



Hudson Board of Appeals

Town Hall

Hudson, Massachusetts 01749

Minutes of Meeting—April 13, 2017

The Hudson Board of Appeals met in the Selectmen's Hearing Room, 2nd Floor, Town Hall, Hudson, Massachusetts. At 7:00 PM, Lawrence Norris called the meeting to order.

Members Present: Lawrence Norris, Dorothy Risser, Todd Pietrasiak, Jason Mauro, Darja Nevits; Christopher Tibbals, and Jill Schafer

Staff: Kristina Johnson, AICP, Assistant Director of Planning and Community Development

A copy of the sign in sheet is enclosed with these minutes.

Petition; 16 Apsley Street, Variance (CONTINUED)

Present were: Edward Andrade, representing the petitioners, Antonio C. Andrade and Ilda C. Andrade

Chairman Norris reopened the above-referenced petition. He summarized the petitioner's request to vary the requirements of the Intensity Schedule (Section 6.2.1.3) to construct a 12 X20 garage within the side yard setback. Further, Chairman Norris summarized the requested documentation by the Board at the March 9, 2017 hearing: 1) a survey; 2) a plot plan; and 3) a photo of the garage prototype.

Mr. Andrade summarized the additional materials submitted to the Board and reiterated that the details of the proposed structure remain the same. He reviewed the plot plan and survey with the Board and discussed the proposed structure's relationship to the setbacks and the existing structures on the property. Mr. Andrade then showed a picture of the proposed garage prototype and passed it around to the members.

Based on Mr. Andrade's testimony, he stated his understanding that the petitioner would require a variance for the rear and side yard setbacks. Dorothy Risser then inquired about the dimensions of the proposed garage to which Mr. Andrade said 12 X20.

Chairman Norris reminded the petitioner of the required findings necessary for the Board to grant the variance. Mr. Norris stated that the petitioner needs to demonstrate what about the lot at 16 Apsley Street is unique as compared to the other lots within the

neighborhood relative to the side and rear setbacks. Chairman Norris recollected having a discussion with the petitioner at the prior month's hearing about the sharp drop off of the lot in the rear; however, according to the plot plan, the drop off does not seem to occur until the actual property line. Mr. Norris noted the lack of contour lines on the plans to gauge the issue.

Dorothy Risser questioned why the proposed structure is being placed so far toward the back of the lot, and whether the structure could be brought forward 15 more feet to avoid the rear setback conflict. Again, Chairman Norris reminded the petitioner that the standard for granting a variance is a lot higher, and it would be easier to demonstrate the hardship with respect to the side setback only. Using the plot plan, the Board calculated that if the proposed garage were moved 15 feet, than it would be off the rear setback by 3 feet—a more desirable condition. The Board generally agreed that granting a variance for two violations is not a desirable action when there is a remedy to avoid violating the rear setback.

Dorothy Risser then inquired about the existence of a retaining wall on the property, to which Mr. Andrade said that the retaining wall is located on the side of the lot. Ms. Risser said that the hardship for the side setback is much more obvious with the existence of the retaining wall, but once again reiterated that moving the proposed garage forward would avoid any rear setback issues.

Vice Chairman Pietrasiak brought to the Board's attention that the proposed garage may be considered an "accessory structure," and therefore, Section 6.3.1 would be applicable. With Section 6.3.1, Vice Chairman Pietrasiak noted that the accessory structure shall not be located any closer than three (3) feet to rear lot line and 10 feet from side lot line. Dorothy Risser asked the petitioner which Town Official indicated that only three (3) feet was necessary for the side setback. Mr. Andrade indicated that the Building Commissioner had discussed three (3) feet as the required rear yard setback. It was noted by Assistant Director Kristina Johnson, that the Building Commissioner did not check off the rear yard violation on the Building Permit Denial Form.

Vice Chairman Pietrasiak read verbatim the definition in the Zoning By-Laws for accessory building. Chairman Norris expressed his belief that this definition covers the Board in issuing the variance on the side setback.

Chairman Norris seconded by Dorothy Risser moved to enter into deliberative session. 8-0-0.

Members of the good expressed their general satisfaction with the petitioner's testimony and that the variance should be granted.

