current sign is sufficient. Mr. Rutan stated that, if the landlord and other business are not opposed, he thinks it should be allowed. Mr. Leland agreed.

Fran Bakstran made a motion to approve a variance to allow a proposed sign be larger than the 100 square feet allowed, to be no larger than 200 square feet to replace the existing 100 square foot sign. Brad Blanchette seconded; motion carries by unanimous vote.

73-79 West Main (Karate School) – Mr. Rutan commented that the proposed use is a low impact use (no cooking, no chemicals, etc.). Mr. Blanchette agreed and noted that the hours of operation are modest and reasonable, and there appears to be ample parking.

Brad Blanchette made a motion to approve the petition to grant a variance/special permit with site plan approval to allow use of a personal karate training/development business personal on the property located at 73-79 West Main Street. Fran Bakstran seconded; motion carries by unanimous vote.

19 East Main Street – Mr. Rutan voiced support of the project, given that it will only be 3 bedrooms in total and there will be no changes to the envelope of the house. Members of the board agreed. Mr. Rutan also commented that, despite what others may say, he is familiar with the area and there are 2-family homes nearby. Ms. Bakstran commented that these units will provide alternate housing that should be relatively affordable, and reiterated that there will be a deed restriction limiting it to no more than 3 bedrooms.

Fran Bakstran made a motion to approve a Variances/Special Permit to allow the renovation of an existing single family home to a two-family home on the property located at 19 East Main Street with the conditions noted in the Groundwater Advisory Committee's comment letter dated August 28, 2018 (copy attached) as previously discussed and a condition requiring review and approval of the language for the deed restriction by the Zoning Enforcement Officer. Brad Blanchette seconded; motion carries by unanimous vote.

318 Main Street (dental practice) – Mr. Rutan found no issues with the project. Ms. Bakstran noted the Groundwater Advisory Committee’s recommendations. Mr. Litchfield reiterated his desire to ensure ongoing confirmation that the septic flows from the property stay within the flow limit of 9,000 gallons per day.

Brad Blanchette made a motion to approve a special permit to allow use of a dental practice at the building located at 318 Main Street with conditions as noted in the GAC comment letter dated August 28, 2018 (copy attached) as previously discussed. Jeffrey Leland seconded; motion carries by unanimous vote.

34 John Edwards Drive – Mr. Rutan voiced his opinion that pulling the garage from underneath the house and constructing one adjacent to it will make it more uniform with the neighborhood. He also noted that there were no objections from any of the abutters.

Board members discussed some confusion about the request, and clarified that the closest point will be within 2 feet of the property line.

Jeffrey Leland made a motion to approve a variance to allow construction of a proposed garage to be located within 2 feet of the side setback. Brad Blanchette seconded; motion carries by unanimous vote.

Approval of Minutes – Fran Bakstran made a motion to accept the Minutes of the Meeting of May 22, 2018 as submitted. Brad Blanchette seconded; motion carries by unanimous vote

Members of the board agreed to defer review of the Minutes of the Meeting of March 27, 2018 to the next meeting.

Election of Officers – Mr. Rutan explained that Mr. Rand had provided a note expressing his interest in continuing to serve as Chair. Ms. Bakstran voiced a preference for someone else to do so, and reiterated her opinion as expressed in the past that it is beneficial to rotate the duties of Chair among the board members.

Fran Bakstran nominated Brad Blanchette to serve as Chair for a one year term. Paul Tagliaferri seconded; Mr. Blanchette was elected Chair by a unanimous vote.

Jeffrey Leland nominated Mark Rutan to serve as Clerk. Fran Bakstran seconded; Mr. Rutan was elected Clerk by a unanimous vote.

Master Plan update – Ms. Bakstran stated that the Master Plan Steering Committee is presenting at the upcoming Applefest and noted that the process is proceeding well.

Meeting adjourned at 9:10PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Elaine Rowe
Board Secretary