Chairman Norris, seconded by Vice Chairman Todd Pietrasiak moved to approve the petition and grant the variance equal to four feet for the construction of the proposed garage with the following findings:

1. That owing to unique circumstances relating to the soil, shape, and topography of the land, specifically the existence of two side retaining walls, all of which general affects the subject property but not generally affecting the SA Zoning District. No reasonable alternative for the removal or relocation of the retaining wall, which renders the entire lots up to the boundary unusable. It has been demonstrated that a literal enforcement of the zoning by-law would involve substantial hardship in that compliance with the side setback requirements would diminish the overall feasibility of the project, and;
2. Desired relief in the amount of four (4) feet from the side setback requirements may be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and without substantially degrading from the intent and purpose of the by-law as adverse effects are mitigated through conditions herein.

Vote: 5-0-0. Unanimous

Petition; 46 Church Street, *Special Permit (Continuance)*

Present were: Attorney Jose Moriera, representing the petitioner
Lew Colton, Architect
Anna Sousa, Petitioner
Debbie Sousa, Petitioner

Chairman Norris re-opened the above-referenced petition and provided an overview of the petitioner's request to demolish a pre-existing non-conforming two-family structure and construct a four-family structure under Section 5.1.6.1 of the Hudson Zoning By-Laws. Chairman Norris then went on to summarize the request to engage the Town Counsel to provide a legal opinion on the following two questions:

1. How the current petition pertains to Section 5.1.6.1 of the Hudson Zoning By-Laws, and if that section is not applicable, what other section of the By-Laws would this petition fall under;
2. What level of evidence should the ZBA entertain in its deliberation pursuant to Chapter 40A Section 6 and Section 7.

Chairman Norris noted that receipt of both the legal opinion from Town Counsel, Aldo Cipriano and from Matthew Runkle, abutter to the property. Mr. Norris read the letter from Mr. Runkle verbatim into the record and provided a copy to Attorney Moriera *Letter and Legal Opinion are part of the administrative record on file in the Planning Department.*

Chairman Norris then summarized the key components of the legal opinion furnished by Attorney Cipriano:

- 1) Summarized the facts of the case and as they are related to operating language within Section 5.1.6.1 regarding the alteration or expansion of a pre-existing non-conforming use.
- 2) Stated that the Board should also examine Section 5.1.6.3 of the Zoning By-Laws with respect to the structure, and that the Board should consider both the non-conforming use and structure together.
- 3) Noted the applicable section of M.G.L Chapter 40, Section 6 and described the procedure for the issuance of Section 6 Finding. Noted that the Board must consider the neighborhood context and whether the proposed alteration or expansion of the non-conformity is in harmony with the purpose and intent of the Zoning By-Laws.

Chairman Norris re-iterated that the petition is still open, and that it is his hope that the Board will continue to explore and discuss all issues in detail. He requested that Attorney Moreira approach the Board and address the legal opinion furnished by Town Counsel.

Attorney Moreira first stated his understanding of the purpose and intent of Section 5.1.6.1 relative to this petition, as any lawful building or premises existing at the time of the adoption of the Zoning By-Laws can be extended, altered, or expanded by Special Permit. He then expressed his disagreement with the Town Counsel's opinion regarding the applicability of Section 5.1.6.3. Attorney Moreira stated that there is no question that the proposed conversion from a two-family to a four-family is an intensification of the non-conforming nature of the use.

Chairman Norris questioned Attorney Moreira is he satisfactorily proven to the Board that indeed that two-family use prior to the adoption of the By-Laws. Attorney Moreira noted that the Town of Hudson Street listings from 1975 indicated that the use of the property was indeed a two-family ; he expressed his understanding that the sometime in the 1970s that use of the property became a two-family. Chairman Norris followed-up and stated his understanding that the Board has never taken any action and/or determination relative to establishing the two-family use, it just happened over time. Attorney Moreira concurred and stated his two-pronged argument:

- 1) Accepting that the property existing on the premise at 46 Church Street, which is a non-conforming lot, a non-conforming feature, gives the Board authority to measure the petition under Section 5.1.6.1; and
- 2) The records show that the property became a two-family in the 1970s and that is no evidence that any abandonment occurred.

Attorney Moreira expressed his disagreement with Attorney Cipriano's opinion relative to the applicability of Chapter 40 A Section 7. Attorney Moreira argued that that once the property became a two-family, there were alterations to the building that had occurred, but no building permit was sought no enforcement action occurred thereto. Therefore, he argued, that the structure becomes pre-existing nonconforming under the 2016 amendments to Chapter 40A Section 7. Attorney Moreira read verbatim the language of the amended Chapter 40A Section 7.

Chairman Norris then inquired why Section 5.1.6.3 of the Zoning By-Laws would apply to this petition. Attorney Moreira read aloud that section and argued it does not fit the petition before the Board. He explained that the intensification of the use intensifies the use of the building, which places the non-conforming nature on the non-conforming lot; therefore, the applicable Section is 5.1.6.1 whereby the extension, alteration, or expansion is allowed by Special Permit of the Zoning Board. He cited the Borkland Case, which held that a decision must be rendered as to whether the proposed alteration or enlargement of the nonconforming use is substantially more detrimental to the neighborhood than the existing nonconforming use. Attorney Moreira then noted that Church Street, Pope Street, and Pleasant Street all have a mix of uses, and submitted for the record the abutters list with the number of units for each address.

Chairman Norris asked Attorney Moreira to clarify that the Board is considering the petition under Section 5.1.6.1 under the Zoning By-Laws. Attorney Moreira concurred and then added that he believes that is the appropriate section along with Chapter 40A Section 6 and Section 7. He encouraged the Board in its examination of whether the enlargement of the non-conforming use is substantially more detrimental to look at the surrounding neighborhood, which he noted contains non-conforming multi-family uses. Attorney Moreira concluded by stating the Board must apply objective criteria in its review of the enlargement of the non-conforming use in relation to the adjacent neighborhood.

Chairman Norris discussed the various elements of the proposed site plan and noted that the new use will completely cover the lot, parking is located in the front and the back, and the driveway runs all the way around the lot. He acknowledged that the Planning Board and ITC did its job relative to reviewing and approving the site plan, he noted that the proposed use must be examined from a zoning perspective—whether it is in harmony with the neighborhood and the purpose and intent of the Zoning By-Laws. Chairman Norris indicated that he was not convinced that the proposed use meets that standard. Attorney Moreira responded by noting that there is no open space requirement for the SB Zoning District in the Intensity Schedule, and that 46 Church Street is one the larger lots within the neighborhood that meets the dimensional requirements.

Darja Nevits reiterated that Board needs has to consider the proposed use in relation to the neighborhood context. She expressed her belief that the proposed building does not fit in with the look and the feel of the neighborhood. Darja noted that proposed building

design is not the only option, and inquired whether the building could be designed to look and feel like a single-family home. Attorney Moreira responded by stating the structural integrity of the building is poor and that the property needs help; furthermore, he stated he would not be opposed to an alternative design.

Dorothy Risser expressed her belief that the non-conforming use was not in place when the Zoning By-Laws were adopted in 1957. She cited three sections of Attorney Cipriano's opinion that called this into question. Attorney Moreira stated that it is his understanding that Attorney Cipriano was examining the petition through the lens of Section 5.1.6.3 of the Zoning By-Laws. Attorney Moreira underscored that he believes that Section 5.1.6.1 is the applicable section of the By-Laws for the review of the petition. Dorothy Risser then expressed her belief about whether one can expand a non-conforming use on a non-conforming lot. Attorney Moriera stated that it is his belief that the amendments to Chapter 40A Section 7 conveys a non-conforming status of the building, which therefore allows for the enlargement of the non-conforming of the use of the building.

Assistant Director Kristina Johnson noted that she had conducted research to gain an understanding of the amendments to Section 7, and had requested Town Counsel to address Section 7 in his legal opinion. Attorney Cipriano expressed his opinion that Section 7 is not applicable.

Dorothy Risser, Members of the Board, and Attorney Moreira engaged in a lengthy discussion regarding the applicability of Section 7 relative to the petition.

Pam Cooper inquired as to whether the proposed structure will be built within the same non-conforming use footprint. She expressed concerns that the amount of paving area puts the proposed structure outside the of the non-conforming footprint. Lewis Colton reviewed the site plan with Board and indicated that the proposed building footprint is smaller than the existing structure on the lot.

Board Members engaged in lengthy discussion about which section of the Zoning By-Laws applies to the Petition—Section 5.1.6.1 or Section 5.1.6.3. Assistant Director Kristina Johnson noted that Attorney is recommending the Board consider both the structure and the use in its review of the Petition.

Dorothy Risser inquired whether the petition is amenable to a site re-design in order to make the proposed four-family use more palatable to the neighborhood, to which Attorney Moreira agreed. Lew Colton d that any site re-design would have to go back through the ITC and Planning Board, and that the site design for the proposed four-family structure was carefully laid out to address all concerns regarding fire protection, parking, drainage, and internal circulation Vice Chairman Pietrasiak weighed in and expressed his belief that there are so many site elements being crammed into the lot in order to accommodate a four-family structure that it does not fit with the character of the neighborhood. He further stated that if the number of units were reduced and

careful attention paid to the look and feel of the structure relative to the neighborhood, the proposed use may be more palatable.

Chairman Norris invited members of the public to provide comments.

Joe Pimetal of 47 Church Street expressed concerns about the look and design of the proposed building relative to the other residential structures within the neighborhood. He expressed his belief that no matter how you orient the buildings on the site, it does not match with the neighborhood character.

Matt Runkel of 42 Church Street noted the legal arguments presented during the hearing, and stated that based on those arguments he could demolish his existing residential structure which is on an undersized lot and build a four-family structure. He expressed his support of upgrading the property, but would like to see re-design of the proposed structure so that fits in with the surrounding neighborhood.

Attorney Moreira stated his willingness to discuss a possible site re-design with his client, and whether the Board would be amenable to continuing the hearing. Chairman Norris agreed and stated that the Board will explore the legal opinion more in-depth with Attorney Cipriano to gain a better understanding of his legal arguments in relation to this petition.

The hearing was continued to May 11, 2017.

Petition; 252 Coolidge Street, Special Permit

Present were: Attorney Paul Giannetti, representing the petitioner
Anthony Parinella, Manna Wellness

Chairman Norris recused himself from this petition and left the meeting. Todd Pietrasiak took over as meeting Chair.

Vice Chairman Pietrasiak—for the benefit of the folks just joining the meeting—explained the meeting format and protocol with respect to hearing the petition, Board Members asking question, public comments, and deliberative session. Vice Chairman Pietrasiak underscored that public comment is no longer accepted during deliberative sessions, as the Board discusses the petition amongst themselves and will take a vote.

Vice Chairman Pietrasiak read verbatim the public hearing notice into the record. The subject petition entails a Request for a Special Permit under the provisions of Section 5.11 through 5.11.9 of the Town of Hudson's Protective Zoning By-Laws to allow the Petitioner to operate a Medical Marijuana dispensary in an existing 1,890 square foot building at 252 Coolidge Street.

Dorothy Risser, ZBA Clerk, read the right of appeal.

Firstly, Attorney Paul Gianetti stated that the petitioner had been before the Board in January 2017, and had been granted a Special Permit to operate a medical marijuana dispensary at 131 Coolidge Street. Attorney Giannetti then stated that the petitioner is once again before the Board to seek a special permit to operate a medical marijuana dispensary across the street at 252 Coolidge Street. Attorney Giannetti provided an overview of the review process with the Town's Internal Traffic Committee (ITC) and the Planning Board. He specifically noted that the site plan was reviewed by both the ITC and the Planning Board. During the course of the Planning Board review, the Planning Board members had requested that the Department of Public Works (DPW) Director and the Police Chief evaluate the ingress and egress from the site. Attorney Gianetti noted that based on the professional opinion of the Police Chief and DPW Director, there are no circulation issues at the entrance to 252 Coolidge, and letters from both Departments have been furnished to that effect for the record.

Attorney Gianetti then proceeded to provide an overview of the site and describe the contents of the petition. He stated that Temescal Wellness intends to convert the existing garage on site into a single-use building for the sale of products, and he noted that the security plan for this building has been reviewed by the Police Chief. If the Board had specific questions regarding the security plan, Attorney Gianetti strongly recommended that the Board enter into an executive session in order to avoid disclosing specific security measures. With respect to the contents of the petition, Attorney Gianetti described the following:

1. A Letter of Non-Opposition signed by the Town Administrator, Thomas Moses.
2. Specific comments relative to public safety from the Fire Chief and the Police Chief.
3. Certificate of registration with the State Department of Public Health.
4. A detailed narrative outlining compliance with the issuance of a special permit
 - Registration with the State Department of Public Health
 - A site plan, which he noted was reviewed by the ITC and approved by the Planning Board.
 - Prior to occupancy, the requirement to receive approval from the Hudson Board of Health.
 - Requirement that the dispensary not be located in a mobile building.
 - Requirement that the dispensary building be located 2,000 feet from a school, day care, or library.
 - Requirement that the dispensary not directly abut an outside exercise facility and/or rail trail.
 - Requirement that the dispensary building cannot be located within a residential unit or building, transient housing, or hotels/motels.

- Requirement that security measures be in place for the dispensary building and the site.
- 5. A list of contact information for the dispensary building with the telephone numbers redacted. A non-redacted version has been furnished to the Health Department, Police Department, and the Planning Department.
- 6. A letter from the property owner acknowledging and authorizing the use of the property for a medical marijuana dispensary.
- 7. Attorney Gianetti expressed Temescal Wellness's understanding that the no smoking and/or consumption of products shall occur on site.
- 8. Attorney Gianetti stated that Temescal Wellness complies with the signage requirements, and acknowledged that a sign permit from the Building Commissioner will be required.
- 9. Attorney Giannetti expressed Temescal's understanding of the required hours of operations, but noted that specific hours of operation relative to this dispensary have not been officially set.

Attorney Giannetti then proceeded to discuss the specific findings the Board must make in order to grant the Special Permit relative to Section 5.11.5 (14) of the Zoning By-Laws. He noted that the Medical Marijuana Overlay District was created at the May 14, 2014 Town Meeting; and as such, he underscored that the proposed dispensary is located in area specifically designated by the Town of Hudson for this use. Attorney Giannetti expressed his belief that this location is beneficial for the following reasons: 1) Access to the Highway; 2) It's located away from residential areas; and 3) It's located away from the Downtown.

Vice Chairman Pietrasiak requested that the Petitioner give an overview of the proposed security measures in such a fashion to avoid entering into Executive Session. Antony Parinella of Temescal Wellness noted that the security measures in place are similar to what was reviewed and approved for the facility across the street at 131 Coolidge Street. Mr. Parinella described in detail the patient circulation within the building and the verification process for patients wishing to purchase products. He noted that the security plan is a State-approved security plan, and mentioned that entire square footage of the floor area and the exterior and windows will be under camera surveillance. Mr. Pietrasiak followed up and asked where within the building the products will be stored, to which Mr. Parinella answered that product will be stored in a locked vault.

Pamela Cooper inquired about the location of one of the building exits from the vault room and whether the Police Chief was comfortable with that. For the benefit of the

Board, Mr. Pietrasiak requested that Stephen Poole, Lakeview Engineering walk through the specifics of the site plan and the internal layout plan. Mr. Poole proceeded to describe the specifics relative to the internal layout plan and the site plan.

Darja Nevits inquired about the layout of the 2nd floor of the building. Mr. Poole pointed out on the internal layout plan that portion of the second floor is attic space and that the habitable area will be used for a break room and the security closet. Ms. Nevits asked a follow up question regarding the function of the security closet. Mr. Parinella stated the security closet will contain all of the Information/Technology equipment, and per State Law must be secured.

Vice Chairman Pietrasiak inquired how patients are allowed through the mantrap, to which Mr. Parinella responded that patients are buzzed into the building.

Stephen Poole then proceeded to discuss the specifics of the external site plan. Specifically he mentioned that the existing fence will be removed in order to add additional parking spaces, and he underscored that the perimeter around the building would be clear to allow adequate space for Police and Fire Department Access.

Dorothy Risser inquired about the width the existing site driveway, to which Stephen Poole responded that it's 30 feet at the entrance to Coolidge Street but does narrow to 25 feet upon entering the site.

Jill Schafer noted that the abutting office building is within 500 feet of the proposed dispensary and that the sign on the building indicates Donahue's Driving School as a tenant. She further noted the State Law prohibits the siting of dispensary in area where children commonly congregate. Members of the Board stated their understanding that the Donahue's Driving School is no longer in operation, but that there is a Pediatric Orthodontist within the building. Mr. Parinella underscored his understanding that the term "commonly congregate" refers to uses such as schools, libraries, and playgrounds.

Vice Chairman Pietrasiak opened up the floor to any questions from meeting attendees.

Mr. Silva (first name unintelligible on recording) of 234 Coolidge Street discuss his concerns about younger individuals smoking on or near his property, and his belief that the proposed dispensary would lead to more people smoking on his property. Mr. Pietrasiak acknowledged his concern and stated that the Board will take that into consideration during its deliberation.

Attorney Christopher, representing the owner of Pillar Realty, LLC, 131 Coolidge Street expressed several concerns relative to this petition. First, he expressed concerns that no traffic impact and access study was completed as part of the project review and he respectively requested that the Board require that a traffic study be completed. Secondly, he expressed concerns that site plan does not display the roadway cross section of State Route 62 and the proposed ingress and egress to the site could have

impact on this roadway and the traffic of the abutting properties. Attorney Yates inquired whether the State had been involved in reviewing the impacts of this project on this roadway, as significant improvements has been recently constructed along section of Route 62. Thirdly, Attorney Yates requested that the Board obtain a list of tenants from the abutting office building. He expressed his concern that his client may be limited on the future tenants that could be located at 131 Coolidge Street.

Assistant Planning Director Kristina Johnson addressed Attorney Yates' comments relative to the traffic concerns. First, Ms. Johnson explained that although Route 62 is a State numbered Route, it is under the jurisdiction of the Town of Hudson. She noted that MassDOT typically reviews and or requires a traffic impact and access study when a project directly abuts state highway infrastructure. Attorney Yates then asked if the Route 62 has been turned over to the Town of Hudson. Ms. Johnson explained that it is her understanding that MassDOT turned over Route 62 to the Town upon completion of the roadway improvements and suggested confirming the exact date with State Highway Layout records.

Attorney Yates acknowledged Ms. Johnson's comment regarding the State Highway jurisdiction issues, but underscored that the issue regarding the traffic study is separate and independent. Mr. Yates expressed his belief that the Planning Board and ZBA Board have required traffic studies for projects on roadways with less traffic than Route 62. Ms. Johnson reiterated that the ITC Board decided that the tip generation associated with the proposed use would not be significant enough to require a full traffic impact and access study. Furthermore, she noted that Planning Board—as a condition of the site plan approval—required the Police Chief and the DPW Director to conduct on site analysis and evaluation as to whether a right-turn only egress is warranted. Ms. Johnson summarized their observation and professional opinion (which is formally expressed in correspondence within the administrative record) that right-turn lane is not only unwarranted, it could cause a safety issue if actually implemented.

Attorney Giannetti followed up and stated his belief that since Route 62 has been recently upgraded, and any trips associated with the proposed dispensary can be accommodated.

Pamela Coper asked how far way the abutting property at 131 Coolidge Street from 252 Coolidge Street. Stephen Poole stated that he does not have an exact measurement, but the roadway curb to curb 80 feet.

Once again, Attorney Yates requested that Board take its time in reviewing the site plan and the potential traffic impacts, and that a detailed traffic study be completed.

Attorney Giannetti expressed his belief that the traffic issues had been appropriately reviewed and that this is an appropriate site for this use, per the zoning regulations.

Vice Chairman Todd Pietrasiak moved to enter into deliberative session. Seconded by

Dorothy Risser. 8-0-0. Unanimous

Members of the Board engaged in a discussion about the proposed location being compliance with the 500-foot requirement to be away from where children congregate and the traffic issues. With respect to the 500-foot requirement, the Board agreed that the approval of this special permit would be based on a snapshot of current conditions today, and it was noted that Donahue Driving School is no longer in operation. With respect to the traffic issues, the Board believed that the traffic generation would be de minimis and that the ITC Board and Police Chief and the DPW Director had investigated the traffic and circulation issues.

Vice Chairman Todd Pietrasiak, seconded by Dorothy Risser moved to grant the special permit under Section 5.11 through 5.11.9 of the Town of Hudson's Protective Zoning By-laws to allow the petitioner to operate a medical marijuana treatment facility at 252 Coolidge Street with the following conditions:

1. Any plans illustrating the layout of the facility with respect to safety and security measures shall be sequestered for the use of law enforcement officials only
2. Per Section 5.11.5 Section 10, the hours of operation shall be not deviate from the 8:00 AM through 8:00 PM timeframe and there shall be no loitering on the premises.
3. Per Section 5.11.5 Section 9, the petitioner shall provide the Special Permit Granting Authority—Police Department, and Hudson Board of Health the names, phone numbers, and e-mail addresses of all management staff and key holders to whom one can provide notice it there are operating issues associated with the establishment and they shall be immediately notified of any change in the above information.
4. The petitioner shall receive all necessary approvals from the Town of Hudson Board of Health prior to receiving an occupancy permit.
5. Per Section 5.11.6, the Petitioner shall file an annual report and appear before the Special Permit Granting Authority and the Board of Health by no later than January 31st. As part of the annual report, the Petitioner shall include a copy of all current applicable State licenses for the Center, and demonstrate continued compliance with the conditions of this Special Permit.
6. The issuance of said Special Permit is contingent upon an executed agreement between the Petitioner and the Town of Hudson as approved by the Board of Selectmen.

Vote: 5-0-0. Unanimous

Dorothy Risser seconded by Todd Pierstrsiak moved to approve the meeting minutes of March 9, 2017.

Vote 8-0-0. Unanimous

No Assistant Director's report was given.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:30 PM.

Director's Report

No report was given.

Adjournment

At 9:40 PM, Todd Pietrasiak, seconded by Dorothy Risser, moved to adjourn.

Vote: 8-0-0, Unanimous